Handbook of Research on Science Education

Volume III

Edited by NORMAN G. LEDERMAN, DANA L. ZEIDLER, and JUDITH S. LEDERMAN



HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON SCIENCE EDUCATION

Volume III

Volume III of this landmark synthesis of research offers a comprehensive, state-of-the-art survey highlighting new and emerging research perspectives in science education.

Building on the foundations set in Volumes I and II, Volume III provides a globally minded, up-to-the-minute survey of the science education research community and represents the diversity of the field. Each chapter has been updated with new research and new content, and Volume III has been further developed to include new and expanded coverage on astronomy and space education, epistemic practices related to socioscientific issues, design-based research, interdisciplinary and STEM education, inclusive science education, and the global impact of nature of science and scientific inquiry literacy.

As with the previous volumes, Volume III is organized around six themes: theory and methods of science education research; science learning; diversity and equity; science teaching; curriculum and assessment; 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 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, scholars, and graduate students, and pointing toward future directions of the field, *Handbook of Research on Science Education Research, Volume III* offers an essential resource to all members of the science education community.

Norman G. Lederman (deceased) was the Distinguished Professor and Chair, Department of Mathematics and Science Education, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA.

Dana L. Zeidler is the Distinguished University Professor and Program Coordinator for Science Education in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Learning of the College of Education at the University of South Florida, USA.

Judith S. Lederman is a Professor Emeritus in the Department of Mathematics and Science Education, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA.



HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON SCIENCE EDUCATION

Volume III

Edited by Norman G. Lederman, Dana L. Zeidler, and Judith S. Lederman



First published 2023 by Routledge 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

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

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

© 2023 Taylor & Francis

The right of Norman G. Lederman, Dana L. Zeidler, Judith S. Lederman to be identified as the authors 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 utilised 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.

ISBN: 978-0-367-42888-4 (hbk) ISBN: 978-0-367-42889-1 (pbk) ISBN: 978-0-367-85575-8 (ebk) DOI: 10.4324/9780367855758

Typeset in Bembo by Apex CoVantage, LLC

CONTENTS

Preface	ix	
Acknowledgments	x_1	
Contributors		
SECTION I		
Theory and Methods of Science Education Research	1	
Section Editor: William Boone		
1 Paradigms in Science Education Research	3	
David F. Treagust and Mihye Won		
2 Quantitative Research Designs and Approaches	28	
Hans E. Fischer, William J. Boone, and Knut Neumann		
3 Qualitative Research as Culture and Practice	60	
Gregory J. Kelly		
OD CTIVO V. V.		
SECTION II Science Learning	87	
Section Editor: Richard A. Duschl	0,	
4 Theories of Learning	89	
Clark A. Chinn and Kalypso Iordanou		
5 Student Conceptions, Conceptual Change, and Learning Progressions	121	
Joseph Krajcik and Namsoo Shin		

Contents

6	6 Student Attitudes, Identity, and Aspirations Toward Science Russell Tytler and Joseph Paul Ferguson		
7	Learning Environments Barry J. Fraser	193	
Div	etion III versity and Equity in Science Learning tion Editors: Cory A. Buxton and Okhee Lee	219	
8	Unpacking and Critically Synthesizing the Literature on Race and Ethnicity in Science Education: How Far Have We Come? Felicia Moore Mensah and Julie A. Bianchini	221	
9	Gender Matters: Building on the Past, Recognizing the Present, and Looking Toward the Future Anna Danielsson, Lucy Avraamidou, and Allison Gonsalves	263	
10	Multilingual Learners in Science Education Cory A. Buxton and Okhee Lee	291	
11	Special Needs and Talents in Science Learning Sami Kahn	325	
12	Science Education in Urban and Rural Contexts: Expanding on Conceptual Tools for Urban-Centric Research Gayle A. Buck, Pauline W. U. Chinn, and Bhaskar Upadhyay	359	
13	Culturally Responsive Science Education for Indigenous and Ethnic Minority Students Meshach Mobolaji Ogunniyi	389	
Sci	ETION IV ence Teaching tion Editors: Jan van Driel and Charlene Czerniak	411	
14	Discourse Practices in Science Learning Gregory J. Kelly, Bryan Brown, and María Pilar Jiménez-Aleixandre	413	
15	Synergies Between Learning Technologies and Learning Sciences: Promoting Equitable Secondary School Teaching Marcia C. Linn, Dermot Donnelly-Hermosillo, and Libby Gerard	447	

Contents

16	Science Education During the Early Childhood Years: Research Themes and Future Directions	499			
	Christina Siry, Kathy Cabe Trundle, and Mesut Saçkes				
17	Elementary Science Teaching: Toward the Goal of Scientific Literacy Valarie L. Akerson and Selina L. Bartels	528			
18	8 Interdisciplinary Approaches and Integrated STEM in Science Teaching Carla C. Johnson and Charlene M. Czerniak				
19	Teaching Biology: What Research Says Hernán Cofré, Claudia Vergara, David Santibáñez, Paola Núñez, and William McComas	586			
20	Teaching Physics Hans E. Fischer and Knut Neumann	619			
21	Chemistry Education Research: Recent Trends and the Onset of the Pandemic Era Sibel Erduran and Aybuke Pabuçcu Akış	657			
22	Earth Science Education Nir Orion and Julie C. Libarkin	692			
23	Environmental Education Justin Dillon and Benjamin Herman	717			
24	Scientific Inquiry Literacy: The Missing Link on the Continuum from Science Literacy to Scientific Literacy Renée S. Schwartz, Judith S. Lederman, and Patrick J. Enderle	749			
Cu	TION V rriculum and Assessment in Science tion Editors: Bronwen Cowen and Anders Jonsson	783			
25	Science, Scientific Literacy, and Science Education Jonathan Osborne	785			
26	The Use of Content Standards for Curriculum Reform in the United States: A Historical Analysis George E. DeBoer	817			
27	Research on Teaching, Learning, and Assessment of Nature of Science Fouad Abd-El-Khalick and Norman G. Lederman	850			

Contents

28	8 Exploring and Expanding the Frontiers of Socioscientific Issues Dana L. Zeidler and Troy D. Sadler				
29	Project Evaluation: Its History, Importance, and Current Practice Sarah Beth Woodruff and Qinghua Nian	930			
30	Precollege Engineering Education Christine M. Cunningham and Cary Sneider	960			
31	Review of Research About Science Education Program Evaluation Frances Lawrenz and Leslie Goodyear	993			
32	An AI-Based Teacher Dashboard to Support Students' Inquiry: Design Principles, Features, and Technological Specifications <i>Janice D. Gobert, Michael A. Sao Pedro, and Cameron G. Betts</i>	1011			
33	33 Large-Scale Assessment in Science Education Xiaoming Zhai and James W. Pellegrino				
SEC	CTION VI				
	ence Teacher Education	1099			
Sec	tion Editor: Saouma Boujaoude				
34	Science Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs: Reforming Practice M. Gail Jones and Soonhye Park	1101			
35	Research on Science Teacher Knowledge and Its Development Jan H. van Driel, Anne Hume, and Amanda Berry	1123			
36	Learning to Teach Science	1162			
	Tom Russell and Andrea K. Martin				
37	Tom Russell and Andrea K. Martin Research on Teacher Professional Development Programs in Science Gillian Roehrig	1197			
37 <i>Ind</i>	Research on Teacher Professional Development Programs in Science Gillian Roehrig	1197 1221			

PREFACE

The third volume of this handbook builds on the seminal work of its predecessors. Volume I, published in 2007, was edited by Sandra K. Abel and Norman G. Lederman. This original volume provided the field with the first comprehensive synthesis of empirical and theoretical research represented by international scholars. The publication of Volume II, edited by Norman G. Lederman and Sandra K. Abell in 2014, carried this scholarship forward with attention to the coherent synthesis of newer research that informed theory, policy, and practice, as well as attention to emerging fields of research. Now, in 2023, we find ourselves building on the shoulders of our colleagues. In Volume III, edited by Norman G. Lederman, Dana L. Zeidler, and Judith S. Lederman, our aim is to build on past research, getting seminal works down to a science, and infuse it with the most insightful current research, raising it up to a state-of-the art collection of the most relevant themes and research to science education. We have confidence that the work in this volume will enrich our current understandings of theory, policy, and practice, as well as stimulate the growth of new directions of fruitful research that will inform our field and as it continues to evolve with the zeitgeist and tenor of the times.

This venture has not been without its unforeseen challenges on so many levels. The loss of a loving husband, colleague, and close friend made the development and production of this volume, to say the least, a difficult journey. We hereby dedicate this volume to Dr. Norman G. Lederman, who would have been quite disappointed in us had we not brought this work to its natural fruition! In a metaphorical, Aristotelian way, we can think of Norm as an unmoved mover – coalescing so many scholars around the globe to contribute their time and energy to something he deemed critical to the field. To partake in this venture, with the collective goal of promoting human flourishing through the exercise of virtues of character and the quest for scientific literacy, is Norm's legacy. Volume III is dedicated to you, Norm!

Of course, much of the development of this book took place as all of us confronted the ravishing global effects of COVID-19, and the many variants that followed. Many of the section editors and authors were faced with life-altering decisions about family, friends, professional colleagues, and rethinking how to effectively educate in the absence of the sociocultural contexts we had taken for granted. There may be topics that the reader would wish were included but could not be because of the personal hardships confronting all of us. However, it may count as a minor marvel that so many international scholars persevered to contribute to this volume, highlighting contemporary and emerging research perspectives. It may have taken a bit longer to bring this current project to conclusion than originally anticipated. We are grateful for the understanding and dedicated efforts

Preface

of all who contributed to this collective endeavor, and we are confident that Volume III represents a compendium of the best global research lines impacting science education research.

The research in this volume is presented in six sections representing major themes in current research. They are as follows:

Section I. Theory and Methods of Science Education Research

Section Editor: William Boone, Miami University

Section II. Science Learning

Section Editor: Richard A. Duschl, Southern Methodist University

Section III. Diversity and Equity in Science Learning

Section Editors: Cory A. Buxton, Oregon State University, and Okhee Lee, New York

University

Section IV. Science Teaching

Section Editors: Jan van Driel, University of Melbourne, and Charlene Czerniak, University

of Toledo

Section V. Curriculum and Assessment in Science

Section Editors: Bronwen Cowen, The University of Waikato, Hamilton, and Anders Jonsson,

Kristianstad University

Section VI. Science Teacher Education

Section Editor: Saouma Boujaoude, American University of Beirut

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We want to acknowledge the work of our Managing Editors, who helped to right the ship if we meandered off course, worked closely with our publisher to make sure all the files were consistent with publication requirements, and applied their technical expertise to formatting and indexing the many manuscripts that comprise this volume. They are Dr. Dionysius Gnanakkan, Illinois Institute of Technology, and Constantine Shuniak, University of South Florida. We could not have completed this task without their dedicated efforts.

CONTRIBUTORS

Fouad Abd-El-Khalick, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA

Valarie Akerson, Indiana University, USA

Aybuke Pabuçcu Akış, Dokuz Eylul University, Turkey

Lucy Avraamidou, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Selina L. Bartels, Valparaiso University, USA

Julie A. Bianchini, University of California, Santa Barbara, USA

Amanda Berry, Monash University, Australia

Cameron G. Betts, Apprendis LLC., USA

William J. Boone, Miami University, USA

Saouma Boujaoude, American University of Beirut, Lebanon

Bryan Brown, Stanford University, USA

Gayle A. Buck, Indiana University, USA

Cory A. Buxton, Oregon State University, USA

Clark Chinn, Rutgers University, USA

Pauline W. U. Chinn, University of Hawaii, USA

Bronwen Cowen, The University of Waikato, New Zealand

Christine M. Cunningham, The Pennsylvania State University, USA

Charlene Czerniak, University of Toledo, USA

Anna Danielsson, Uppsala University, Sweden

George E. DeBoer, Colgate University, USA

Justin Dillon, University of Exeter, UK

Dermot Donnelly-Hermosillo, University of California, Berkeley, USA

Richard A. Duschl, Southern Methodist University, USA

Patrick J. Enderle, Georgia State University, USA

Sibel Erduran, University of Oxford, UK

Joseph Ferguson, Deakin University, Australia

Hans E. Fischer, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Barry J. Fraser, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Libby Gerard, University of California, Berkeley, USA

Janice Gobert, Rutgers University, USA

Allison Gonsalves, McGill University, Canada

Leslie Goodyear, Education Development Center, USA

Benjamin Herman, Texas A&M University, USA

Anne Hume, University of Waikato, New Zealand

Kalypso Iordanou, University of Central Lancashire, Cyprus

Contributors

María Pilar Jiménez-Aleixandre, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Carla C. Johnson, North Carolina State University, USA

M. Gail Jones, North Carolina State University, USA

Anders Jonsson, Kristianstad University, Sweden

Sami Kahn, Princeton University, USA

Gregory J. Kelly, The Pennsylvania State University, USA

Joseph S. Krajcik, Michigan State University, USA

Frances Lawrenz, University of Minnesota, USA

Judith S. Lederman, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA

Norman G. Lederman, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA

Okhee Lee, New York University, USA

Julie C. Libarkin, Michigan State University, USA

Marcia C. Linn, University of California, Berkeley, USA

Hernán Cofré, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Andrea K. Martin, Queen's University, Canada

Felicia Moore Mensah, Columbia University, USA

Knut Neumann, Leibniz-Institute for Science and Mathematics Education (IPN), Kiel, Germany

Qinghua Nian, Johns Hopkins University, USA

Paola Núñez, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Meshach M. Ogunniyi, University of the Western Cape, South Africa

Nir Orion, Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel

Jonathan Osborne, Stanford University, USA

Soonhye Park, North Carolina State University, USA

James Pellegrino, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA

Gillian Roehrig, University of Minnesota, USA

Tom Russell, Queen's University, Canada

Mesut Saçkes, Balikesir University, Turkey

Troy Sadler, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA

David Santibáñez, Universidad Finis Terrae, Chile

Michael A. Sao Pedro, Apprendis LLC., USA

Kathleen Scalise, University of Oregon, USA

Renée S. Schwartz, Georgia State University, USA

Namsoo Shin, Michigan State University, USA

Christina Siry, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

Cary Sneider, Portland State University, USA

David F. Treagust, Curtin University, Australia

Kathy Cabe Trundle, Utah State University, USA

Russell Tytler, Deakin University, Australia

Bhaskar Upadhyay, University of Minnesota, USA

Jan H. van Driel, University of Melbourne, Australia

Claudia Vergara, Pontificia Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile

Mihye Won, Curtin University, Australia

Sarah Beth Woodruff, Miami University, USA

Dana L. Zeidler, University of South Florida, USA



SECTION I

Theory and Methods of Science Education Research

Section Editor: William Boone



1

PARADIGMS IN SCIENCE EDUCATION RESEARCH

David F. Treagust and Mihye Won

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: 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? (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Like G. 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 to reporting the findings.

As Kuhn noted, although the paradigm is firmly based on the philosophical stance and has a significant influence over every aspect of the research procedures, researchers take for granted the paradigm in which they work, if they consider the paradigm at all. Indeed, researchers often have little or no knowledge of the historical grounding of the philosophical positions behind the paradigm, and consequently, they do not recognize the implications for conducting research. Indeed, in our recent informal review of research papers in science education when preparing for this chapter, the majority of authors do not refer explicitly to the paradigm that frames their research. In a similar manner, research methods books, particularly qualitative research methods books, discuss philosophical foundations and differences between quantitative and qualitative studies without necessary mentioning paradigms. Generally, the focus is on "practical" aspects of data collection and analysis - that is, stepby-step how-to procedures, such as how to phrase survey questions, how to use statistical packages, or how to conduct effective interviews (e.g., Creswell & Guetterman, 2019; Fraenkel et al., 2019; Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). In such discussions of the research process, educational researchers view their studies mainly in terms of technicalities, without acknowledging worldviews that shape and validate their knowledge claims (Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009). In more recent editions, some comprehensive research methods texts do discuss research paradigms and philosophical backgrounds, but largely in terms of the procedural differences between quantitative and qualitative data collection (Cohen et al., 2011; Punch & Oancea, 2014). Despite their importance, in most research papers and educational research methods books, research paradigms are rather hidden from plain view.

DOI: 10.4324/9780367855758-2

The fact that many people conduct studies without seriously considering research paradigms may be interpreted that the practical aspects of selecting a research paradigm are not as paramount as some researchers believe should be the case (Bryman, 2008). Some researchers even regard discussion of paradigms as a purely philosophical exercise, a remnant of the paradigm wars in the 1980s and 90s (Morgan, 2007). Reflecting on this time period, the 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 taking an interpretivist and/or critical stance. 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 acknowledgment of the contributions that research from different paradigms brings to the education community (Bredo, 2009).

In recent years, there have been 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 the United States by the National Research Council (NRC) (2002) and by other research-funding organizations dogmatically promote a certain type of research studies under the banner of evidence-based, scientific research, implying quantitative experimental design studies. At the time, this position by the NRC was not well considered by researchers in education who believed that it is dangerous to have such a limited view on what "other" types of research could contribute to establishing better education (see especially Feuer et al., 2002). (A detailed discussion of this issue is available in *Educational Researcher* in 2002 [volume 31, issue 8] and 2009 [volume 38, issues 6–7] and *Qualitative Inquiry* in 2004 [volume 10, issue 1].)

Furthermore, in the education community, and in the science education community in particular, there is still 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 methodologically 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 post-positivist 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 practice, this more balanced knowledge base is evident from an extensive review of 137,024 doctoral dissertations in education in US universities from 1980 to 2012, which showed an increased popularity of the interpretive research approaches during this period (Munoz-Najar Galvez et al., 2020). Further, there has been a willingness to move away from paradigm wars and examine the emergence of new approaches that address the complexities of educational research (Pivovarova et al., 2020).

We intentionally did not use the common category distinction of quantitative and qualitative research in this chapter because the category could be misleading – as if paradigm is limited to the choice of data-collection methods. As mentioned earlier, we believe a research paradigm is much more encompassing than the choice of data types. It is not helpful when a US government report – *Common guidelines for educational research and development* (Earle et al., 2013) – presents six types of research without any mention of paradigms. In our view, without an analytical understanding of each research paradigm, it is easy to misjudge the quality and the value of research to be investigated and miss the opportunities to learn from them (Moss et al., 2009).

In this chapter, we discuss four research paradigms – positivist/post-positivist, interpretivist/constructivist, critical theory, and mixed methods. While there are many different categorizations and

boundary drawings of research paradigms (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Moss et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2012), we chose those four to illustrate their own philosophical underpinnings or theoretical frameworks that guide research procedures and discuss how each paradigm is realized in various research studies in science education. Positivist/post-positivist researchers, based on realist worldviews, attempt to discover the truth by emulating "scientific" research with solid literature backgrounds and "objective" and rigorous research methods. Interpretivist researchers, based on relativist or constructivist worldviews, endeavor to make sense of the social phenomena through a lens of participants, demanding researchers of flexibility, open-mindedness, and reflexivity in design and execution of the research. Critical theory researchers, based on feminist, post-modernist, and other critical worldviews, challenge the status quo by questioning common assumptions and practices to create a more equitable, democratic society. In addition to research being conducted and framed within these three paradigms (even when not overtly mentioned), over the past three decades, a strong argument has emerged for what is referred to as the fourth pragmatic paradigm (Lukenchuk & Kolich, 2013). In this paradigm, mixed-methods researchers in education are not constrained by the underlying philosophies of the three paradigms referred to earlier and choose to not consider the philosophical underpinning of research, focusing on answering specific research questions.

By describing selected research articles that reflect the different paradigms referenced in the science education research field, we reflect on our own research practices and facilitate a dialogue across paradigms among science education researchers.

Post-Positivist Research Paradigm

Philosophical Backgrounds and Theoretical Frameworks of Post-Positivist Research Studies

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 the 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, but modified forms of positivism are quite prevalent and influential in the education field.

Different from positivists, post-positivists do admit that culture, personal value systems, and other surroundings influence an individual's 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 or not. 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 approach

the truth (or warranted assertions to borrow from John Dewey [1938/1991]) and are able to inform the people of interest (teachers, policymakers, parents, students, etc.) in order to help make data-driven decisions, for example, on a new educational program or educational improvement plans (in this case, informing teachers which teaching method is better for improving student achievement).

Examples of Post-Positivist Research Studies

Similar to research in the natural sciences or psychology, the post-positivist tradition focuses on seeking a scientifically rational or 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 five research studies from the science education literature with which we are familiar to illustrate the common features. These studies are not the result of an exhaustive review of the 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 post-tests. 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 (five years); within each teacher's class, the students were randomly assigned into two groups after a pre-test; 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 have 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, Sunitadevi Velayutham et al. (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 very important to obtain 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 interview. 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 post-positivist research paradigm includes studies that assess national standards or competencies of learning. These competencies include understanding and application of science concepts, principles and views of the nature of science and evaluation, and judgment about the role of science knowledge in understanding key problems of society and the life world. Julia Holstenbach et al. (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 included 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 to develop instructional settings and materials to guide students in achieving the complex competencies addressed.

Secondary analyses where the research is presented as objective, logical, and evidence-based, with the researchers having no contact with the participants or the research sites, also fit within the post-positivist design. Hsin-Hui Wang et al. (2021) explored how specific inquiry-related learning activities were related to student enjoyment of learning science and intended choice of future STEM careers. The data were from Taiwanese and Australian PISA 2015 results on three activities – debating and planning experiments, drawing conclusions and doing hands-on activities, and teachers and students explaining ideas. Taiwan and Australia were identified as sharing a consensus on developing scientific inquiry-related instruction to enhance the effectiveness of science education. The authors state that Taiwanese and Australian 15-year-old students have similar performances on science competency (4th and 14th out of 72 countries) but distinct cooperative behaviors – Taiwanese students emphasizing the product of cooperation compared to the Australian emphasis on the process of cooperation. Australian and Taiwanese high– and low–scientific competency students were compared across the three activities. Contrary to reports that inquiry activities are negatively associated with student learning outcomes, "this study identified specific inquiry-related activities that are beneficial to high and low scientific competency students in Australia and Taiwan" (p. 173).

Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) is required as part of the primary and high school curricula in Germany, and these aims can be achieved by introducing students to systems thinking. However, systems thinking is not part of university teacher education in Germany. In this study, Daniela Fanta et al. (2020) conducted a study with preservice biology and geography teachers to investigate the effect of three different interventions – a technical course, a mixed course, and a didactic course – that differed on the proportion of systems science and content for teaching systems thinking. The goal was to measure the extent of fostering systems thinking in student teachers of biology and geography in contrast to a control group. A heuristic structural competence model for systems thinking comprising four dimensions of competence was developed and used as the basis for a test

produced by the authors that was given to the preservice teachers. A quasi-experimental intervention study in a pre-, post-, and follow-up test control group design was employed and the instrument reliability, difficulty, and discrimination values provided. Upon completion of the courses, systems thinking was evident in all three courses compared to the control group. The authors concluded that "courses in fostering and teaching systems thinking should become part of the curricula in university teacher education, especially in the ESD-related topics such as biology and geography" (p. 240).

Common Features of Post-Positivist Research

Common Research Topics: The primary concern of 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 et al., 2002). Studies that typically are within a post-positivist paradigm include: (1) intervention studies, as seen in Ryoo and Linn's (2012) study and that of Fanta et al. (2020), and educational software studies such as the one by van Borkulo et al. (2012); (2) large-scale assessment studies, such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in the United States (Dee & Jacob, 2011), the National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) in Australia (Dulfer et al., 2012), and the national competency study by Holstenbach et al. (2011); (3) international comparison studies, such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (Thomson et al., 2012; Mullis et al., 2020) and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2010; Thomson et al., 2016); and (4) secondary analyses, like those by Wang et al. (2021).

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 frequently choose experimental designs (Ryoo & Linn, 2012) or large-scale surveys (Velayutham et al., 2011) or interventions (Fanta et al., 2020). 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). However, this level of control is constrained because educational researchers are limited by ethical considerations and in this way use quasi-experimental designs. These researchers 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 addressed (Cohen et al., 2011). While qualitative data may be collected for such research designs through interviews, observations, or students' essays, the data are typically converted into numbers to correspond to pre-set categories (Ryoo & Linn, 2012) or used to support or elaborate on the quantitative data (Velayutham et al., 2011) as a form of triangulation.

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 et al. (2011) and Fanta et al. (2020), the same basic relationship was established between the researchers and the participants with no personal attachment with the participants. In the secondary analysis study by Hsin-Hui Wang et al. (2021), the researchers are far removed from the participants and the research sites.

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 guide-lines 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 [n.d.] 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., 2019).

Common Quality Standards: While many educational researchers characterize positivism/post-positivism in terms of rigorous research methods and verifiable data (Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009), D.C. Phillips (2005) argued 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: (1) a clear definition of concepts/constructs that are employed in the study; (2) a strong, logical reasoning throughout the research process – from literature review to interpretation of the empirical data to drawing of its conclusions; and (3) significant contribution of the study findings to educators or policymakers.

Common Report Styles: Most post-positivist educational 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 to give an impersonal, objective tone.

Interpretivist/Constructivist Research Paradigm

Philosophical Background and Theoretical Frameworks of Interpretivist/Constructivist Research Paradigm Studies

Interpretivism emerged as the reaction against the prevalent "scientific" positivism research. Different from post-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 the 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 post-positivists' effort to gloss over the specifics of the teaching and learning context to generalize their research findings. They argue that measuring and generalizing human understanding and behaviors – as in post-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, 1938/1988) regarding educational phenomenon. 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 the 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 and share 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 complete or the right one, but 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 may 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. Furthermore, as the researcher is often the instrument of interpretation, the researcher usually provides the reader with self-reflections on the research process and provides evidence of any real or perceived biases that may have been part of the interpretation process.

Examples of Interpretivist/Constructivist Research Studies

Similar to researchers in anthropology, science education researchers in the interpretivist/constructivist 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 with the participants, whom they study and from whom they collect large amounts of (mostly) qualitative data from observations, interviews, and descriptive narratives. 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 four examples are interpretivist/constructivist studies with which we are familiar that provide evidence of the variety of interpretivist studies. As with the selected post–positivist studies, these four studies are not the result of an exhaustive review of the literature.

An example of a more methodical interpretivist research position is one by David Treagust et al. (2001). The study explored how a middle school teacher used assessment embedded within her teaching the topic of sound. In conducting this case study, the researchers 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). One of the authors was the teacher of the class, and the rest of the researchers interacted with the students as observer participants. After three 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 et al. (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 scientific discourse 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, and how his drawings were admired by others, etc. 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 boy 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 students' negotiation of meanings could help their scientific sense-making.

What is taught in a genetics class depends on the teachers' perspective on teaching genetics – some content is required and other content is optional, so it is dependent on the teachers' willingness to teach it. In this qualitative case study, Tuomas Aivelo and Anna Uitto (2019) conducted open-ended semi-structured interviews with ten upper-secondary high school biology teachers in Finland to learn how these teachers justified their choices for content and contexts when teaching genetics. The teachers were specifically asked how they teach and what examples they used on three different human-related contexts: genetically modified organisms (GMOs), human hereditary disorders, and human complex traits, such as intelligence. These three contexts functioned as a gradient in terms of how much freedom teachers had to choose what content and contexts they taught, with GMOs being part of the national core curriculum. Interviews lasted for 40 to 92 minutes. The teachers' responses were categorized using a theory-guided content analysis. Trustworthiness of the data was based on teachers recording details of their teaching and the questions that students asked or for answers that needed clarification. Teachers' discussion of the content taught was divided into three themes, and how they taught the use of GMOs and human genetics and dealt with controversial or

sensitive issues in genetics. The analysis showed that there were fundamental differences in these biology teachers' perceptions of the most important themes in genetics and genetics teaching and hence what was taught. While many of these Finnish teachers discussed human traits and other sensitive issues, the researchers argue that the teachers would need more curriculum support to handle controversial and sensitive issues in the classroom. GMO was the most taught topic by all teachers, being specifically mentioned in the curriculum.

Heidi 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' experiences – the 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 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. 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 in the paper to demonstrate the subtle way the participants' experiences are integrated into their way of communication 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.

Consistent with recent policy initiatives in the United States, the goal of this study was to explore and further elucidate secondary teachers' knowledge of students' conceptions on the topic of evolution by natural selection. In this research, Margaret Lucero et al. (2020) conducted teacher interviews – using items from a known questionnaire as prompts, collected students' artifacts and video recorded classroom observations. The research design employed a qualitative grounded theory approach to analyze data collected from four high school biology teachers. Recognizing that many US students hold non-scientific explanations about evolution and natural selection, the researchers interviewed the teachers prior to and after formal instruction on evolution. Data from the videoed classroom observations and the students' artifacts triangulated with the teacher interviews generated 18 concepts through open coding of the data, reconciliation of tentative categories and axial coding to establish the trustworthiness of the data. Five broad categories were identified, two confirming prior research - about students' understanding of ecological and genetics concepts and students' default ways of thinking - and three providing new ideas - related to students' experience of the topic, non-science issues such as lack of vocabulary that may affect understanding, and students' testtaking strategies. The authors argue that the findings provide a better understanding of secondary students' understanding of evolution that can help address reform-oriented instruction.

Common Features of Interpretivist Research Studies

Common Research Topics: Interpretivist studies focus on the cultures (Carlone, 2004), language use (Warren et al., 2001), teachers' decisions about content and contexts (Aivelo & Uitto, 2019), teachers' knowledge of students' conceptions (Lucero et al., 2020), classroom interactions (Gallas, 1995;

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 sensemaking process for the researchers involved, the research design itself can evolve, as illustrated by studies using grounded theory (Lucero et al., 2020). 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 something that would be frowned upon in post-positivist research, but is a natural process of interpretivist research. Interpretivist/constructivist researchers tend to adopt qualitative research designs, such as case study, ethnography, narrative, and phenomenological research (Carlone, 2004). 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 post-positivist 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 pre-given but are co-created through hermeneutic dialogues (Schwandt, 2000), researchers often aim to study by engaging with the activities of the research participants (Aivelo & Uitto, 2019; Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Lucero et al., 2020; 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 to immerse in the situation to experience the situation 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 sensemaking process. Frederick Erickson (Moss et al., 2009) categorizes the criteria to judge quality interpretivist research study into two: the technical aspects and the educational imagination. Technical aspects involve: (1) prolonged, meaningful interaction in the field; (2) careful, repeated sifting through the data; (3) reflective analysis of the data; and (4) 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; affects readers through resonance; 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 we 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 (Aivelo & Uitto, 2019; Carlone, 2004; Lucero et al., 2020). Or it could take a story-like format of describing a daily procedure of a schoolteacher or children's discussion in class (Gallas, 1995, 1997). In such story-like reports, some researchers do not make a long validity claim or methodological justification; they simply describe what they have done and explain why. Other researchers use member checking, follow audit trails, and other measures as a way to ensure that researchers are interpreting and communicating research participants' perspectives fairly and reflectively. 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 weaved 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 on 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 data analysis, and how they considered alternative interpretations. However, the research by Munoz-Najar Galvez et al. (2020) that analyzed 137,024 dissertation abstracts in the field of education from 1980 to 2010 showed that "topics associated with the interpretive approach rose in popularity while the outcomes-oriented paradigm declined" (p. 612). This detailed analysis of educational research abstracts is consistent with science education research articles where sociocultural, interpretivist research studies appear more frequently in major science education journals. In addition, *Cultural Studies in Science Education*, established in 2006, 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.

Critical Theory¹ Research Paradigm

Philosophical Backgrounds and Theoretical Frameworks of Critical Theory Research Paradigm Studies

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 as 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 et al., 1996)? Twenty years ago researchers were asking questions such as: 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 to learn science at school (Aikenhead & Jegede, 1999; Brickhouse et al., 2000; Harding, 1991)? Research has provided answers to many of these questions, leading to further questions about how to maintain females' interest and engagement in science (see, for example, Prieto-Rodriguez et al., 2020; Stevenson et al., 2021).

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). Critical researchers ask themselves how they should change, as teacher, educational researcher, and concerned community member, for society to be more equal, open, and democratic (Bouillion & Gomez, 2001; Elmesky & Tobin, 2005; Roth & Desautels, 2002; Tan & Barton, 2008). In order to enact changes in the lives of the socially, economically, and historically marginalized people, researchers often spend time in low-income, ethnic minority neighborhood schools and become involved in some type of action research project.

Examples of Critical Theory Research Studies

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 following five examples are critical theory studies with which we are familiar that provide evidence of the variety of elements in such studies. As with the selected studies in the post-positivist and interpretive research, these five studies are not the result of an exhaustive review of the literature. The first two studies by Bouillion and Gomez (2001) and by Elmesky and Tobin (2005) illustrate how science education researchers attempted to change how schooling or social research is conducted. The researchers first pointed out the limitations of the status quo and then enacted alternative ways. Their primary goal was not only to observe but to change the situation and empower the students and their community for the betterment of the people involved. The third study by Tan and Barton (2008) was conducted in the same vein as the first two, but their study may look very similar to an interpretivist study in terms of their defense of research methods, presentation of results, and interpretations. The fourth study, by Eisenhart (2000), is a critical autoethnographic study where 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. The fifth study, by Hoeg and Bencze (2017), illustrates how government policy statements for STEM education are based on embedded practices that benefit and privilege certain people as effective citizens and the statements are not criticized. The five studies briefly summarized next 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 by 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 to make the action project successful. Here, the research report format is not much different from interpretivist research studies but has the important element of political orientation challenging the status quo. However, the focus of the study was not simply reporting a successful science activity. The researchers aimed to change the existing practice of science teaching at 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 actively incorporated into the activity planning and execution; between education researchers and school teachers as they became equal contributors in the collaborative project; 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. Instead of following the conventional model of objectifying students' ideas, Rowhea Elmesky and Kenneth Tobin (2005) involved students as the collaborative researchers rather than as subjects trying to change the power imbalance in the research process. 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 Kincheloe and 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 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 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 "problems" or "failures" and by depriving learning opportunities to make meaningful personal connections to science. After a discussion of the feminist stance on the global knowledge economy, the researchers carefully described how two sixth grade ethnic minority girls from a low-income neighborhood community 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 a critical auto-ethnographic, 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/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 pro-life 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 of the 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 why 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 of what happened to the larger social discourse eased her guilty conscience to her co-author and showed off an academic's intellectual power. This reflective, honest piece of writing leads us to reconsider the meaning of what we do and how we do it in a new light.

The importance of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education - collectively known as STEM education – for preparing citizens for the future is readily accepted by most nations. In the United States policy guidelines have been developed in STEM education. In their article, Darren Hoeg and Larry Bencze (2017) raise issues with the manner in which these policy guidelines are presented and critically discuss the "biopolitics in science education, notions of citizenship in contemporary school education and science education and citizenship and STEM Education" (p. 844). The review identified themes and categories that became the basis of critical discourse analysis based on Foucault's (2003) stages of biopolitical development associated with human action and practice. The authors illuminated the ways in which powerful social practices are embedded in the construction of STEM policy and education. They argue that these policy statements are designed to create positive attitudes toward solutions that prioritize and privilege citizen subjectivity such that responses are positive to STEM initiatives and little criticism is engendered. The dominant way of speaking in this discourse is that a scientifically literate citizenship represents "progress". The discourse connects scientific literacy with effective citizenship - namely, those who participate effectively, implying that other citizenship roles and types of citizens are not as important to the problems that threaten a nation and specifically the economy.

Common Features of Critical Theory Research Studies

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 the multiple, subtle ways that discourage or marginalize the participation of socially disadvantaged people in schooling or science (Elmesky & Tobin, 2005) or challenges to policies that prioritize and privilege some citizens over others (Hoeg & Bencze, 2017). The study of power relationships is a common research topic. As an example, Teo and Tan (2020) provided a critical analysis of power, knowledge, and power relationships between a chemistry expert – the school-based School Scientist – and two apprentices – two students in Grade 10 and another in Grade 9) – in a chemical synthesis project. "This study shows teaching and learning in the form of an apprenticeship model involved dynamism in the negotiations of power relationships during the apprenticeship process" (p. 672–673).

Common Research Designs: The designs of critical theory research are often very similar to 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 relations 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) are examples of such studies.

Role of the Researcher. The main goal of research is not about expanding the body of knowledge but about challenging the given status quo with the aim of transforming the society and institution for the betterment of the people involved (Hoeg & Bencze, 2017). Rather than writing as a distant, unbiased scholar, critical theory researchers claim they are intellectuals and activists, working for social justice and for the people who are socially and politically disempowered (Fine et al., 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 relationships with research participants, democratic decision-making, and shared contributions to the study), and the social impact of the study in transforming society (e.g., greater/sophisticated understanding of the society, the empowerment of the participants, and prompting or enacting changes in social/personal practices) (G. Anderson et al., 1994; Griffiths, 1998).

Common Report Styles: Because they are consciously problematizing what is given or conventional, the authors intentionally do not follow the traditional fabric of a research report. Instead, they experiment with the reporting of the study, such as adopting a performance or writing the story as fiction (Flores-González et al., 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 Tan and Barton (2008) and by Eisenhart (2000).

Mixed-Methods Research Paradigm

Discussions about research paradigms often result in responses like, "Research paradigms do not matter anymore" and "We can mix and match multiple paradigms to answer research questions". While it is true that research studies do need to address the research questions thoroughly, and some researchers use both quantitative and qualitative data, can we really mix and match research paradigms? How can realism (positivist), relativism (interpretivist), and feminism (critical theory) as worldviews be integrated into a research study? How can a researcher be a distant scientist (positivist) without direct connection to research participants and at the same a passionate interpreter (interpretivist) and advocate (critical theory) of research participants with intimate knowledge of their lived experiences?

To many contemporary education researchers, research paradigms are not considered complex belief systems with philosophical underpinnings and practical implications. Rather, paradigms are regarded the same as research methods or designs. According to Cohen et al. (2017), researchers such as Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) appear to make the distinction linked to types of data - post-positivism (quantitative research), constructivism (qualitative research), participatory/transformative (qualitative research), and pragmatism (quantitative research and qualitative research). Alise and Teddlie (2010) also identified a strong tendency for post-positivist researchers to use quantitative methods and for interpretivist and critical theory researchers to use qualitative methods. Many researchers do not regard paradigms as complex belief systems, and they do not see any problems mixing quantitative and qualitative data in a research study. Mixed-methods researchers believe that dichotomizing quantitative and qualitative data is not only unproductive but fallacious (Ercikan & Roth, 2006). As researchers tend to focus on practical aspects of research design and methods rather than worldviews or paradigms when designing and executing research, some researchers question the practical value of research paradigms anyway (Morgan, 2007). Others (e.g., Greene, 2008) focus on the practical value of a problem-solving approach without the restrictions of theory. Discussions about the relationship between paradigms and data types is an ongoing issue.

As Bryman (2008) notes, combining different research methods is an area where researchers still have different views. While many post-positivist researchers welcome such adjustment as a way to increase the validity of research findings, constructivist researchers are rather critical of such approaches. Denzin and Lincoln (2011), for example, regard mixed methods as a remnant of positivist legacies that relies on numbers as scientific evidence, resisting to acknowledge the value of interpretivist qualitative studies and the political issue of what counts as evidence.

Without an explicit philosophical framework and guiding principles within it and conflating research paradigms with methods, the mixed-methods approach is a different way of framing research compared to the other three research traditions. Nevertheless, we decided to include mixed methods as the fourth paradigm, despite our initial reservation against it. In many ways, discussion of the mixed-methods approach relates to our earlier comments about Kuhn's discussion of the invisibility of paradigms where researchers do not consider the history that frames their current practice. This tendency to ignore historical and philosophical considerations such as paradigms when designing and discussing our research is a limitation of the reported research. For a brief comparison of four different research traditions, please see Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Similarities and Differences of Common Features Between the Four Paradigms

Common Features	Post-Positivist Research Studies	Interpretivist / Constructivist Research Studies	Critical Theory Research Studies	Mixed Methods Research Studies
Research Topics	Evaluation of effectiveness/ efficiency of intervention teaching programs Large-scale assessments or surveys	Lived experiences of teachers and students with focus on culture, language use, and daily classroom/school interactions	Political and historical aspects of education Lived experiences of disadvantaged population to highlight educational inequality Activist movement to challenge the status quo	Evaluation of effectiveness/ efficiency of intervention teaching programs
Research Designs	Explanatory designs (e.g., experiment or survey research) with representative sampling, quantitative measurement, and multiple validation processes of data	Exploratory designs (e.g., grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenology research) in naturalistic settings with evolving research methods involving thick description	Similar to interpretivist studies or participatory action research with explicit emphasis on social ideologies and power relationships	Explanatory or exploratory mixed- methods research designs
Role of the Researcher in Relation to the Participants	Objective, unbiased collector and interpreter of data without close connection to research participants	Insightful and passionate meaning maker and storyteller of research participants' lived experiences	Strong advocates of the socially marginalized to challenge status quo	Objective data collector and interpreter with some connection to research participants
Quality Standards	Clear definition of constructs/concepts Rigorous research methods for objective, comprehensive data Reliability of measurement Internal and external validity of knowledge claims	Prolonged meaningful interaction in the field and repeated re-analysis and reflections on data Depends on researcher's skills, sensitivity, and integrity Member check, audit trail, peer review, triangulation	Democratic and catalytic value of the research	Comprehensive answer to the research questions
Report Styles	Traditional scientific research format, written in third person	Use of thick description Can be as a traditional empirical study Or as storytelling, weaving participants' lived experience with researchers' interpretations	Consciously problematizing what is given or conventional. Some researchers write a fictional story, others more traditional ethnographic reports	Similar styles as in post-positivist studies with participants' interview quotes

Examples of Mixed-Methods Studies

Next, we present five studies that adopt mixed-methods approaches, providing readers with the types of data collected and how these are analyzed in mixed-methods research studies. As noted in Table 1.1, mixed-methods researchers' reports have the main features of reports by researchers using post-positivist and interpretivist paradigms but, as already stated, have essentially ignored the philosophical and epistemological frameworks or backgrounds.

Using an overtly described two-phase, sequential mixed-methods study, Sedat Ucar et al. (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 mixed-methods 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 "mixed-method, 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 semi-structured 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 or not 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 post-instruction 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; fossilization of geochemistry remained problematic for both groups.

Vaughan Prain and Bruce Waldrip (2006) conducted research with a group of teachers and their Year 4–6 students when they engaged with multiple representations of the same science concepts in electrical circuits and collisions and vehicle safety. Using "a mixed-methods approach entailing collection and analysis of both qualitative 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 class-room practice with a multi-modal focus. The data included classroom observations and interviews with students when they were involved in classroom activities. Two science classes were reported.

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 demonstrated conceptual understanding were those who recognized the relationships between modes.

In a similar manner, using a mixed-methods study described as a quasi-experimental control group design with a pre- and post-test questionnaire involving both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures, Emine Adadan (2020) investigated the role of metacognitive awareness in preservice chemistry teachers' level of understanding of gas behavior in a multi-representational instruction setting. The quantitative data were from a survey administered to a group of 34 preservice teachers and qualitative data from an open-ended questionnaire. Reliability measures for the quantitative data were reported, and the qualitative responses were coded using the constant comparative method. The results were reported in response to three research questions, and the numerical and interpretive data analyses provided consistent and integrated evidence (p. 271). Similar to other related studies, "the participants with high metacognitive awareness appeared to outperform the participants with low metacognitive awareness in terms of developing a more scientific understanding of gas behaviour immediately after the multi-representational instruction" (p. 271).

Common Features of Mixed-Methods Research Studies

Common Research Topics: Mixed-methods studies involve a wider range of research topics, from an evaluation of a teaching intervention with some research participants' insights integrated into the research report, to a case study of classroom interactions and dialogues with some complementary quantitative measures.

Common Research Designs: Creswell's (2012) common mixed-methods designs, both explanatory and exploratory, are adopted so long as quantitative and qualitative data are used in a complementary manner. These designs encompass post-positivist researchers adding qualitative data, such as short interviews or field notes, to a quantitative experimental research design, as seen in Ucar et al. (2011) and Clary and Wandersee (2007). They also include interpretivist researchers borrowing quantitative techniques, such as achievement test scores or survey results, to a case study design, as seen in Hohenshell and Hand (2006) and Prain and Waldrip (2006).

Common Quality Standards: One of the justifications of mixed-methods approaches is that the mixed use of quantitative and qualitative data enables a thorough triangulation of the data to make stronger knowledge claims (Creswell, 2012; Mathison, 1988; Reeves, 1997).

Role of the Researcher and Common Report Styles: As mixed-methods researchers use the methods from the other three paradigms, the role of the researcher and the reporting styles are similar to those described for the other three paradigms.

Conclusion

Science education researchers have strived to establish solid knowledge claims in 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 this chapter, we have described four distinctive research traditions, identified relevant studies, and highlighted commonly shared features within each tradition. Our aim has been to show how a research paradigm frames the 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.

The landscape of conducting research within these paradigms has gradually changed over the years, though all paradigms, in keeping with the ideas of Thomas Kuhn, are largely hidden from

view. In the years ahead, we can imagine that approaches to research will continuously evolve to incorporate new issues and ideas. We hope this review will contribute to productive discussion by science education researchers working within and across these four different research paradigms in science education.

Acknowledgments

This chapter extends the published chapter in the *Handbook of Research in Science Education* (Volume 2) authored by Treagust et al. (2014). We would like to thank Reinders Duit (now retired from the IPN – Leibniz Institute for Science and Mathematics Education, University of Kiel, Germany) for his contribution to that earlier chapter.

We would like to thank Xiufeng Liu and William Romine, who carefully and critically reviewed this chapter. We hope that we have done justice to their critiques and constructive suggestions.

Note

1 Critical theory studies include several research traditions, such as feminism, postcolonialism, post-structuralism, emancipatory/participatory, postmodernism, etc.

References

- Adadan, E. (2020). Analyzing the role of metacognitive awareness in preservice chemistry teachers' understanding of gas behavior in a multirepresentational instruction setting. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 57, 253–278. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21589
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI) 1098-2736(199903)36:3<269::AID-TEA3>3.0.CO;2-T
- Aivelo, T., & Uitto, A. (2019). Teachers' choice of content and consideration of controversial and sensitive issues in teaching of secondary school genetics. *International Journal of Science Education*, 41(18), 2716–2735. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1694195
- Alise, M. A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). A continuation of the paradigm wars? Prevalence rates of methodological approaches across the social/behavioral sciences. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4(2), 103–126. http://doi.org/10.1177/1558689809360805
- 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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, G. (1998). Fundamentals of educational research (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Anderson, G., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. S. (1994). Studying your own school: An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research. Corwin Press.
- Australian Association for Research in Education. (n.d). AARE code of ethics. www.aare.edu.au/assets/documents/policies/AARE-Code-of-Ethics.pdf
- Barton, A. C., & Osborne, M. D. (2001). Introduction *Teaching science in diverse settings: Marginalized discourses and classroom practice*. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.1037
- Bredo, E. (2009). Comments on Howe: Getting over the methodology wars. Educational Researcher, 38(6), 441–448. http://doi.org/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. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(200005)37:5<441::AID-TEA4>3.0.CO;2-3
- Bryman, A. (2008). The end of paradigm wars? In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, & J. Brannen (Eds.), SAGE hand-book of social research methods (pp. 12–26). Sage.
- Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods (4th ed.). 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20006

- 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). 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20178
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. R. B. (2011). Research methods in education (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. R. B. (2017). Research methods in education (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Controversies in mixed methods research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Strate-gies of qualitative inquiry (4th ed.). Sage Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.). Sage.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20586
- 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). Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1925/1981). Experience and nature. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The later works*, 1925–1953 (Vol. 1). Southern Illinois University Press (Reprinted from: 1997).
- Dewey, J. (1938/1988). Experience and education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953* (Vol. 13, pp. 1–62). 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). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dulfer, N., Polesel, J., & Rice, S. (2012). The experience of education: The impacts of high stakes testing on school students and their families. Whitlam Institute, University of Western Sydney.
- Earle, J., Maynard, R., & Neild, R. C. (Co-chairs). (2013). Common guidelines for education research and development. Institute of Education Science, US Department of Education and National Science Foundation.
- Eggert, S., & Bögeholz, S. (2006). Göttinger Modell der Bewertungskompetenz Teilkompetenz "Bewerten, Entscheiden und Reflektieren" für Gestaltungsaufgaben nachhaltiger Entwicklung [The Göttingen Model of evaluation and judgement competence evaluating, deciding, and reflecting in the area of sustainable development]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 12, 177–197. https://archiv.ipn.uni-kiel.de/zfdn/pdf/010_12.pdf
- Einarsdottir, J. (2007). Research with children: Methodological and ethical challenges. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 15(2), 197–211. http://doi.org/10.1080/13502930701321477
- Eisenhart, M. (2000). Boundaries and selves in the making of science. Research in Science Education, 30(1), 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02461652
- Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. (1996). Creating conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. American Educational Research Journal, 33(2), 261–295. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312033002261
- 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/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). 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). Springer.
- Erickson, F., & Gutierrez, K. (2002). Comment: Culture, rigor, and science in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 21–24. http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x031008021
- Etherington, K. (2007). Ethical research in reflexive relationships. Qualitative Inquiry, 13(5), 599–616. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800407301175
- Fanta, D., Braeutigam, J., & Riess, W. (2020). Fostering systems thinking in student teachers of biology and geography – An intervention study. *Journal of Biological Education*, 54, 226–244. http://doi.org/10.1080/00 219266.2019.1569083
- Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 4–14. http://doi.org/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). 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). Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (2003). Society must be defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975–1976 (D. Macey, Trans.). Picador.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). How to design and evaluate research in education (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018007004
- Gallas, K. (1995). Talking their way into science: Hearing children's questions and theories, responding with curricula. Teachers College Press.
- Gallas, K. (1997). Sometimes I can be anything: Power, gender, and identity in a primary classroom. Teachers College Press. Greene, J. C. (2008). Is mixed methods social inquiry a distinctive methodology? Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 2(1), 7–22. http://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807309969
- Griffiths, M. (1998). Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence. Open University Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Judging the quality of fourth generation evaluation. 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). 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). Sage.
- Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives. Cornell University Press.
- Hoeg, D., & Bencze, L. (2017). Rising against a gathering storm: A biopolitical analysis of citizenship in STEM policy. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 12, 843–861. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-017-9838-9
- 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. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500690500336965
- Holstenbach, J., Fischer, H. E., Kauertz, A., Mayer, J., Sumfleth, E., & Walpuski, M. (2011). Modellierung der Bewertungskompetenz in den Naturwissenschaften zur Evaluation der Nationalen Bildungsstandards [Modeling the evaluation and judgement competence in science to evaluate national educational standards]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 17, 261–287. https://archiv.ipn.uni-kiel.de/zfdn/pdf/17_Hostenbach.pdf
- Howe, K. R. (2009). Positivist dogmas, rhetoric, and the education science question. Educational Researcher, 38(6), 428–440. http://doi.org/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). 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. http://doi.org/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). 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). 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). Falmer Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Tobin, K. G. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4, 513–528. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-009-9178-5
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolution. 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. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X026001023
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigm controversies, contraditions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 163–188). Sage.
- Lucero, M., Delgado, C., & Green, K. (2020). Elucidating high school teachers' knowledge of students' conceptions regarding natural selection. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 18, 1041–1061. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-019-10008-1
- Lukenchuk, A., & Kolich, E. (2013). Paradigms and educational research: Weaving the tapestry. In A. Lukenchuk (Ed.), Counterpoints paradigms of research for the 21st century: Perspectives and examples from practice (Vol. 436, pp. 61–87). Peter Lang.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 13–17. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X017002013
- 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). Springer.

- Maxwell, J. A. (2004). Reemergent scientism, postmodernism, and dialogue across differences. Qualitative Inquiry, 10(1), 35–41. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403259492
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09348351
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., Kelly, D. L., & Fishbein, B. (2020). *TIMSS 2019 international results in mathematics and science*. Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2019/international-results/
- Munoz-Najar Galvez, S., Heiberger, R., & McFarland, D. (2020). Paradigm wars revisited: A cartography of graduate research in the field of education (1980–2010). American Educational Research Journal, 57(2), 612– 652. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219860511
- National Research Council. (2002). Scientific research in education. The National Academies Press. https://doi. org/10.17226/10236
- Noddings, N. (1998). Perspectives from feminist philosophy. Educational Researcher, 27(5), 17–18. http://doi. org/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). OECD Publishing.
- 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), 577–587. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2005.00457.x
- Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). *Postpositivism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Pivovarova, M., Powers, J. M., & Fischman, G. E. (2020). Moving beyond the paradigm wars: Emer-
- Provarova, M., Powers, J. M., & Fischman, G. E. (2020). Moving beyond the paradigm wars: Emergent approaches for educational research. *Review of Research in Education*, 44(1), vii–xvi. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X20909400
- 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). 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. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500690600718294
- Prieto-Rodriguez, E., Sincock, K., & Blackmore, K. (2020). STEM initiatives matter: Results from a systematic review of secondary school interventions for girls. *International Journal of Science Education*, 42(7), 1144–1161. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1749909
- Punch, K. F., & Oancea, A. (2014). Introduction to research methods in education. Sage.
- Reeves, T. (1997). Educational paradigms. In C. R. Dills & A. J. Romiszowski (Eds.), *Instructional development paradigms* (pp. 163–178). 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). 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. http://doi.org/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). Sage.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). Dictionary of qualitative inquiry (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Stevenson, K. T., Szczytko, R. S., Carrier, S. J., & Peterson, M. N. (2021). How outdoor science education can help girls stay engaged with science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 43(7), 1090–1111. http://doi. org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1900948
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2002). Comment: "Science" rejects postmodernism. Educational Researcher, 31(8), 25–27. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/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). Springer.

Paradigms in Science Education Research

- Teo, T. W., & Tan, Y. L. K. (2020). Examining power, knowledge and power relations in a science research apprenticeship. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 15, 659–677. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09936-9
- Thomson, S., De Bortoli, L., & Underwood, C. (2016). PISA 2015: A first look at Australia's results. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). https://research.acer.edu.au/ozpisa/21
- Thomson, S., Hillman, K., & Wernert, N. (2012). Monitoring Australian year 8 student achievement internationally: TIMSS 2011. 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. http://doi.org/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. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/1098-237X(200103) 85:2%3C137::AID-SCE30%3E3.0.CO;2-B
- Treagust, D. F., Won, M., & Duit, R. (2014). Paradigms in science education research. In N. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education Volume II* (pp. 3–17). Routledge.
- 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.541529
- Wang, H.-H., Lin, H.-S., Chen, Y.-C., Pan, Y.-T., & Hong, Z.-R. (2021). Modeling relationships among students' inquiry-related learning activities, enjoyment of learning and their intended choice of a future career. International Journal of Science Education, 43(1), 157–178. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1860266
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.1017
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2009). Research methods in education: An introduction (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2009). Writing up qualitative research (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Wong, E. D. (2002). To appreciate variation between scientists: A perspective for seeing science's vitality. *Science Education*, 86(3), 386–400. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.10023

Paradigms in Science Education Research

Adadan, E. (2020). Analyzing the role of metacognitive awareness in preservice chemistry teachers' understanding of gas behavior in a multirepresentational instruction setting. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 253–278. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21589 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199903)36:3<269::AID-TEA3>3.0.CO;2-T Aivelo, T., & Uitto, A. (2019). Teachers' choice of content and consideration of controversial and sensitive issues in teaching of secondary school genetics. International Journal of Science Education, 41(18), 2716–2735. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1694195

Alise, M. A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). A continuation of the paradigm wars? Prevalence rates of methodological approaches across the social/behavioral sciences. Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 4(2), 103–126. http://doi.org/10.1177/1558689809360805 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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

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

Australian Association for Research in Education . (n.d). AARE code of ethics. www.aare.edu.au/assets/documents/policies/AARE-Code-of-Ethics.pdf

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

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.1037

Bredo, E. (2009). Comments on Howe: Getting over the methodology wars. Educational Researcher, 38(6), 441–448. http://doi.org/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. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(200005)37:5<441::AID-TEA4>3.0.CO;2-3

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). Sage.

Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods (4th ed.). 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20006

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). 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20178

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. R. B. (2011). Research methods in education (4th ed.). Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. R. B. (2017). Research methods in education (8th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Controversies in mixed methods research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Strategies of qualitative inquiry (4th ed.). Sage Publishers.

Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (6th ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.). Sage.

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20586

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). Sage.

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

Dewey, J. (1938/1988). Experience and education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953 (Vol. 13, pp. 1–62). 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). Southern Illinois University Press.

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

Earle, J., Maynard, R., & Neild, R. C. (Co-chairs). (2013). Common guidelines for education research and development. Institute of Education Science, US Department of Education and National Science Foundation.

Eggert, S., & Bögeholz, S. (2006). Göttinger Modell der Bewertungskompetenz – Teilkompetenz "Bewerten, Entscheiden und Reflektieren" für Gestaltungsaufgaben nachhaltiger Entwicklung [The Göttingen Model of evaluation and judgement competence – evaluating, deciding, and reflecting in the area of sustainable development]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 12, 177–197. https://archiv.ipn.uni-kiel.de/zfdn/pdf/010_12.pdf

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

Eisenhart, M. (2000). Boundaries and selves in the making of science. Research in Science Education, 30(1), 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02461652

- Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. (1996). Creating conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. American Educational Research Journal, 33(2), 261–295. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312033002261
- 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/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). 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). Springer.
- Erickson, F., & Gutierrez, K. (2002). Comment: Culture, rigor, and science in educational research. Educational Researcher, 31(8), 21–24. http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x031008021
- Etherington, K. (2007). Ethical research in reflexive relationships. Qualitative Inquiry, 13(5), 599–616. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800407301175
- Fanta, D., Braeutigam, J., & Riess, W. (2020). Fostering systems thinking in student teachers of biology and geography An intervention study. Journal of Biological Education, 54, 226–244. http://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2019.1569083
- Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. Educational Researcher, 31(8), 4–14. http://doi.org/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). 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). Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (2003). Society must be defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975–1976 (D. Macey, Trans.). Picador.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). How to design and evaluate research in education (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018007004
- Gallas, K. (1995). Talking their way into science: Hearing children's questions and theories, responding with curricula. Teachers College Press.
- Gallas, K. (1997). Sometimes I can be anything: Power, gender, and identity in a primary classroom. Teachers College Press.
- Greene, J. C. (2008). Is mixed methods social inquiry a distinctive methodology? Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 2(1), 7–22. http://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807309969
- Griffiths, M. (1998). Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence. Open University Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Judging the quality of fourth generation evaluation. 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). 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). Sage.
- Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives. Cornell University Press.
- Hoeg, D., & Bencze, L. (2017). Rising against a gathering storm: A biopolitical analysis of citizenship in STEM policy. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 12, 843–861. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-017-9838-9
- 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. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500690500336965
- Holstenbach, J., Fischer, H. E., Kauertz, A., Mayer, J., Sumfleth, E., & Walpuski, M. (2011). Modellierung der
- Bewertungskompetenz in den Naturwissenschaften zur Evaluation der Nationalen Bildungsstandards [Modeling the evaluation and judgement competence in science to evaluate national educational standards]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 17, 261–287. https://archiv.ipn.uni-kiel.de/zfdn/pdf/17_Hostenbach.pdf
- Howe, K. R. (2009). Positivist dogmas, rhetoric, and the education science question. Educational Researcher, 38(6), 428–440. http://doi.org/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). 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. http://doi.org/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). 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). 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). Falmer Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Tobin, K. G. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4, 513–528. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-009-9178-5
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolution. 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. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X026001023
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigm controversies, contraditions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 163–188). Sage.
- Lucero, M., Delgado, C., & Green, K. (2020). Elucidating high school teachers' knowledge of students' conceptions regarding natural selection. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 18, 1041–1061. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-019-10008-1 Lukenchuk, A., & Kolich, E. (2013). Paradigms and educational research: Weaving the tapestry. In A. Lukenchuk (Ed.), Counterpoints paradigms of research for the 21st century: Perspectives and examples from practice (Vol. 436, pp. 61–87). Peter Lang.

- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? Educational Researcher, 17(2), 13–17. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X017002013 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). Springer.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2004). Reemergent scientism, postmodernism, and dialogue across differences. Qualitative Inquiry, 10(1), 35–41. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403259492
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09348351
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., Kelly, D. L., & Fishbein, B. (2020). TIMSS 2019 international results in mathematics and science. Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2019/international-results/Munoz-Najar Galvez, S., Heiberger, R., & McFarland, D. (2020). Paradigm wars revisited: A cartography of graduate research in the field of education (1980–2010). American Educational Research Journal, 57(2), 612–652. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219860511 National Research Council. (2002). Scientific research in education. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/10236 Noddings, N. (1998). Perspectives from feminist philosophy. Educational Researcher, 27(5), 17–18. http://doi.org/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). OECD Publishing.
- 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), 577–587. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2005.00457.x
- Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). Postpositivism and educational research. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Pivovarova, M., Powers, J. M., & Fischman, G. E. (2020). Moving beyond the paradigm wars: Emergent approaches for educational research. Review of Research in Education, 44(1), vii–xvi. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X20909400
- 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). 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. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500690600718294 Prieto-Rodriguez, E., Sincock, K., & Blackmore, K. (2020). STEM initiatives matter: Results from a systematic review of secondary school interventions for girls. International Journal of Science Education, 42(7), 1144–1161. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1749909
- Punch, K. F., & Oancea, A. (2014). Introduction to research methods in education. Sage.
- Reeves, T. (1997). Educational paradigms. In C. R. Dills & A. J. Romiszowski (Eds.), Instructional development paradigms (pp. 163–178). 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). 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. http://doi.org/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). Sage. Schwandt, T. A. (2001). Dictionary of qualitative inquiry (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Stevenson, K. T., Szczytko, R. S., Carrier, S. J., & Peterson, M. N. (2021). How outdoor science education can help girls stay engaged with science. International Journal of Science Education, 43(7), 1090–1111. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1900948 St. Pierre, E. A. (2002). Comment: "Science" rejects postmodernism. Educational Researcher, 31(8), 25–27. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/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). Springer.
- Teo, T. W., & Tan, Y. L. K. (2020). Examining power, knowledge and power relations in a science research apprenticeship. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15, 659–677. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09936-9
- Thomson, S., De Bortoli, L., & Underwood, C. (2016). PISA 2015: A first look at Australia's results. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). https://research.acer.edu.au/ozpisa/21
- Thomson, S., Hillman, K., & Wernert, N. (2012). Monitoring Australian year 8 student achievement internationally: TIMSS 2011. 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. http://doi.org/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. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/1098-237X(200103)85:2%3C137::AID-SCE30%3E3.0.CO;2-B
- Treagust, D. F., Won, M., & Duit, R. (2014). Paradigms in science education research. In N. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education Volume II (pp. 3–17). Routledge.
- 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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/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. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.541529

Wang, H.-H., Lin, H.-S., Chen, Y.-C., Pan, Y.-T., & Hong, Z.-R. (2021). Modeling relationships among students' inquiry-related learning activities, enjoyment of learning and their intended choice of a future career. International Journal of Science Education, 43(1), 157–178. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1860266

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.1017 Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2009). Research methods in education: An introduction (9th ed.). Pearson.

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

Wong, E. D. (2002). To appreciate variation between scientists: A perspective for seeing science's vitality. Science Education, 86(3), 386–400. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.10023

Quantitative Research Designs and Approaches

Bacon, F. (2000). Francis Bacon: The New Organon (Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy) (L. Jardine & M. Silverthorne, Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139164030

Badagnani, D., Petrucci, D., & Cappannini, O. (2017). Evidence on the coherence – Pieces debate from the force concept inventory. European Journal of Physics, 39(1), 015705. http://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6404/aa940f

Ball, D. L. (1991). Research on teaching mathematics: Making subject matter part of the equation. In J. Brophy (Ed.), Advances in research on teaching. Teachers' knowledge of subject matter as it relates to their teaching practices (Vol. 2, pp. 1–48). JAI. Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., Klusmann U., Krauss S., Neubrand, M., & Tsai, Y.-M. (2010). Teachers' mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. American Educational Research Journal, 47(1), 133–180. http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209345157

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). Research in education (10th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Blalock, H. M. (1968). The measurement problem: A gap between the languages of theory and research. In H. M. Blalock & A. B. Blalock (Eds.), Methodology in social research (pp. 1–27). McGraw-Hill.

Boone, W. J., & Staver, J. (2020). Advances in Rasch analysis in the human science. Springer.

Boone, W. J., Staver, J., & Yale, M. (2014). Rasch analysis in the human sciences. Springer.

Breitsohl, H. (2018). Beyond ANOVA: An introduction to structural equation models for experimental designs. Organizational Research Methods, 22(3), 649–677. http://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118754988

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. Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 56(6), 393–402. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1630.2009.00811.x

Carlson, J., & Daehler, K. R. (2019). The refined consensus model of pedagogical content knowledge in science education. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 77–92). Springer.

Casadio, R., & Scardigli, F. (2020). Generalized uncertainty principle, classical mechanics, and general relativity. Physics Letters, B, 807, 135558.

Cauet, E., Liepertz, S., Borowski, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2015). Does it matter what we measure? Domain-specific professional knowledge of physics teachers. [Messen wir relevantes Wissen? Fachspezifisches Professionswissen von Physiklehrkräften]. Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Bildungswissenschaften, 37(3), 462–479.

Chen, C., Sonnert, G., Sadler, P. M., & Sunbury, S. (2020). The impact of high school life science teachers' subject matter knowledge and knowledge of student misconceptions on students' learning. CBE – Life Sciences Education, 19(1), ar9. http://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19-08-0164

Chi, M. T. H., De Leeuw, N., Chiu, M.-H., & Lavancher, C. (1994). Eliciting self-explanations improves understanding. Cognitive Science, 18(3), 439–477. https://doi.org/10.1016/0364-0213(94)90016-7

Clausen, M. (2002). Qualität von Unterricht – Eine Frage der Perspektive? [Quality teaching – A question of perspective?]. Waxmann. Clauser, B., & Linacre, J. M. (1999). Relating cronbach and Rasch reliabilities. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 13.

Clayson, P. E., Carbine, K. A., Baldwin, S. A., & Larson, M. J. (2019). Methodological reporting behavior, sample sizes, and statistical power in studies of event-related potentials: Barriers to reproducibility and replicability. Psychophysiology, 56(11), e13437. http://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13437

Cooper, G., & Berry, A. (2020). Demographic predictors of senior secondary participation in biology, physics, chemistry and earth/space sciences: Students' access to cultural, social and science capital. International Journal of Science Education, 42(1), 151–166. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1708510

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: An overview of the state of empirical research]. In A. Helmke , W. Hornstein , & E. Terhart (Eds.), Qualität und Qualitätssicherung im Bildungsbereich: Schule, Sozialpädagogik, Hochschule [Quality and quality management in education: School, social pedagogy, university] (Vol. 41, Beiheft , Ed., pp. 73–92). Beltz.

Döring, N. , & Bortz, J. (2016). Datenanalyse [Analysis of data]. In Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation in den Sozial- und Humanwissenschaften [Research methods and evaluation in social- and human sciences] (pp. 597–784). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. Duit, R. (2014). Teaching and learning the physics energy concept. In R. F. Chen , A. Eisenkraft , D. Fortus , J. Krajcik , K. Neumann , J. Nordine , & A. Scheff (Eds.), Teaching and learning of energy in K-12 education (pp. 67–85). Springer International Publishing. Etkina, E. , Gitomer, D. , Iaconangelo, C. , Phelps, G. , Seeley, L. , & Vokos, S. (2018). Design of an assessment to probe teachers' content knowledge for teaching: An example from energy in high school physics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 14(1), 010127. http://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.14.010127

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Albert-Georg Lang. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behavior Research Methods, 41, 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149 Field, A. (2009). Discovering statistics using SPSS. Sage Publications.
- Field, A. P. (2005). Intraclass correlation. In B. S. Everitt & D. C. Howell (Eds.), Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013192.bsa313
- 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(4), 309–349. www.jstor.org/stable/43156373
- Fischer, H. E., & Neumann, K. (2012). Video analysis as a tool for understanding science instruction. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Europe: Retrosspective and prospective (pp. 115–139). Sense Publishers.
- Fisher, W. J. (1992). Reliability, separation, strata statistics. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 6.
- Fricke, K., Ackeren, I. V., Kauertz, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2012). Students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom management in elementary and secondary science lessons and the impact on student achievement (p. 167). Brill | Sense.
- 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.
- Galili, I., & Lehavi, Y. (2006). Research report. International Journal of Science Education, 28(5), 521–541. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500690500338847
- Garrett, P. E., Wood, J. L., & Yates, S. W. (2018). Critical insights into nuclear collectivity from complementary nuclear spectroscopic methods. Physica Scripta, 93(6), 063001. http://doi.org/10.1088/1402-4896/aaba1c
- Geller, C., Neumann, K., Boone, W. J., & Fischer, H. E. (2014). What makes the finnish different in science? Assessing and comparing students' science learning in three countries. International Journal of Science Education, 36(18), 3042–3066. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2014.950185
- Gess-Newsome, J., Taylor, J. A., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Wilson, C. D., & Stuhlsatz, M. A. M. (2019). Teacher pedagogical content knowledge, practice, and student achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 41(7), 944–963. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1265158
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Aldine Transaction. Granger, C. (2008). Rasch analysis is important to understand and use for measurement. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 21, 1122–1123.
- Gravetter, F. J., Wallnau, L. B., Forzano, L.-A. B., & Wittnauer, J. E. (2020). Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences (10th ed.). Cengage.
- Gwet, K. L. (Ed.). (2014). Handbook of inter-rater reliability: The definite guide to measuring the extent of agreement (4th ed.). Gaithersburg Advanced Analytics.
- 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(1), 81-112. http://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487
- 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, 3, 238–247. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.238
- Hestenes, D., Wells, M., & Swackhamer, G. (1992). Force concept inventory. The Physics Teacher, 30(3), 141–158. http://doi.org/10.1119/1.2343497
- Honingh, M., Ruiter, M., & Thiel, S. V. (2020). Are school boards and educational quality related? Results of an international literature review. Educational Review, 72(2), 157–172. http://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1487387
- Hox, J. J., & Moerbeek, M. (2018). Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications (3rd ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. Janík, T., & Seidel, T. (Eds.). (2009). The power of video studies in investigating teaching and learning in the classroom (1st ed.). Waxmann. ISBN 978-3-8309-2208-7.
- Kane, M. T. (2006). Validity. Educational Measurement, 4, 17-64.
- Kapadia, K., Coca, V., & Easton, J. Q. (2007). Keeping new teachers: A first look at the influences of induction in the Chicago public schools. Research report. Consortium on Chicago School Research, University of Chicago.
- 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). JAM Press.
- Keller, M. M., Neumann, K., & Fischer, H. E. (2017). The impact of physics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and motivation on students' achievement and interest. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(5), 586–614. http://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21378 Klieme, E., Pauli, C., & Reusser, K. (Eds.). (2006). Dokumentation der Erhebungs- und Auswertungsinstrumente zur schweizerisch-
- deutschen Videostudie "Unterrichtsqualität, Lernverhalten und mathematisches Verständnis" [Documentation of the instruments of the Swiss-German video study, lesson quality, learning behavior, and mathematical understanding] (Vol. 15). Deutsches Institut für internationale pädagogische Forschung [German Institute for International Educational Research].
- Kolen, M. J., & Brennan, R. L. (2004). Test equating, scaling, and linking: Methods and practices (2nd ed.). Springer.
- $Koran, M. \ L. \ , \& \ Koran \ Jr., \ J. \ (1984). \ Aptitude-treatment interaction \ research \ in \ science \ education. \ Journal \ of \ Research \ in \ Science \ Teaching, 21(8), 793-808. \ http://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660210804$
- Lederman, N. G. (2019). Contextualizing the relationship between nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry. Science & Education, 28(3), 249–267. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00030-8
- 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. http://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20382
- Li, H., Liu, J., Zhang, D., & Liu, H. (2020). Examining the relationships between cognitive activation, self-efficacy, socioeconomic status, and achievement in mathematics: A multi-level analysis. British Journal of Educational Psychology, n/a(n/a). http://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12351
- Linacre, J. M. (1997). KR-20 or Rasch reliability: Which tells the "truth"? Rasch Measurement Transactions, 3, 580-581.
- Liu, X. (2013). Difficulties of items related to energy and matter: Implications for learning progression in high school chemistry. Educación Química, 24(4), 416–422.

- Mayring, P. (2007). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods. Brill | Sense.
- Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. Klagenfurt. For print on demand see www.beltz.de
- Mayring, P. (2019). Qualitative content analysis: Demarcation, varieties, developments. Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 20(3), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.3.3343
- McLure, F., Won, M., & Treagust, D. F. (2020). A sustained multidimensional conceptual change intervention in grade 9 and 10 science classes. International Journal of Science Education, 42(5), 703–721. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1725174
- Memon, M. A., Ting, H., Cheah, J. H., Thurasamy, R., Chuah, F., & Cham, T. H. (2020). Sample size for survey research: review and recommenations. Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling, 4(2), i–xx. http://doi.org/10.47263/jasem.4(2)01
- 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. http://doi.org/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). 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. http://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21061
- Nevo, B. (1985). Face validity revisited. Journal of Educational Measurement, 22(4), 287-293.
- Niedderer, H., Aufschnaiter, Stefan v., Tiberghien, A., Buty, Ch., Haller, K., Hucke, L., Sander, F., & Fischer, H. E. (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*. Science & Technology Education Library, (Vol. 16, pp. 31–40). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-48196-0 5
- 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. http://doi.org/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 [The methodology of an "objective hermeneutic" and its general research logical significance in social sciences]. In H.-G. Soeffner (Ed.), Interpretative Verfahren in den Sozial- und Textwissenschaften [Interpretative methods in social sciences and text analysis] (pp. 352–434). 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). Columbia University Press.
- Ohle, A. (2010). Primary school teachers' content knowledge in physics and its impact on teaching and students' achievement. 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.
- O'Leary-Kelly, S. W., & Vokurka, R. J. (1998). The empirical assessment of construct validity. Journal of Operations Management, 16(4), 387–405. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-6963(98)00020-5
- Olszewski, J. (2010). The impact of physics teachers' Pedagogical content knowledge on teacher action and student outcomes (Vol. 109). Logos.
- Opfermann, M., Schmeck, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2017). Multiple representations in physics and science education Why should we use them? In D. F. Treagust, R. Duit, & H. E. Fischer (Eds.), Multiple representations in physics education (pp. 1–22). Springer International Publishing.
- Opitz, S. T., Neumann, K., Bernholt, S., & Harms, U. (2017). How do students understand energy in biology, chemistry, and physics? Development and validation of an assessment instrument. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13, 3019–3042. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.00703a
- Opitz, S. T., Neumann, K., Bernholt, S., & Harms, U. (2019). Students' energy understanding across biology, chemistry, and physics contexts. Research in Science Education, 49(2), 521–541. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9632-4
- Özcan, Ö., & Gerçek, C. (2019). Multidimensional analyzing of the microteaching applications in teacher education via videograph. European Journal of Teacher Education, 42(1), 82–97. http://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2018.1546285
- Popper, K. R. (1959). The logic of scientific discovery. Basic Books.
- Prenzel, M. (2003). Unterrichtsentwicklung auf der Grundlage empirisch fundierter Diagnosen und Interventionskonzepte [Lesson development based on empirically grounded diagnoses and intervention concepts]. In E. J. Brunner , P. Noack , G. Scholz , & I. Scholl (Eds.), Diagnose und Intervention in schulischen Handlungsfeldern [Diagnose and intervention in school activities] (pp. 29–46). Waxmann.
- Prenzel, M., & Deutsches, P. K. (2004). Pisa 2003. Waxmann Verlag.
- Rasch, G. (1980), Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment tests. University of Chicago Press.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). Hierarchical linear models (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Romine, W. L., Sadler, T. D., Dauer, J. M., & Kinslow, A. (2020). Measurement of socio-scientific reasoning (SSR) and exploration of SSR as a progression of competencies. International Journal of Science Education, 42(18), 2981–3002. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1849853
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Briggs, D., Shepard, L., Iverson, H., & Huchton, M. (2008). Evaluating the impact of instructional innovations in engineering education. In M. Duque (Ed.), Engineering education for the XXI Century: Foundations, strategies and cases (pp. 241–274). ACOFI Publications.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A., & Li, M. (2013). Analyzing teachers' feedback practices in response to students' work in science classrooms. Applied Measurement in Education. 26(3), 163–175. http://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2013.793188
- Salkind, N. J. (Ed.). (2010). Encyclopedia of research design (Vols. 1-0). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288
- Schneider, B., Carnoy, M., Kilpatrick, J., Schmidt, W. H., & Shavelson, R. J. (2007). Estimating causal effects using experimental and observational designs. American Educational Research Association.
- Seidel, T., & Prenzel, M. (2006). Stability of teaching patterns in physics instruction: Findings from a video study. Learning and Instruction, 16(3), 228–240. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2006.03.002

- Seidel, T., Prenzel, M., & Kobarg, M. (Eds.). (2005). How to run a video study. Technical report of the IPN video study. Waxmann. Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. Psychological Bulletin, 86(2), 420–428.
- Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. Psychological Bulletin, 86(2), 420–428 http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.2.420
- Sinclair, J. K., Taylor, P. J., & Hobbs, S. J. (2013). Alpha level adjustments for multiple dependent variable analyses and their applicability A review. International Journal of Sports Science and Engineering, 7(1), 17–20.
- Smith, R. M. (1986). Person fit in the Rasch model. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46, 359-372.
- Smith, R. M. (1991). The distributional properties of Rasch item fit statistics. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51, 541–565.
- Smith, R. M. (1996). Polytomous meansquare fit statistics. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 10, 516-517.
- Smith, R. M., Linacre, J. M., & Smith, E. V. (2003). Guidelines for manuscripts. Journal of Applied Measurement, 4, 198–204. www.rasch.org/guidelines.htm
- Snow, R. E. (1991). Aptitude-treatment interaction as a framework for research on individual differences in psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59(2), 205–216. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.59.2.205
- Stelmack, J. A., Szlyk, J. P., Stelmack, T. R., Demers-Turco, P., Williams, R. T., Moran, D. A., & Massof, R. W. (2004).
- Psychometric properties of the veterans affairs low-vision visual functioning questionnaire. Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, 45(11), 3919–3928. http://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.04-0208
- Stigler, J., & Hiebert, J. (1999). The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom. The Free Press. http://lst-iiep.unesco.org/cgi-bin/wwwi32.exe/[in=epidoc1.in]/?t2000=011347/(100)
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded the- ory procedures and techniques. Sage.
- Teig, N., Scherer, R., & Nilsen, T. (2019). I know I can, but do I have the time? The role of teachers' self-efficacy and perceived time constraints in implementing cognitive-activation strategies in science. Frontiers in Psychology, 10(1697). http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01697
- Tsaousis, I., Sideridis, G. D., & AlGhamdi, H. M. (2020). Measurement invariance and differential item functioning across gender within a latent class analysis framework: Evidence from a high-stakes test for university admission in Saudi Arabia. Frontiers in Psychology, 11(622). http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00622
- VanVoorhis, C. R. W., & Morgan, B. L. (2007). Understanding power and rules of thumb for determining sample sizes. Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 3(2), 43–50.
- Weinberg, S. L., Harel, D., & Knapp Abramowitz, S. (2020). Statistics using R: An integrative approach. Cambridge University Press. Won, M., Krabbe, H., Ley, S. L., Treagust, D. F., & Fischer, H. E. (2017). Science teachers' Use of a concept map marking guide as a formative assessment tool for the concept of energy. Educational Assessment, 22(2), 95–110. http://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2017.1309277
- Wright, B., & Stone, M. (1979). Best test design. MESA Press.
- Wright, B. D. (1995). Which standard error? Rasch Measurement Transactions, 9.
- Wright, B. D., & Masters, G. N. (1982). Rating scale analysis: Rasch measurement. MESA Press.
- Yeh, Y.-C. (2012). Aptitude-treatment interaction. In N. M. Seel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of the sciences of learning (pp. 295–298). Springer US.

Qualitative Research as Culture and Practice

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

American Educational Research Association . (2006). Standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications. Educational Researcher, 35, 33–40.

Anderson, C. W., de los Santos, E. X., Bodbyl, S., Covitt, B. A., Edwards, K. D., Hancock, J. B., Lin, Q., Thomas, C. M., Penuel, W. R., & Welch, M. M. (2018). Designing educational systems to support enactment of the Next Generation Science Standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 1026–1052.

Avraamidou, L. (2020). "I am a young immigrant woman doing physics and on top of that I am Muslim": Identities, intersections, and negotiations. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 311–341.

Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextualities: Volosinov, Bakhtin, literary theory, and literacy studies. In A. F. Ball & S. Warshauer Freedman (Eds.), Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning (pp. 53–65). Cambridge University Press.

Bloome, D., Beierle, M., Grigorenko, M., & Goldman, S. (2009). Learning over time: Uses of intercontextuality, collective memories, and classroom chronotopes in the construction of learning opportunities in a ninth-grade language arts classroom. Language and Education, 23, 313–334.

Bloome, D., Carter, S., Christian, B., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic approach. Erlbaum.

Boda, P. A., & Brown, B. (2020). Priming urban learners' attitudes toward the relevancy of science: A mixed-methods study testing the importance of context. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 567–596.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2019). Designing for rightful presence in STEM: The role of making present practices. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 28, 616–658.

Camilli, G., Elmore, P. B., & Green, J. L. (Eds.). (2006). Handbook of complementary methods for in education research. Lawrence Elbaum.

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.

Castanheira, M. L., Crawford, T., Dixon, C. N., & Green, J. L. (2001). Interactional ethnography: An approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. Linguistics and Education, 11(4), 353–400.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions (3rd ed.). Sage.

Delamont, S. (Ed.). (2012). Handbook of qualitative research in education. Edward Elgar Publishing.

DeLiema, D., Enyedy, N., & Danish, J. A. (2019). Roles, rules, and keys: How different play configurations shape collaborative science inquiry. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 28, 513–555.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). The Sage handbook of qualitative research. Sage.

Design-Based Research Collective . (2003). Design-based research: An emerging paradigm for educational inquiry. Educational Researcher, 32(1), 5–8.

Durbin, P. T. (1988). Dictionary of concepts in the philosophy of science. Greenwood Press.

Eisenhart, M., & Towne, L. (2003). Contestation and change in national policy on "scientifically based" education research. Educational Researcher, 32(7), 31–38.

Emeagwali, G. (2020). African indigenous knowledges and the decolonization of education in Africa. In J. Abidogun & T. Falola (Eds.), The Palgrave handbook of African education and indigenous knowledge (pp. 335–349). Palgrave Macmillan.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). Writing ethnographic fieldnotes (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, M., DeMarrais, K., Preissle, J., Roulston, K., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2007). Standards of evidence in qualitative research: An incitement to discourse. Educational Researcher, 36(1), 25–32.

Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. Review of Research in Education, 23, 119–169.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures; selected essays. Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1983). Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. Basic Books.

Glesne, C. (2016). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction (5th ed.). Pearson.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. Harvard University Press.

González-Howard, M., & McNeill, K. L. (2019). Teachers' framing of argumentation goals: Working together to develop individual versus communal understanding. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 821–844.

Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2003). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. Nurse Education Today, 24, 105–112.

Green, J. L., Baker, W. D., Chian, M., Vanderhoof, C., Hooper, L., Kelly, G. J., Skukauskaite, A., & Kalainoff, M. (2020). Studying the over-time construction of knowledge in education settings: A microethnographic-discourse analysis approach. Review of Research in Education, 44, 161–194.

Green, J. L., & Bloome, D. (1997). Ethnography and ethnographers of and in education: A situated perspective. In J. Flood, S. B.

Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), Research on teaching and literacy through the communicative and visual arts (pp. 181–202). Macmillan.

Green, J. L., & Bridges, S. M. (2018). Interactional ethnography. In F. Fischer, C. E. Hmelo-Silver, S. R. Goldman, & P. Reimann (Eds.), International handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 475–488). Routledge.

Green, J. L., & Harker, J. O. (Eds.). (1988). Multiple perspective analyses of classroom discourse. Ablex.

Green, J. L., Skukauskaite, A., & Castanheira, M. (2012). Studying the discursive construction of learning lives for individuals and the collective. In O. Erstad & J. Sefton-Green (Eds.), Identity, community, and learning lives in the digital age (pp. 126–145). Cambridge University Press.

Hammersley, M. (2008). Questioning qualitative inquiry: Critical essays. Sage Press.

Harris, M. (2001). The rise of anthropological theory: A history of theories of culture. AltaMira Press.

Haverly, C., Calabrese Barton, A., Schwarz, C. V., & Braaten, M. (2020). "Making space": How novice teachers create opportunities for equitable sense-making in elementary science. Journal of Teacher Education, 71, 63–79.

Heap, J. L. (1995). The status of claims in "qualitative" research. Curriculum Inquiry, 25(3), 271-291.

Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research. Teachers College Press.

Howe, K. , & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. Educational Researcher, 19(4), 2-9.

Kelly, A. E., Lesh, R. A., & Baek, J. Y. (Eds.). (2008). Handbook of design research methods in education: Innovations in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics learning and teaching. Routledge.

Kelly, G. J. (2006). Epistemology and educational research. In J. Green , G. Camilli , & P. Elmore (Eds.), Handbook of complementary methods in education research (pp. 33–55). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kelly, G. J. (2014). Discourse practices in science learning and teaching. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education, volume 2 (pp. 321–336). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kelly, G. J., & Cunningham, C. M. (2019). Epistemic tools in engineering design for K-12 education. Science Education, 103, 1080–1111.

Kelly, G. J., & Green, J. L. (Eds.). (2019a). Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education. Routledge.

Kelly, G. J., & Green, J. L. (2019b). Framing issues of theory and methods for the study of science and engineering education. In G. J. Kelly & J. L. Green (Eds.), Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education (pp. 1–28).

Lagemann, E. C. (2000). An elusive science: The troubling history of education research. University of Chicago Press.

Land, S. M., & Zimmerman, H. T. (2015). Socio-technical dimensions of an outdoor mobile learning environment: A three-phase design-based research investigation. Educational Technology Research and Development, 63(2), 229–255.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.

Leavy, P. (Ed.). (2014). The Oxford handbook of qualitative research. Oxford University Press.

Letts, W., & Fifield, S. (Eds.). (2019). STEM of desire: Queer theories and science education. Brill Sense.

Longino, H. E. (2002). The fate of knowledge. Princeton University Press.

MacLure, M. (2013). Researching without representation? Language and materiality in post-qualitative methodology. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26, 658–667.

McNew-Birren, J., Hildebrand, T., & Belknap, G. (2018). Strange bedfellows in science teacher preparation: Conflicting perspectives on social justice presented in a teach for America – university partnership. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13, 437–462.

Mensah, F. M. (2019). Finding voice and passion: Critical race theory methodology in science teacher education. American Educational Research Journal, 56, 1412–1456.

Murray, S. O. (1998). American sociolinguistics: Theorists and theory groups. John Benjamins Publishing.

National Research Council . (2002). Scientific research in education. In R. Shavelson & L. Towne (Eds.), Committee on scientific principles for educational research. National Academy Press.

National Research Council . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18290

Page-Reeves, J., Marin, A., Moffett, M., DeerlnWater, K., & Medin, D. (2019). Wayfinding as a concept for understanding success among Native Americans in STEM: "Learning how to map through life". Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14, 177–197.

Parsons, E. R. C. (2008). Positionality of African Americans and a theoretical accommodation of it: Rethinking science education research. Science Education, 92, 1127–1144.

Rahmawati, Y., & Taylor, P. C. (2018). "The fish becomes aware of the water in which it swims": Revealing the power of culture in shaping teaching identity. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13, 525–537.

Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), An introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in education (pp. 1–18). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rorty, R. (1982). Method, social hope, and social science. In R. Rorty (Ed.), Consequences of pragmatism (pp. 191–210). University of Minnesota Press.

Rorty, R. (1989). Contingency, irony, and solidarity. Cambridge University Press.

Rorty, R. (1991). Objectivity, relativism, and truth. Cambridge University Press.

Rorty, R. (1999). Philosophy and social hope. Penguin.

Salloum, S., & BouJaoude, S. (2020). Understanding interactions in multilingual science classrooms through Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT): What do contradictions tell us? International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 1–23.

Sandoval, W. (2014). Conjecture mapping: An approach to systematic educational design research. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 23, 18–36.

Scantlebury, K., Hussenius, A., & Ivarsson, J. (2019). Learning about matter and the material, struggling with entanglement and staying with the trouble to raise up feminist science education. In J. Bazzul & C. Siry (Eds.), Critical voices in science education research (pp. 235–245). Springer.

Shea, M. V., & Sandoval, J. (2020). Using historical and political understanding to design for equity in science education. Science Education, 104, 27–49.

Sherman, B. J., Bateman, K. M., Jeong, S. K., & Hudock, L. A. (2019). Dialogic meta-ethnography: Troubling methodology in ethnographically informed qualitative inquiry. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1–24.

Smith, D. (1996). Telling the truth after postmodernism. Symbolic Interaction, 19(3), 171–202.

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage handbook of qualitative research (pp. 443–466). Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Procedures and techniques for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.). Sage.

Strike, K. A. (1995). Discourse ethics and restructuring. Presidential address. In M. Katz (Ed.), Philosophy of education (pp. 1–14). Philosophy of Education Society.

Taylor, P. C. (2014). Contemporary qualitative research: Toward an integral research perspective. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education, volume 2 (pp. 38–54). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Thomas, G. (2015). How to do your case study (2nd ed.). Sage.

Traweek, S. (1988). Beamtimes and lifetimes: The world of high energy physicists. Harvard University Press.

van Langenhove, L., & Harré, R. (1999). Positioning and the writing of science. In R. Harré & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), Positioning theory (pp. 102–115). Blackwell.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (2000). Speed bumps: A student-friendly guide to qualitative research. Teachers College Press.

Wiblom, J., Rundgren, C. J., & Andrée, M. (2019). Developing students' critical reasoning about online health information: A capabilities approach. Research in Science Education, 49(6), 1759–1782.

Wortham, S., & Reyes, A. (2015). Discourse analysis beyond the speech event. Routledge.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage.

Zidny, R., Sjöström, J., & Eilks, I. A. (2020). Multi-perspective reflection on how indigenous knowledge and related ideas can improve science education for sustainability. Science & Education, 29, 145–185.

Theories of Learning

Allchin, D. (2011). Evaluating knowledge of the nature of (whole) science. Science Education, 95, 1–25.

Amin, T. G., & Levrini, O. (Eds.). (2018). Converging perspectives on conceptual change: Mapping an emerging paradigm in the learning sciences. Routledge.

Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2020). Classroom motivation: Linking research to teacher practice. Routledge.

Anmarkrud, Ø., Andresen, A., & Bråten, I. (2019). Cognitive load and working memory in multimedia learning: Conceptual and measurement issues. Educational Psychologist, 54(2), 61–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1554484

Asterhan, C. S. C., & Schwarz, B. B. (2016). Argumentation for learning: Well-trodden paths and unexplored territories. Educational Psychologist, 51(2), 164–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1155458

Baehr, J. (2021). Deep in thought: A practical guide to teaching for intellectual virtues. Harvard Education Press.

Bang, M. (2015). Culture, learning, and development and the natural World: The influences of situative perspectives. Educational Psychologist, 50(3), 220–233.

Bang, M., Warren, B., Rosebery, A. S., & Medin, D. (2012). Desettling expectations in science education. Human Development, 55(5–6), 302–318. https://doi.org/10.1159/000345322

Barron, B. (2003). When smart groups fail. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12, 307-359.

- Barzilai, S., & Chinn, C. A. (2018). On the goals of epistemic education: Promoting apt epistemic performance. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 27, 353–389.
- Barzilai, S., & Chinn, C. A. (2020). A review of educational responses to the "post-truth" condition: Four lenses on "post-truth" problems. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 107–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1786388
- Barzilai, S., & Ka'adan, I. (2017). Learning to integrate divergent information sources: The interplay of epistemic cognition and epistemic metacognition. Metacognition and Learning, 12(2), 193–232.
- Barzilai, S., Mor-Hagani, S., Zohar, A. R., Shlomi-Elooz, T., & Ben-Yishai, R. (2020). Making sources visible: Promoting multiple document literacy with digital epistemic scaffolds. Computers & Education, 157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103980
- Barzilai, S., & Zohar, A. (2014). Reconsidering personal epistemology as metacognition: A multifaceted approach to the analysis of epistemic thinking. Educational Psychologist, 49(1), 13–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2013.863265
- Battaly, H. (2015). Responsibilist virtues in reliabilist classrooms. In J. Baehr (Ed.), Intellectual virtues and education: Essays in applied virtue epistemology (pp. 163–183). Routledge.
- Battey, D., & McMichael, E. W. (2021). Inquiry-based practices: Opening possibilities for (in)equitable interactions in classrooms. In R. G. Duncan & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), International handbook of learning and inquiry (pp. 189–203). Routledge.
- Battey, D., Neal, R. A., Leyva, L., & Adams-Wiggins, K. (2016). The interconnectedness of relational and content dimensions of quality instruction: Supportive teacher Student relationships in urban elementary mathematics classrooms. The Journal of Mathematical Behavior, 42, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmathb.2016.01.001
- Beilin, H. (1992). Piaget's enduring contribution to developmental psychology. Developmental Psychology, 28, 191–204.
- Belland, B. R., KIm, C., & Hannafin, M. J. (2013). A framework for designing scaffolds that improve motivation and cognition. Educational Psychologist, 48, 243–270.
- Bielaczyc, K., & Collins, A. (1999). Learning communities in classrooms: Advancing knowledge for a lifetime. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory (Vol. II, pp. 269–292). Erlbaum.
- Bråten, I., & Strømsø, H. I. (2010). When law students read multiple documents about global warming: Examining the role of topic-specific beliefs about the nature of knowledge and knowing. Instructional Science, 38, 635–657.
- Brewer, W. F. (1974). There is no convincing evidence for operant or classical conditioning in adult humans. In W. B. Weimer & D. S. Palermo (Eds.), Cognition and the symbolic processes (pp. xx–xx). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bromme, R., & Goldman, S. R. (2014). The public's bounded understanding of science. Educational Psychologist, 49(2), 59-69.
- Brown, A. L., & Campione, J. C. (1994). Guided discovery in a community of learners. In K. McGilly (Ed.), Classroom lessons: Integrating cognitive theory and classroom practice (pp. 229–270). MIT Press.
- Chen, B., & Hong, H.-Y. (2016). Schools as knowledge-building organizations: Thirty years of design research. Educational Psychologist, 51(2), 266–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1175306
- Chen, J. A., Tutwiler, M. S., Metcalf, S. J., Kamarainen, A., Grotzer, T., & Dede, C. (2016). A multi-user virtual environment to support students' self-efficacy and interest in science: A latent growth model analysis. Learning and Instruction, 41, 11–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2015.09.007
- Chen, Z., & Klahr, D. (1999). All other things being equal: Acquisition and transfer of the control of variables strategy. Child Development, 70, 1098–1120.
- Chi, M. T. H. (2005). Commonsense conceptions of emergent processes: Why some misconceptions are robust. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 14, 161–199.
- Chi, M. T. H., & Wylie, R. (2014). The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. Educational Psychologist, 49, 219–243.
- Chinn, C. A., Barzilai, S., & Duncan, R. G. (2020). Disagreeing about how to know: The instructional value of explorations into knowing. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 167–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1786387
- Chinn, C. A. , Barzilai, S. , & Duncan, R. G. (2021). Education for a "post-truth" world: New directions for research and practice. Educational Researcher, 50(1), 51–60. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x20940683
- Chinn, C. A., Buckland, L. A., & Samarapungavan, A. (2011). Expanding the dimensions of epistemic cognition: Arguments from philosophy and psychology. Educational Psychologist, 46, 141–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.587722
- Chinn, C. A., & Duncan, R. G. (2018). What is the value of general knowledge of scientific reasoning? In F. Fischer, C. A. Chinn, K. Engelmann, & J. Osborne (Eds.), Scientific reasoning and argumentation: The roles of domain-specific and domain-general knowledge (pp. 77–101). Routledge.
- Chinn, C. A., Duncan, R. G., & Av-Shalom, N. A. (2021). Promoting better thinking in an epistemically unfriendly world: Applying the grasp of evidence framework to evaluate learning environments. Information & Technology in Education & Learning, 1, 1–23.
- Chinn, C. A., Duncan, R. G., Dianovsky, M., & Rinehart, R. (2013). Promoting conceptual change through inquiry. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of conceptual change (2nd ed., pp. 539–559). Taylor & Francis.
- Chinn, C. A., Duncan, R. G., & Rinehart, R. W. (2018). Epistemic design: Design to promote transferable epistemic growth in the PRACCIS project. In E. Manalo, Y. Uesaka, & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), Promoting spontaneous use of learning and reasoning strategies: Theory, research, and practice for effective transfer (pp. 242–260). Routledge.
- Chinn, C. A., & Malhotra, B. A. (2002). Epistemologically authentic reasoning in schools: A theoretical framework for evaluating inquiry tasks. Science Education, 86, 175–218.
- Chinn, C. A., Rinehart, R. W., & Buckland, L. A. (2014). Epistemic cognition and evaluating information: Applying the AIR model of epistemic cognition. In D. Rapp & J. Braasch (Eds.), Processing inaccurate information: Theoretical and applied perspectives from cognitive science and the educational sciences (pp. 425–453). MIT Press.
- Chinn, C. A., & Sandoval, W. A. (2018). Epistemic cognition and epistemic development. In F. Fischer, C. Hmelo-Silver, S. Goldman, & P. Reimann (Eds.), International handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 24–33). Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. (1959). A review of B. F. Skinner's Verbal Behavior. Language, 35, 26-58.
- Clough, M. P. (2011). The story behind the science: Bringing science and scientists to life in post-secondary science education. Science & Education, 20(7–8). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-010-9310-7
- Cobb, P., McClain, K., & Gravemeijer, K. (2003). Learning about statistical covariation. Cognition and Instruction, 21, 1–78.
- Cohen, E. G. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. Review of Educational Research, 64, 1–35. Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A., Abram, P. L., Scarloss, B. A., & Schultz, S. E. (2002). Can groups learn? Teachers College Record, 104, 1045–1068.

- 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). Erlbaum.
- Danish, J. A., & Gresalfi, M. (2018). Cognitive and sociocultural perspective on learning: Tensions and synergy in the learning sciences. In F. Fischer, C. Hmelo-Silver, S. Goldman, & P. Reimann (Eds.), International handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 34–43). Routledge.
- Day, S. B., & Goldstone, R. L. (2012). The import of knowledge export: Connecting findings and theories of transfer of learning. Educational Psychologist, 47, 153–176.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Plenum Press.
- Detterman, D. K. (1993). The case for the prosecution: Transfer as an epiphenomenon. In D. K. Detterman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition, and instruction (pp. 1–24). Ablex.
- diSessa, A. A. (1993). Toward an epistemology of physics. Cognition and Instruction, 10, 105–225. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1002&3 2
- diSessa, A. A., Gillespie, N. M., & Esterly, J. B. (2004). Coherence versus fragmentation in the development of the concept of force. Cognitive Science, 28, 843–900.
- Dohn, N. B. (2016). Explaining the significance of participationist approaches for understanding students' knowledge acquisition. Educational Psychologist, 51(2), 188–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1160321
- Duncan, R. G., Av-Shalom, N. A., & Chinn, C. A. (2021). Inquiry and learning in science. In R. G. Duncan & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), International handbook of learning and inquiry (pp. 325–344). Routledge.
- Duncan, R. G., & Chinn, C. A. (Eds.). (2021). International handbook of learning and inquiry. Routledge.
- Duncan, R. G., Chinn, C. A., & Barzilai, S. (2018). Grasp of evidence: Problematizing and expanding the next generation science standards' conceptualization of evidence. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 907–937. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21468 Duschl, R. A. (2008). Quality argumentation and epistemic criteria. In S. Erduran & M. P. Jiménez-Aleixandre (Eds.), Argumentation in science education (pp. 159–175). Springer.
- Duschl, R. A., & Grandy, R. E. (2008). Reconsidering the character and role of inquiry in school science: Framing the debate. In R. A. Duschl & R. E. Grandy (Eds.), Teaching scientific inquiry: Recommendations for research and implementation (pp. 1–37). Sense Publishers.
- Duschl, R. A., & Tahirsylaj, A. (2021). Evolving conceptions of educational research and inquiry. In R. G. Duncan & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), International handbook of learning and inquiry (pp. 17–38). Routledge.
- Efklides, A. (2011). Interactions of metacognition with motivation and affect in s-elf-regulated learning: The MASRL model. Educational Psychologist, 46(1), 6–25.
- Elby, A., Macrander, C., & Hammer, D. (2016). Epistemic cognition in science. In J. A. Greene, W. A. Sandoval, & I. Bråten (Eds.), Handbook of epistemic cognition (pp. 113–127). Routledge.
- 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, 399–483.
- Feinstein, N. (2011). Salvaging science literacy. Science Education, 95(1), 168-185. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20414
- Feinstein, N. W., & Waddington, D. I. (2020). Individual truth judgments or purposeful, collective sensemaking? Rethinking science education's response to the post-truth era. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 155–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1780130
- Fischer, F., Chinn, C. A., Engelmann, K., & Osborne, J. (Eds.). (2018). Scientific reasoning and argumentation: The roles of domain-specific and domain-general knowledge. Routledge.
- Fischer, F., Kollar, I., Stegmann, K., & Wecker, C. (2013). Toward a script theory of guidance in computer-supported collaborative learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 48(1), 56–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.748005
- Fong, C., & Slotta, J. D. (2018). Supporting communities of learners in the elementary classroom: The common knowledge learning environment. Instructional Science, 46(4), 533–561. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-018-9463-3
- Ford, M. J. (2005). The game, the pieces, and the players: Generative resources from two instructional portrayals of experimentation. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 14, 449–487.
- Ford, M. J. (2008). "Grasp of practice" as a reasoning resource for inquiry and nature of science understanding. Science & Education, 17, 147–177.
- Fox, E., & Riconscente, M. (2008). Metacognition and self-regulation in James, Piaget, and Vygotsky. Educational Psychology Review, 20, 373–389.
- Frazier, L. D., Schwartz, B. L., & Metcalfe, J. (2021). The MAPS model of self-regulation: Integrating metacognition, agency, and possible selves. Metacognition and Learning, 16(2), 297–318.
- Gay, G. (2018). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gick, M. L., & Holyoak, K. J. (1983). Schema induction and analogical transfer. Cognitive Psychology, 15, 1–38.
- Gobert, J. D., Baker, R. S., & Wixon, M. B. (2015). Operationalizing and detecting disengagement within online science microworlds. Educational Psychologist, 50(1), 43–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.999919
- González-Howard, M., & McNeill, K. L. (2020). Acting with epistemic agency: Characterizing student critique during argumentation discussions. Science Education, 104(6), 953–982. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21592
- Greene, J. A., & Azevedo, R. (2007). A theoretical review of Winne and Hadwin's model of self-regulated learning: New perspectives and directions. Review of Educational Research, 77, 334–372.
- Greeno, J. G. (1989). On claims that answer the wrong questions. Educational Researcher, 26, 5–17.
- Greeno, J. G., & van de Sande, C. (2007). Perspectival understanding of conceptions and conceptual growth in interaction. Educational Psychologist, 42, 9–23.
- Hall, R., & Jurow, A. S. (2015). Changing concepts in activity: Descriptive and design studies of consequential learning in conceptual practices. Educational Psychologist, 50(3), 173–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2015.1075403
- Halldén, O., Haglund, L., & Strömdahl, H. (2007). Conceptions and contexts: On the interpretation of interview and observational data. Educational Psychologist, 42, 25–40.
- Hand, V., & Gresalfi, M. (2015). The joint accomplishment of identity. Educational Psychologist, 50, 190-203.
- Herrenkohl, L. R., & Guerra, M. R. (1998). Participant structures, scientific discourse, and student engagement in fourth grade. Cognition and Instruction, 16, 431–473.

- Hetmanek, A., Engelmann, K., Opitz, A., & Fischer, F. (2018). Beyond intelligence and domain knowledge: Scientific reasoning and argumentation as a set of cross-domain skills In F. Fischer, C. A. Chinn, K. Engelmann, & J. Osborne (Eds.), Scientific reasoning and argumentation: The roles of domain-specific and domain-general knowledge (pp. 203–226). Routledge.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E., & Chinn, C. A. (2016). Collaborative learning. In E. M. Anderman & L. Corno (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (3rd ed., pp. 349–363). Routledge.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Duncan, R. G., & Chinn, C. A. (2007). Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006). Educational Psychologist, 42, 99–107.
- Hogan, K., Nastasi, B. K., & Pressley, M. (1999). Discourse patterns and collaborative scientific reasoning in peer and teacher-guided discussions. Cognition and Instruction, 17, 379–432.
- Höttecke, D., & Allchin, D. (2020). Reconceptualizing nature-of-science education in the age of social media. Science Education, 104(4), 641–666. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21575
- Howell, E. L., & Brossard, D. (2021). (Mis)informed about what? What it means to be a science-literate citizen in a digital world. PNAS, 118(15). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1912436117
- Hulleman, C. S., Schrager, S. M., Bodmann, S. M., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2010). A meta-analytic review of achievement goal measures: Different labels for the same constructs or different constructs with similar labels? Psychol Bull, 136(3), 422–449. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018947
- lordanou, K. (2010). Developing argument skills across scientific and social domains. Journal of Cognition and Development, 11, 293–327.
- lordanou, K. (2022). Supporting strategic and meta-strategic development of argument skill: The role of reflection. Metacognition and Learning, 17, 399–425. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-021-09289-1
- lordanou, K., & Rapanta, C. (2021). "Argue with me": A method for developing argument skills. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 631203. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.631203
- Järvelä, S., Malmberg, J., & Koivuniemi, M. (2016). Recognizing socially shared regulation by using the temporal sequences of online chat and logs in CSCL. Learning and Instruction, 42, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2015.10.006
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1992). Positive interdependence: Key to effective cooperation. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz & N. Miller (Eds.), Interaction in cooperative groups: The theoretical anatomy of group learning (pp. 174–199). Cambridge University Press.
- Kali, Y. (2021). Guiding frameworks for the design of inquiry learning environments. In R. G. Duncan & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), International handbook of learning and inquiry (pp. 39–59). Routledge.
- Kapur, M. (2016). Examining productive failure, productive success, unproductive failure, and unproductive success in learning. Educational Psychologist, 51, 289–299.
- Kapur, M. , & Bielaczyc, K. (2012). Designing for productive failure. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 21(1), 45-83. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2011.591717
- Kavanagh, J., & Rich, M. D. (2018). Truth decay: An initial exploration of the diminishing role of facts and analysis in American public life. Rand Corporation.
- Kienhues, D., Jucks, R., & Bromme, R. (2020). Sealing the gateways for post-truthism: Reestablishing the epistemic authority of science. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 144–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1784012
- King, A. (2002). Structuring peer interaction to promote high-level cognitive processing. Theory Into Practice, 41, 33–39.
- 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.
- Klahr, D., & Nigam, M. (2004). The equivalence of learning paths in early science instruction. Psychological Science, 15, 661–667. Kuhn, D. (2021). Metacognition matters in many ways. Educational Psychologist, 57(2), 73–86.
- https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1988603
- Kuhn, D., Zillmer, N., Crowell, A., & Zavala, J. (2013). Developing norms of argumentation: Metacognitive, epistemological, and social dimensions of developing argumentive competence. Cognition and Instruction, 31(4), 456–496.
- Lagemann, E. C. (2000). An elusive science: The troubling history of education research. University of Chicago Press.
- Lapsley, D., & Chaloner, D. (2020). Post-truth and science identity: A virtue-based approach to science education. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 132–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1778480
- Latour, B. (1999). Pandora's hope. Harvard University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.
- Lazonder, A. W., & Harmsen, R. (2016). Meta-analysis of inquiry-based learning: Effects of guidance. Review of Educational Research, 86(3), 681–718.
- 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, 497–521. Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2004). Modeling natural variation through distribution. American Educational Research Journal, 41, 635–679
- Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2006). Scientific reasoning and science literacy. In R. M. Lerner, W. Damon, K. A. Renninger, & I. E. Sigel (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology (6th ed., pp. 153–196). Wiley.
- Lei, C. , & Chan, C. K. K. (2018). Developing metadiscourse through reflective assessment in knowledge building environments. Computers & Education, 126, 153–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.07.006
- Leung, J. S. C. (2020a). Promoting students' use of epistemic understanding in the evaluation of socioscientific issues through a practice-based approach. Instructional Science, 48(5), 591–622. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-020-09522-5
- Leung, J. S. C. (2020b). Students' adherences to epistemic understanding in evaluating scientific claims. Science Education, 104(2), 164–192. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21563
- Lobato, J. (2012). The actor-oriented transfer perspective and its contributions to educational research and practice. Educational Psychologist, 47, 232–247.
- Lobczowski, N. G., Allen, E. M., Firetto, C. M., Greene, J. A., & Murphy, P. K. (2020). An exploration of social regulation of learning during scientific argumentation discourse. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101925 Longino, H. E. (1990). Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry. Princeton University Press.
- Longino, H. E. (1996). Cognitive and non-cognitive values in science: Rethinking the dichotomy. In L. H. Nelson & J. R. Nelson (Eds.), Feminism, science, and the philosophy of science (pp. 39–58). Kluwer.

- Lynch, M. (2016). The Internet of us: Knowing more and understanding less in the age of big data. Norton.
- Maier, M., Rothmund, T., Retzbach, A., Otto, L., & Besley, J. C. (2014). Informal learning through science media usage. Educational Psychologist, 49(2), 86–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.916215
- Manz, E. (2016). Examining evidence construction as the transformation of the material world into community knowledge. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(7), 1113–1140.
- Manz, E., & Renga, I. P. (2017). Understanding how teachers guide evidence construction conversations. Science Education, 101(4), 584–615.
- Mara, K. R., Kaplan, A., Balsai, M. J., Cromley, J. G., Perez, T., & Dai, T. (2021). How instructors can enhance biology students' motivation, learning, and grades through brief relevance writing and worked-example interventions. Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education, 22(2). https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.00110-21
- Mason, L., Zaccoletti, S., Carretti, B., Scrimin, S., & Diakidoy, I. A. N. (2019). The role of inhibition in conceptual learning from refutation and standard expository texts. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17(3), 483–501.
- 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, 53–78.
- Medin, D. L., & Bang, M. (2014). Who's asking? Native science, Western science, and science education. MIT Press.
- Metz, K. E. (1995). Reassessment of developmental constraints on children's science instruction. Review of Educational Research, 65, 93–127.
- Miller, E., Manz, E., Russ, R., Stroupe, D., & Berland, L. (2018). Addressing the epistemic elephant in the room: Epistemic agency and the next generation science standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 1053–1075. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21459
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (2005). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. In N. González, L. C. Moll, & C. Amanti (Eds.), Funds of knowledge: Theoretizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms (pp. 71–87). Routledge.
- Morales-Doyle, D., Childress Price, T., & Chappell, M. J. (2019). Chemicals are contaminants too: Teaching appreciation and critique of science in the era of Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Science Education, 103(6), 1347–1366. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21546
- Muis, K. R., Chevrier, M., & Singh, C. A. (2018). The role of epistemic emotions in personal epistemology and self-regulated learning. Educational Psychologist, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2017.1421465
- Murphy, P. K., Greene, J. A., Firetto, C. M., Hendrick, B. D., Li, M., Montalbano, C., & Wei, L. (2018). Quality Talk: Developing students' discourse to promote high-level comprehension. American Educational Research Journal, 55(5), 1113–1160. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218771303
- Nasir, N. I. S., & Vakil, S. (2017). STEM-focused academies in urban schools: Tensions and possibilities. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 26(3), 376–406. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2017.1314215
- National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academies Press.
- Nehm, R. H., & Schonfeld, I. S. (2008). Measuring knowledge of natural selection: A comparison of the CINS, an open-response instrument, and an oral interview. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45(10), 1131–1160. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20251 Newton, P., Driver, R., & Osborne, J. (1999). The place of argumentation in the pedagogy of school science. International Journal of Science Education, 21, 553–576.
- NGSS Lead States. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. National Academies Press.
- Nolen, S. B. (2020). A situative turn in the conversation on motivation theories. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101866
- Nolen, S. B., Horn, I. S., & Ward, C. J. (2015). Situated motivation. Educational Psychologist, 50, 234–247.
- Norris, S. P., & Phillips, L. M. (2003). How literacy in its fundamental sense is central to scientific literacy. Science Education, 87, 224–240.
- O'Donnell, A. M. (2006). The role of peers and group learning. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (2nd ed., pp. 781–802). Erlbaum.
- Oreskes, N. (2019). Why trust science? Princeton University Press.
- Osborne, J. F., Borko, H., Fishman, E., Gomez Zaccarelli, F., Berson, E., Busch, K. C., Reigh, E., & Tseng, A. (2019). Impacts of a practice-based professional development program on elementary teachers' facilitation of and student engagement with scientific argumentation. American Educational Research Journal, 56(4), 1067–1112. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218812059
- Panadero, E., & Järvelä, S. (2015). Socially shared regulation of learning: A review. European Psychologist, 20, 190–203. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000226
- Piaget, J. (1928/1959). Judgment and reasoning in the child (M. Warden, Trans.). Littlefield, Adams, & Co.
- Piaget, J. (1964/1968). Six psychological studies (A. Tenzer, Trans.). Random House.
- Piaget, J. (1974). Understanding causality (D. Miles & M. Miles, Trans.). W.W. Norton.
- 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.
- Quintana, C., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Krajcik, J., Fretz, E., Duncan, R. G., Kyza, E., Edelson, D., & Soloway, E. (2004). A scaffolding design framework for software to support science inquiry. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 13, 337–386.
- Renninger, K. A., & Hidi, S. (Eds.). (2016). The power of interest for motivation and engagement. Routledge.
- Reznitskaya, A., Glina, M., Carolan, B., Michaud, O., Rogers, J., & Sequeira, L. (2012). Examining transfer effects from dialogic discussions to new tasks and contexts. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 37(4), 288–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2012.02.003
- Reznitskaya, A., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (2021). How best to argue? Examining the role of talk in learning from a sociocultural perspective. In R. G. Duncan & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), International handbook of learning and inquiry (pp. 204–220). Routledge.
- Rinehart, R. W., Duncan, R. G., & Chinn, C. A. (2016). Critical design decisions for successful model-based inquiry in science classrooms. International Journal of Designs for Learning, 7, 17–40.
- Robinson, K. A., Perez, T., Carmel, J. H., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2019). Science identity development trajectories in a gateway college chemistry course: Predictors and relations to achievement and STEM pursuit. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 56,

- 180–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.01.004
- Rogat, T. K., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2011). Socially shared regulation in collaborative groups: An analysis of the interplay between quality of social regulation and group processes. Cognition and Instruction, 29, 375–415.
- Rogat, T. K., Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., & DiDonato, N. (2013). Motivation in collaborative groups. In C. E. Hmelo-Silver, C. A. Chinn, C. K. K. Chan, & A. M. O'Donnell (Eds.), International handbook of collaborative learning (pp. 250–267). Routledge.
- Ronfard, S., Brown, S., Doncaster, E., & Kelemen, D. (2021). Inhibiting intuition: Scaffolding children's theory construction about species evolution in the face of competing explanations. Cognition, 211, 104635.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 54–67.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860
- Ryu, S., & Sandoval, W. A. (2012). Improvements to elementary children's epistemic understanding from sustained argumentation. Science Education, 96, 488–526.
- Saleh, A., Hmelo-Silver, C. E., & Glazewski, K. D. (2021). Collaborative interactions in inquiry learning. In R. G. Duncan & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), International handbook of learning and inquiry (pp. 239–255). Routledge.
- Samarapungavan, A., Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1996). Mental models of the earth, sun, and moon: Indian children's cosmologies. Cognitive Development, 11, 491–521.
- Sandoval, W. A., & Millwood, K. A. (2005). The quality of students' use of evidence in written scientific explanations. Cognition and Instruction, 23, 23–55.
- Sandoval, W. A., & Reiser, B. J. (2004). Explanation-driven inquiry: Integrating conceptual and epistemic scaffolds for scientific inquiry. Science Education, 88, 345–372.
- Schmidt, H. G., Van Der Molen, H. T., Te Windel, W. W. R., & Wijnen, W. H. F. W. (2009). Constructivist, problem-based learning does work: A meta-analysis of curricular comaprisons involving a single medical school. Educational Psychologist, 44, 227–249.
- Schoor, C., Narciss, S., & Körndle, H. (2015). Regulation during cooperative and collaborative learning: A theory-based review of terms and concepts. Educational Psychologist, 50, 97–119.
- Schunk, D. H., & Greene, J. A. (Eds.). (2018). Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Schwartz, D. L., & Bransford, J. D. (1998). A time for telling. Cognition and Instruction, 16, 475-522.
- Schwartz, D. L., Chase, C. C., Oppezzo, M. A., & Chin, D. B. (2011). Practicing versus inventing with contrasting cases: The effects of telling first on learning and transfer. Journal of Educational Psychology, 103, 759–775.
- Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). Achievement goal theory at the crossroads: Old controversies, current challenges, and new directions. Educational Psychologist, 46(1), 26–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.538646
- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. Educational Researcher, 27(2), 4-13.
- Sharan, S., Sharan, Y., & Tan, I. G.-C. (2013). The Group Investigation approach to cooperative learning. In C. E. Hmelo-Silver, C. A. Chinn, C. K. K. Chan, & A. M. O'Donnell (Eds.), International handbook of collaborative learning (pp. 351–369). Routledge.
- Sherin, B. L., Krakowski, M., & Lee, V. R. (2012). Some assembly required: How scientific explanations are constructed during clinical interviews. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 166–198.
- Sinatra, G. M., & Lombardi, D. (2020). Evaluating sources of scientific evidence and claims in the post-truth era may require reappraising plausibility judgments. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 120–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1730181 Smith, C. L., & Wiser, M. (2015). On the importance of epistemology-disciplinary core concept interactions in LPs. Science Education, 99, 417–423. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21166
- Smith, M. U., & Siegel, H. (2004). Knowing, believing, and understanding: What goals for science education? Science & Education, 13, 553–582.
- Sodian, B. (2018). The development of scientific thinking in preschool and elementary school age. In F. Fischer, C. A. Chinn, K. Engelmann, & J. Osborne (Eds.), Scientific reasoning and argumentation: The roles of domain-specific and domain-general knowledge (pp. 227–250). Routledge.
- Sosa, E. (2011). Knowing full well. Princeton University Press.
- Sosa, E. (2015). Judgment and agency. Oxford University Press.
- Stroupe, D., Caballero, M. D., & White, P. (2018). Fostering students' epistemic agency through the co-configuration of moth research. Science Education, 102(6), 1176–1200. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21469
- Summers, R., Alameh, S., Brunner, J., Maddux, J. M., Wallon, R. C., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2019). Representations of nature of science in U.S. science standards: A historical account with contemporary implications. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(9), 1234–1268. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21551
- Sweller, J., & Chandler, P. (1994). Why some material is difficult to learn. Cognition and Instruction, 12, 185–233.
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning. Falmer Press.
- Vosniadou, S. (2007). The cognitive-situative divide and the problem of conceptual change. Educational Psychologist, 42, 55–66.
- Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1992). Mental models of the earth: A study of conceptual change in childhood. Cognitive Psychology, 24, 535–585.
- Vosniadou, S., Ioannides, C., Dimitracopoulou, A., & Papademetriou, E. (2001). Designing learning environments to promote conceptual change in science. Learning and Instruction, 11, 381–419.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
- Wagner, J. F. (2010). A transfer-in-pieces consideration of the perception of structure in the transfer of learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19(4), 443–479. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2010.505138
- Webb, N. M. (2013). Information processing approaches to collaborative learning. In C. E. Hmelo-Silver, C. A. Chinn, C. K. K. Chan, & A. M. O'Donnell (Eds.), International handbook of collaborative learning (pp. 19–40). Routledge.
- Webb, N. M., & Farivar, S. (1994). Promoting helping behavior in cooperative small groups in middle school mathematics. American Educational Research Journal, 31, 369–395.
- White, B. Y., & Frederiksen, J. R. (1998). Inquiry, modeling, and metacognition: Making science accessible to all students. Cognition and Instruction, 16, 3–118.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 68–81.

- Wiley, J., & Voss, J. F. (1999). Constructing arguments from multiple sources: Tasks that promote understanding and not just memory for text. Journal of Educational Psychology, 91, 301–311.
- Winne, P. H., & Hadwin, A. F. (1998). Studying as self-regulated learning. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), Metacognition in educational theory and practice (pp. 277–304). Erlbaum.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 17, 89–100.
- Wu, H.-K., Krajcik, J. S., & Soloway, E. (2001). Promoting understanding of chemical representations: Students' use of a visualization tool in the classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 821–842.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. Race Ethnicity and Education, 8(1), 69–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006
- Zeldin, A. L., Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). A comparative study of the self-efficacy beliefs of successful men and women in mathematics, science, and technology careers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45(9), 1036–1058. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20195
- Zengilowski, A., Schuetze, B. A., Nash, B. L., & Schallert, D. L. (2021). A critical review of the refutation text literature: Methodological confounds, theoretical problems, and possible solutions. Educational Psychologist, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1861948
- Zhang, L., Kirschner, P. A., Cobern, W. W., & Sweller, J. (2021). There is an evidence crisis in science educational policy. Educational Psychology Review, 34, 1157–1176. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09646-1
- Zohar, A., & Ben David, A. (2009). Paving a clear path in a thick forest: A conceptual analysis of a metacognitive component. Metacognition and Learning, 4(3), 177–195.

Student Conceptions, Conceptual Change, and Learning Progressions

Alonzo, A. C., & Steedle, J. T. (2009). Developing and assessing a force and motion learning progression. Science Education, 93(3), 389–421.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1989). Science for all Americans: A project 2061 report on literacy goals in science, mathematics, and technology (Vol. 89). American Association for the Advancement of Science.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (2001). Project 2061. https://www.aaas.org/programs/project-2061.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (2007). Atlas of science literacy (Vol. 2). AAAS Project, p. 2061.

Anderson, J., & Li, Y. (2020). Integrated approaches to STEM education: An international perspective. Springer Nature.

- Arzi, H. J. (1988). From short-to long-term: Studying science education longitudinally. Studies in Science Education, 15(1), 17–53.
- Ausubel, D. P., Novak, J. D., & Hanesian, H. (1968). Educational psychology: A cognitive view (Vol. 6). Holt, rinehart and Winston.
- Baroody, A. J., Cibulskis, M., Lai, M.-L., & Li, X. (2004). Comments on the use of learning trajectories in curriculum development and research. Mathematical Thinking and Learning, 6, 227–260. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327833mtl0602_8
- Berland, L. K., & McNeill, K. L. (2010). A learning progression for scientific argumentation: Understanding student work and designing supportive instructional contexts. Science Education, 94(5), 765–793.
- Blumenfeld, P., Soloway, E., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. Educational Psychologist, 26, 369–398.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). How people learn (Vol. 11). National Academy Press.
- Briggs, D. C. , Alonzo, A. C. , Schwab, C. , & Wilson, M. (2006). Diagnostic assessment with ordered multiple-choice items. Educational Assessment, 11(1), 33–63.
- Carey, S. (1988). Conceptual differences between children and adults. Mind and Language, 3(3), 167-181.
- Carey, S. (1999). Sources of conceptual change. Conceptual Development: Piaget's Legacy, 293-326.
- Catley, K., Lehrer, R., & Reiser, B. (2005). Tracing a prospective learning progression for developing understanding of evolution. Paper Commissioned by the National Academies Committee on Test Design for K-12 Science Achievement, 67.
- Chi, M. T. (1976). Short-term memory limitations in children: Capacity or processing deficits? Memory & Cognition, 4(5), 559-572.
- Chi, M. T. (1992). Conceptual change within and across ontological categories: Examples from learning and discovery in science. In R. Giere & H. Feigl (Eds.), Cognitive models of science (pp. 129–186). University of Minnesota Press.
- Chi, M. T., & Ceci, S. J. (1987). Content knowledge: Its role, representation, and restructuring in memory development. Advances in Child Development and Behavior, 20, 91–142.
- Chi, M. T., Feltovich, P. J., & Glaser, R. (1981). Categorization and representation of physics problems by experts and novices. Cognitive Science, 5(2), 121–152.
- Clark, D., & Linn, M. C. (2003). Designing for knowledge integration: The impact of instructional time. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12(4), 451–493.
- Cobb, P., Confrey, J., DiSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in educational research. Educational Researcher, 32(1), 9–13.
- Cooper, M. M., Underwood, S. M., Hilley, C. Z., & Klymkowsky, M. W. (2012). Development and assessment of a molecular structure and properties learning progression. Journal of Chemical Education, 89(11), 1351–1357.
- Corcoran, T. B., Mosher, F. A., & Rogat, A. (2009). Learning progressions in science: An evidence-based approach to reform. Report of the center on continuous instructional improvement, teachers college. Columbia University.
- Davis, E. A., & Krajcik, J. S. (2005). Designing educative curriculum materials to promote teacher learning. Educational Researcher, 34, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034003003
- diSessa, A. A. (1988). Knowledge in pieces. In G. Forman & P. B. Pufall (Eds.), Constructivism in the computer age (pp. 49–70). Psychology Press.
- diSessa, A. A., & Minstrell, J. (1998). Cultivating conceptual change with benchmark lessons. In J. G. Greeno & S. V. Goldman (Eds.), Thinking practices in mathematics and science learning (pp. 155–187). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Duschl, R., Maeng, S., & Sezen, A. (2011). Learning progressions and teaching sequences: A review and analysis. Studies in Science Education, 47(2), 123–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2011.604476
- Duncan, R. G., Krajcik, J. S., & Rivet, A. E. (Eds.). (2017). Disciplinary core ideas: Reshaping teaching and learning. NTSA Press, National Science Teachers Association.
- Duncan, R. G., & Rivet, A. E. (2013). Science learning progressions. Science, 339(6118), 396-397.
- Duncan, R. G., 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: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 46(6), 655–674.
- Esposito, A. G., & Bauer, P. J. (2017). Going beyond the lesson: Self-generating new factual knowledge in the classroom. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 153, 110–125.
- Fortus, D., Adams, L., Krajcik, J. S., & Reiser, B. (2015). Assessing the role of curriculum coherence in student learning about energy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52, 1408–1425. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21261
- Fortus, D., & Krajcik, J. (2012). Curriculum coherence and learning progressions. In Second international handbook of science education (pp. 783–798). Springer.
- Gotwals, A. W., & Songer, N. B. (2006). Measuring students' scientific content and inquiry reasoning. In S. A. Barab, K. E. Hay, & D. T. Hickey (Eds.), The international conference of the learning sciences: Indiana university 2006 (Proceedings of ICLS 2006, Vol. 1, pp. 196–202). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Gotwals, A. W., Songer, N. B., & Bullard, L. (2012). Assessing students' progressing abilities to construct scientific explanations. In Learning progressions in science (pp. 183–210). Brill.
- Gunckel, K. L., Covitt, B. A., Salinas, I., & Anderson, C. W. (2012). A learning progression for water in socioecological systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(7), 843–868.
- Harris, C. J., Krajcik, J. S., Pellegrino, J. W., & DeBarger, A. H. (2019a). Designing knowledge-in-use assessments to promote deeper learning. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 38(2), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12253
- Harris, C. J., Krajcik, J. S., Pellegrino, J. W., & DeBarger, A. H. (2019b). Designing knowledge-in-use assessments to promote deeper learning. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 38(2), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12253
- He, P., Shin, N., Li, T., & Krajcik, J. (2020, March). Developing an integrated learning progression and assessments to measure middle school student proficiency of energy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the NARST-A Worldwide Organization for Improving Science Teaching and Learning through Research, Portland, OR. Conference canceled. www.researchgate.net/publication/348635154
- Inagaki, K., & Hatano, G. (2002). Young children's naive thinking about the biological world. Psychology Press.
- Jin, H., & Anderson, C. W. (2012). A learning progression for energy in socio-ecological systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(9), 1149–1180.
- Johnson, P. (1998). Progression in children's understanding of a "basic particle theory": A longitudinal study. International Journal of Science Education, 20(4), 393–412.
- Kaldaras, L., Akaeze, H., & Krajcik, J. (2021a). Developing and validating Next Generation Science Standards-aligned learning progression to track three-dimensional learning of electrical interactions in high school physical science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(4), 589–618.
- Kaldaras, L., Akaeze, H., & Krajcik, J. (2021b). A methodology for determining and validating latent factor dimensionality of complex multi-factor science constructs measuring knowledge-in-use. Educational Assessment, 26(4), 241–263.
- Keil, F. C. (1981). Constraints on knowledge and cognitive development. Psychological Review, 88(3), 197-227.
- 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.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20240 Krajcik, J. S., Reiser, B., Sutherland, L., & Fortus, D. (2009). Investigating our world through science and technology (IQWST). Unpublished Curriculum.
- Krajcik, J. S., & Shin, N. (2022). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (3rd ed.). Cambridge.
- Krajcik, J. S., Sutherland, L., Drago, K., & Merritt, J. (2012). The promise and value of learning progression research. Making it Tangible: Learning Outcomes in Science Education, 261–284.
- 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.
- Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2004). Modeling natural variation through distribution. American Educational Research Journal, 41(3), 635–679.
- Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2015). Learning progressions: The whole world is NOT a stage. Science Education, 99(3), 432–437.
- 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 (pp. 511–544). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Margel, H., Eylon, B. S., & Scherz, Z. (2008). A longitudinal study of junior high school students' conceptions of the structure of materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45(1), 132–152.
- Merritt, J. D. (2010). Tracking students' understanding of the particle nature of matter [Doctoral dissertation], ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database (UMI No. 3441321).
- Merritt, J. D., & Krajcik, J. (2013). Learning progression developed to support students in building a particle model of matter. In Concepts of matter in science education (pp. 11–45). Springer.
- Minstrell, J. (1984). Teaching for the development of understanding of ideas: Forces on moving objects. Observing Science Classrooms: Observing Science Perspectives from Research and Practice, 55–74.
- Minstrell, J., & Kraus, P. (2005). Guided inquiry in the science classroom. How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom, 475–513.
- Mintzes, J. J., Wandersee, J. H., & Novak, J. D. (1997). Teaching science for understanding. Academic Press.
- 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), 675–698.

Morell, L., Collier, T., Black, P., & Wilson, M. (2017). A construct-modeling approach to develop a learning progression of how students understand the structure of matter. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(8), 1024–1048.

National Academies of Sciences, E., & Medicine . (2018). How people learn II: Learners, contexts, and cultures. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (1999). How people learn: Bridging research and practice. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2006). Systems for state science assessment. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K-8. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012a). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012b). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18290

National Science Teaching Association . (2019). About the next generation science standards. https://ngss.nsta.org/About.aspx 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.

Next Generation Science Standard Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. National Academies Press.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB). (2002). Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425.

Nordine, J., & Lee, O. (Eds.). (2021). Crosscutting concepts: Strengthening science and engineering learning. NSTA Press.

Novak, J. D. (2002). Meaningful learning: The essential factor for conceptual change in limited or inappropriate propositional hierarchies leading to empowerment of learners. Science Education, 86(4), 548–571.

OECD . (2019). PISA 2018 results (volume I): What students know and can do. PISA, OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en

Osborne, J. F., Henderson, J. B., MacPherson, A., Szu, E., Wild, A., & Yao, S. Y. (2016). The development and validation of a learning progression for argumentation in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(6), 821–846.

Osborne, R., & Freyberg, P. (1985). Learning in science. The implications of children's science. Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 70 Court Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801.

Patti, J., Holzer, A. A., Brackett, M. A., & Stern, R. (2015). Twenty-first-century professional development for educators: A coaching approach grounded in emotional intelligence. Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 8(2), 96–119. Perkins, D. N. (1992). Smart schools: Better thinking and learning for every child. Free Press.

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.

Plummer, J. D., & Maynard, L. (2014). Building a learning progression for celestial motion: An exploration of students' reasoning about the seasons. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(7), 902–929.

Roseman, J., Linn, M., & Koppal, M. (2008). Characterizing curriculum coherence. Designing Coherent Science Education: Implications for Curriculum, Instruction, and Policy, 13–36.

Schmidt, W. H., Wang, H. C., & McKnight, C. C. (2005). Curriculum coherence: An examination of US mathematics and science content standards from an international perspective. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 37(5), 525–559.

Schwarz, C. V., Passmore, C., & Reiser, B. J. (2017). Helping students make sense of the world using next generation science and engineering practices. NSTA Press.

Schwarz, C. V., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Kenyon, L., Achér, A., Fortus, D., Shwartz, Y., 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(6), 632–654.

Scott, E. E., Edwards, K. D., & Anderson, C. W. A. (2022). How students interpret claims, analyze data, and link evidence to claims about carbon-transforming processes. In H. J. A. J. K. Duanli Yan (Ed.), Handbook of learning progressions. Taylor and Francis. Shin, N., Choi, S.-Y., Stevens, S. Y., & Krajcik, J. S. (2019). The impact of using coherent curriculum on students' understanding of

core ideas in chemistry. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17(2), 295–315.

Shin, N., He, P., Li, T., & Krajcik, J. (2021, April). A three-dimensional integrated learning progression and aligned assessments to monitor middle school student proficiency of energy, modeling and cause and effect. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the NARST-A Worldwide Organization for Improving Science Teaching and Learning through Research, Virtual Conference. www.researchgate.net/publication/350756338

Sirhan, G. (2007). Learning difficulties in chemistry: An overview. Journal of Turkish Science Education, 4, 2–20.

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2006.9678570

Songer, N. B., Kelcey, B., & Gotwals, A. W. (2009a). 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20313

Songer, N. B., Kelcey, B., & Gotwals, A. W. (2009b). 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. Steedle, J. T., & Shavelson, R. J. (2009). Supporting valid interpretations of learning progression level diagnoses. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 699–715. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20308

Stevens, S. Y., Delgado, C., & Krajcik, J. S. (2010). Developing a hypothetical multi-dimensional learning progression for the nature of matter. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(6), 687–715. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20324

Strike, K., & Posner, G. (1985). A conceptual change view of learning and understanding, cognitive structure and conceptual change (pp. 189–210). LHTWest and AL Pines, Press, Academic.

Talanquer, V. (2009). On cognitive constraints and learning progressions: The case of "structure of matter". International Journal of Science Education, 31(15), 2123–2136.

Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gullotta, T. P. (2015). Social and emotional learning: Past, present, and future. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice (pp. 3–19). Guilford.

West, P., Rutstein, D. W., Mislevy, R. J., Liu, J., Levy, R., Dicerbo, K. E., Crawford, A., Choi, Y., Chapple, K., & Behrens, J. T. (2012). A Bayesian network approach to modeling learning progressions. In Learning progressions in science (pp. 255–292). Brill Sense.

Whitehead, A. N. (1967/1929). The aims of education and other essays. Free Press.

Wilson, M. (2009). Measuring progressions: Assessment structures underlying a learning progression. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46(6), 716–730.

Wiser, M., Smith, C. L., & Doubler, S. (2012). Learning progressions as tools for curriculum development: Lessons from the Inquiry Project. In Learning progressions in science (pp. 357–403). Brill Sense.

Student Attitudes, Identity, and Aspirations Toward Science

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Summers, R., Said, Z., Wang, S., & Culbertson, M. (2015). Development and large-scale validation of an instrument to assess Arabic-speaking students' attitudes toward science. International Journal of Science Education, 37(16), 2637–2663.

Adler, I., Schwartz, L., Madjar, N., & Zion, M. (2018). Reading between the lines: The effect of contextual factors on student motivation throughout an open inquiry process. Science Education, 102(4), 820–855.

Aguilera, D., & Perales-Palacios, F. (2020). What effects do didactic interventions have on students' attitudes towards science? A meta-analysis. Research in Science Education, 50(2), 573–597.

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

Aini, R. Q., Rachmatullah, A., Roshayanti, F., Shin, S., Lee, J. K., & Ha, M. S. (2020, March). Testing validity inferences of science motivation questionnaire (SMQ-II) instrument: Rasch-based analysis with Indonesian secondary students. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1521(4), 042101. IOP Publishing.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behavior. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), The handbook of attitudes (pp. 173–221). Erlbaum.

Alsop, S. (2015). Affect in learning science. In R. Gunstone (Ed.), Encyclopedia of science education (pp. 20–24). Springer.

Alsop, S. (2016). Encountering science education's capacity to affect and be affected. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(3), 551–565.

Alsop, S. (2017). Afterword: Science education and promises of aesthetics, emotion and wellbeing. In A. Bellocchi, C. Quigley, & K. Otrel-Cass (Eds.), Exploring emotions, aesthetics and wellbeing in science education research (pp. 269–285). Springer.

Alsop, S. (2018). Science education and promises and prospects of interest. In J. Yeo , T. Teo , & K. S. Tang (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Asia-Pacific and beyond. Springer.

Alsop, S., & Dillon, J. (2018). Encounters with a Narwhal: Revitalising science education's capacity to affect and be affected. In D. Corrigan, C. Buntting, A. Jones, & J. Loughran (Eds.), Navigating the changing landscape of formal and informal science learning opportunities. Springer.

Anderhag, P. (2017). Taste for science: A Bourdieu-pragmatism approach to interest, aesthetics and learning. In A. Bellocchi, C. Quigley, & K. Otrel-Cass (Eds.), Exploring emotions, aesthetics and wellbeing in science education research (pp. 39–54). Springer. Anderhag, P., Hamza, K. M., & Wickman, P. O. (2015). What can a teacher do to support students' interest in science? A study of the constitution of taste in a science classroom. Research in Science Education, 45(5), 749–784.

Anderhag, P., Wickman, P.-O., Bergqvist, K., Jakobson, B., Hamza, K. M., & Säljö, R. (2016). Why do secondary school students lose their interest in science? Or does it never emerge? A possible and overlooked explanation. Science Education, 100(5), 791–813. Anderhag, P., Wickman, P.O., & Hamza, K. M. (2015a). Signs of taste for science: A methodology for studying the constitution of interest in the science classroom. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10(2), 339–368.

Anderhag, P., Wickman, P. O., & Hamza, K. M. (2015b). How can teaching make a difference to students' interest in science? Including Bourdieuan field analysis. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10(2), 377–380.

Archer, L. (2012). "Between authenticity and pretension": Parents', pupils' and young professionals' negotiations of minority ethnic middle-class identity. The Sociological Review, 60(1), 129–148.

Archer, L. (2014). Conceptualising aspiration. In A. Mann , J. Stanley , & L. Archer (Eds.), Understanding employer engagement in education – Theories and evidence (pp. 23–35). Routledge.

Archer, L., Dawson, E., DeWitt, J., Godec, S., King, H., Mau, A., Nomikou, E., & Seakins, A. (2017). Killing curiosity? An analysis of celebrated identity performances among teachers and students in nine London secondary science classrooms. Science Education, 101(5), 741–764.

Archer, L., Dawson, E., DeWitt, J., Seakins, A., & Wong, B. (2015). "Science capital": A conceptual, methodological, and empirical argument for extending Bourdieusian notions of capital beyond the arts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(7), 922–948.

Archer, L., & DeWitt, J. (2015). Science aspirations and gender identity: Lessons from the ASPIRES project. In E. K. Henrisken, J. Dillon, & J. Ryder (Eds.), Understanding student participation and choice in science and technology education (pp. 89–102). Springer.

Archer, L., DeWitt, J., & Osborne, J. (2015). Is science for us? Black students' and parents' views of science and science careers. Science Education, 99(2), 199–237.

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

Archer, L., DeWitt, J., & Willis, B. (2014). Adolescent boys' science aspirations: Masculinity, capital, and power. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(1), 1–30.

Archer, L., Moote, J., Francis, B., DeWitt, J., & Yeomans, L. (2017). The "exceptional" physics girl: A sociological analysis of multimethod data from young women aged 10–16 to explore gendered patterns of post-16 participation. American Educational

Research Journal, 54(1), 88-126.

Archer, L., Moote, J., Macleod, E., Francis, B., & DeWitt, J. (2020). ASPIRES 2: Young people's science and career aspirations, age 10–19. UCL Institute of Education.

Aschbacher, P. R., Ing, M., & Tsai, S. M. (2014). Is science me? Exploring middle school students' STEM career aspirations. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 23(6), 735–743.

Avraamidou, L. (2014). Studying science teacher identity: Current insights and future research directions. Studies in Science Education, 50(2), 145–179.

Avraamidou, L. (2020a). "I am a young immigrant woman doing physics and on top of that I am Muslim": Identities, intersections, and negotiations. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(3), 311–341.

Avraamidou, L. (2020b). Science identity as a landscape of becoming: Rethinking recognition and emotions through an intersectionality lens. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(2), 323–345.

Aydeniz, M., & Kotowski, M. R. (2014). Conceptual and methodological issues in the measurement of attitudes towards science. The Electronic Journal for Research in Science & Mathematics Education, 18(3), 1–24.

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. Self-efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents, 5(1), 307–337.

Bellocchi, A. , Quigley, C. , & Otrel-Cass, K. (Eds.). (2017). Exploring emotions, aesthetics and wellbeing in science education research (Vol. 13). Springer.

Bellocchi, A., & Ritchie, S. M. (2015). "I was proud of myself that I didn't give up and I did it": Experiences of pride and triumph in learning science. Science Education, 99(4), 638–668.

Bellocchi, A., Ritchie, S. M., Tobin, K., King, D. T., Sandhu, M., & Henderson, S. (2014). Emotional climate and high quality learning experiences in science teacher education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(10), 1301–1325.

Birmingham, D. , Calabrese Barton, A. , McDaniel, A. , Jones, J. , Turner, C. , & Rogers, A. (2017). "But the science we do here matters": Youth-authored cases of consequential learning. Science Education, 101(5), 818–844.

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.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). The logic of practice. Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1992). Language and symbolic power. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2010). Sociology is a martial art. New Press.

Butler, J. (1993). Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex. Routledge.

Caiman, C., & Jakobson, B. (2019). The role of art practice in elementary school science. Science & Education, 28(1–2), 153–175.

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.

Carlone, H. B., Huffling, L. D., Tomasek, T., Hegedus, T. A., Matthews, C. E., Allen, M. H., & Ash, M. C. (2015). "Unthinkable" selves: Identity boundary work in a summer field ecology enrichment program for diverse youth. International Journal of Science Education, 37(10), 1524–1546.

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(8), 1187–1218.

Carlone, H. B., Johnson, A., & Scott, C. M. (2015). Agency amidst formidable structures: How girls perform gender in science class. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 474–488.

Carlone, H. B., Scott, C. M., & Lowder, C. (2014). Becoming (less) scientific: A longitudinal study of students' identity work from elementary to middle school science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(7), 836–869.

Chappell, M. J., & Varelas, M. (2020). Ethnodance and identity: Black students representing science identities in the making. Science Education, 104(2), 193–221.

Chen, S., & Wei, B. (2022). Development and validation of an instrument to measure high school students' science identity in science learning. Research in Science Education, 52(1), 111–126.

Cheng, M. H. M., & Wan, Z. H. (2016). Unpacking the paradox of Chinese science learners: Insights from research into Asian Chinese school students' attitudes towards learning science, science learning strategies, and scientific epistemological views. Studies in Science Education, 52(1), 29–62.

Cheung, D. (2018). The key factors affecting students' individual interest in school science lessons. International Journal of Science Education, 40(1), 1–23.

Cooper, G., Berry, A., & Baglin, J. (2020). Demographic predictors of students' science participation over the age of 16: An Australian case study. Research in Science Education, 50(1), 361–373.

Davis, J. P., & Bellocchi, A. (2018). Objectivity, subjectivity, and emotion in school science inquiry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(10), 1419–1447.

Dawson, E., Archer, L., Seakins, A., Godec, S., DeWitt, J., King, H., Mau, A., & Nomikou, E. (2020). Selfies at the science museum: Exploring girls' identity performances in a science learning space. Gender and Education, 32(5), 664–681.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of theories of social psychology (pp. 416–436). Sage Publications Ltd.

Dewey, J. (1922). Habits as social functions. In Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology (pp. 14–23). Modern Library.

Dewey, J. (1934/1980). Art as experience. Perigee Books.

Dewey, J. (1938/1997). Experience and education. Touchstone, Simon and Schuster.

DeWitt, J., & Archer, L. (2015). Who aspires to a science career? A comparison of survey responses from primary and secondary school students. International Journal of Science Education, 37(13), 2170–2192.

DeWitt, J., Archer, L., & Mau, A. (2016). Dimensions of science capital: Exploring its potential for understanding students' science participation. International Journal of Science Education, 38(16), 2431–2449.

DeWitt, J., Archer, L., & Moote, J. (2019). 15/16-year-old students' reasons for choosing and not choosing physics at A level. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17(6), 1071–1087.

DeWitt, J., Archer, L., & Osborne, J. (2014). Science-related aspirations across the primary – Secondary divide: Evidence from two surveys in England. International Journal of Science Education, 36(10), 1609–1629.

- Dong, Z., Li, M., Minstrell, J., & Cui, Y. (2020). Psychometric properties of science motivation questionnaire II-Chinese version in two waves of longitudinal data. Psychology in the Schools, 57(8), 1240–1256.
- Dou, R., Bhutta, K., Ross, M., Kramer, L., & Thamotharan, V. (2020). The effects of computer science stereotypes and interest on middle school boys' career intentions. ACM Transactions Computer Education, 20(3), 1–15.
- Dou, R., & Cian, H. (2021). The relevance of childhood science talk as a proxy for college students' STEM identity at a Hispanic serving institution. Research in Science Education, 51(3), 1093–1105.
- Dou, R. , Hazari, Z. , Dabney, K. , Sonnert, G. , & Sadler, P. (2019). Early informal STEM experiences and STEM identity: The importance of talking science. Science Education, 103(3), 623-637.
- Drymiotou, I., Constantinou, C. P., & Avraamidou, L. (2021). Enhancing students' interest in science and understandings of STEM careers: The role of career-based scenarios. International Journal of Science Education, 43(5), 717–736.
- Du, X., & Wong, B. (2019). Science career aspiration and science capital in China and UK: A comparative study using PISA data. International Journal of Science Education, 41(15), 2136–2155.
- 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.
- Fakoyede, S. J., & Otulaja, F. S. (2020). Beads and beadwork as cultural artifacts used in mediating learners' agentic constructs in science classrooms: A case for place-based learning. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(1), 193–210.
- Ferguson, J. P., Tytler, R., & White, P. (2021). The role of aesthetics in the teaching and learning of data modelling. International Journal of Science Education, 44(5), 753–774.
- Fortus, D. (2014). Attending to affect. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(7), 821–835.
- Fortus, D., & Vedder-Weiss, D. (2014). Measuring students' continuing motivation for science learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(4), 497–522.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109.
- Fredricks, J. A., Hofkens, T., Wang, M.-T., Mortenson, E., & Scott, P. (2018). Supporting girls' and boys' engagement in math and science learning: A mixed methods study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(2), 271–298.
- Gardner, P. L. (1975). Attitudes to science. Studies in Science Education, 2(1), 1-41.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. Review of Research in Education, 25(1), 99–125.
- Gilbert, A., & Byers, C. (2017). Wonder as a tool to engage preservice elementary teachers in science learning and teaching. Science Education, 101(6), 907–928.
- Glynn, S. M., Brickman, P., Armstrong, N., & Taasoobshirazi, G. (2011). Science motivation questionnaire II: Validation with science majors and nonscience majors. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(10), 1159–1176.
- Glynn, S. M., Taasoobshirazi, G., & Brickman, P. (2009). Science motivation questionnaire: Construct validation with nonscience majors. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46(2), 127–146.
- Godec, S. , King, H. , & Archer, L. (2017). The science capital teaching approach: Engaging students with science, promoting social justice. UCL Institute of Education.
- Godec, S., King, H., Archer, L., Dawson, E., & Seakins, A. (2018). Examining student engagement with science through a Bourdieusian notion of field. Science & Education, 27(5–6), 501–521.
- Godec, S., Patel, U., Archer, L., & Dawson, E. (2020). Young people's tech identity performances: Why materiality matters. International Journal of STEM Education, 7(1), 1–12.
- Godwin, A., & Potvin, G. (2017). Pushing and pulling Sara: A case study of the contrasting influences of high school and university experiences on engineering agency, and participation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(4), 439–462.
- Godwin, A., Potvin, G., Hazari, Z., & Lock, R. (2016). Identity, critical agency, and engineering: An affective model for predicting engineering as a career choice. Journal of Engineering Education, 105(2), 312–340.
- Großmann, N., & Wilde, M. (2020). Promoting interest by supporting learner autonomy: The effects of teaching behaviour in biology lessons. Research in Science Education, 50(5), 1763–1788.
- Gupta, A., Elby, A., & Danielak, B. A. (2018). Exploring the entanglement of personal epistemologies and emotions in students' thinking. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 14(1), 010129.
- Hagay, G., & Baram-Tsabari, A. (2015). A strategy for incorporating students' interests into the high-school science classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(7), 949–978.
- Halliday, M. (1978). Language as social semiotic. Edward Arnold.
- Hannigan, S., Wickman, P.-O., Ferguson, J. P., Prain, V., & Tytler, R. (2021). The role of aesthetics in learning science in an art-science lesson. International Journal of Science Education, 44(5), 797–814.
- Harré, R., & Van Langenhove, L. (1999). Positioning theory: Moral contexts of international action. Wiley.
- Hassan, S. S. (2018). Measuring attitude towards learning science in Malaysian secondary school context: Implications for teaching. International Journal of Science Education, 40(16), 2044–2059.
- Hazari, Z., Cass, C., & Beattie, C. (2015). Obscuring power structures in the physics classroom: Linking teacher positioning, student engagement, and physics identity development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(6), 735–762.
- Hazari, Z., Chari, D., Potvin, G., & Brewe, E. (2020). The context dependence of physics identity: Examining the role of performance/competence, recognition, interest, and sense of belonging for lower and upper female physics undergraduates. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(10), 1583–1607.
- 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.
- Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2006). The four phase model of interest development. Educational Psychologist, 41(2), 111–127. Hilts, A., Part, R., & Bernacki, M. L. (2018). The roles of social influences on student competence, relatedness, achievement, and retention in STEM. Science Education, 102(4), 744–770.
- Hobbs, L., & Kelly, L. (2017). The heart of the educator: Aesthetic experience shaping knowledge, identity, and passion. In A. Bellocchi, C. Quigley, & K. Otrel-Cass (Eds.), Exploring emotions, aesthetics and wellbeing in science education research (pp. 55–82). Springer.
- Hofferber, N., Basten, M., Großmann, N., & Wilde, M. (2016). The effects of autonomy-supportive and controlling teaching behaviour in biology lessons with primary and secondary experiences on students' intrinsic motivation and flow-experience. International Journal

- of Science Education, 38(13), 2114-2132.
- Höft, L., Bernholt, S., Blankenburg, J., & Winberg, M. (2019). Knowing more about things you care less about: Cross-sectional analysis of the opposing trend and interplay between conceptual understanding and interest in secondary school chemistry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(2), 184–210.
- Hong, J. C., Chang, C. H., Tsai, C. R., & Ta, K. H. (2019). How situational interest affects individual interest in a STEAM competition. International Journal of Science Education, 41(12), 1667–1681.
- Howard, M. A., & Kern, A. L. (2019). Conceptions of wayfinding: Decolonizing science education in pursuit of Native American success. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(4), 1135–1148.
- Jaber, L. Z., & Hammer, D. (2016). Learning to feel like a scientist. Science Education, 100(2), 189–220.
- Jack, B. M., & Lin, H.-S. (2017). Making learning interesting and its application to the science classroom. Studies in Science Education, 53(2), 137–164.
- Jack, B. M., Lin, H.-S., & Yore, L. D. (2014). The synergistic effect of affective factors on student learning outcomes. Journal of Research on Science Teaching, 51(8), 1084–1101.
- Jakobson, B., & Wickman, P.-O. (2008). The roles of aesthetic experience in elementary school science. Research in Science Education, 38(1), 45–66.
- Jakobson, B., & Wickman, P. O. (2015). What difference does art make in science? A comparative study of meaning-making at elementary school. Interchange, 46(4), 323–343.
- Jiang, F., & McComas, W. F. (2015). The effects of inquiry teaching on student science achievement and attitudes: Evidence from propensity score analysis of PISA data. International Journal of Science Education, 37(3), 554–576.
- Kane, J. M. (2016). Young African American boys narrating identities in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(1), 95–118.
- Kang, H., Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., Simpkins, S. D., Rhee, H.-Y., & Turner, C. (2019). How do middle school girls of color develop STEM identities? Middle school girls' participation in science activities and identification with STEM careers. Science Education, 103(2), 418–439.
- Kang, J., & Keinonen, T. (2017). The effect of inquiry-based learning experiences on adolescents' science-related career aspiration in the Finnish context. International Journal of Science Education, 39(12), 1669–1689.
- Kang, J., & Keinonen, T. (2018). The effect of student-centered approaches on students' interest and achievement in science: Relevant topic-based, open and guided inquiry-based, and discussion-based approaches. Research in Science Education, 48(1), 865–885.
- Kang, J., Keinonen, T., & Salonen, A. (2019). Role of interest and self-concept in predicting science aspirations: Gender study. Research in Science Education, 51(2), 513–535.
- Kewalramani, S., & Phillipson, S. (2020). Parental role in shaping immigrant children's subject choices and career pathway decisions in Australia. International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 20(1), 79–99.
- Kim, M. (2018). Understanding children's science identity through classroom interactions. International Journal of Science Education, 40(1), 24–45.
- Krapp, A., & Prenzel, M. (2011). Research on interest in science: Theories, methods and findings. International Journal of Science Education, 33(1), 27–50.
- Lau, K. C., & Ho, S. C. (2020). Attitudes towards science, teaching practices, and science performance in PISA 2015: Multilevel analysis of the Chinese and Western top performers. Research in Science Education, 51(2), 415–426.
- Lemke, J. (2013). Thinking about feeling: Affect across literacies and lives. In O. Erstad & J. Sefton-Green (Eds.), Learning lives: Transactions, technologies, and learner identity (pp. 57–69). Cambridge University Press.
- Lemke, J. (2015). Feeling and meaning: A unitary bio-semiotic account. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), International handbook of semiotics (pp. 589–616). Springer.
- Lima Junior, P., Anderhag, P., & Wickman, P. O. (2022). How does a science teacher distinguish himself as a good professional? An inquiry into the aesthetics of taste for teaching. International Journal of Science Education, 44(5), 815–832.
- Lindholm, M. (2018). Promoting curiosity? Possibilities and pitfalls in science education. Science & Education, 27(9–10), 987–1002.
- Liou, P.-Y. (2021). Students' attitudes toward science and science achievement: An analysis of the differential effects of science instructional practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(3), 310–334.
- Liu, J., McMahon, M., & Watson, M. (2015). Parental influence on mainland Chinese children's career aspirations: Child and parental perspectives. International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 15(2), 131–143.
- Luce, M. R., & Hsi, S. (2015). Science-relevant curiosity expression and interest in science: An exploratory study. Science Education, 99(1), 70–97.
- Maltese, A. V., Melki, C. S., & Wiebke, H. L. (2014). The nature of experiences responsible for the generation and maintenance of interest in STEM. Science Education, 98(6), 937–962.
- Marginson, S., Tytler, R., Freeman, B., & Roberts, K. (2013). STEM: Country comparisons. Australian Council of Learned Academies. www.acola.org.au
- McKinley, E. (2005). Brown bodies, white coats: Postcolonialism, Maori women and science. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26(4), 481–496.
- McKinley, E. (2016). STEM and indigenous learners [Paper presentation]. Research Conference 2016 Improving STEM learning: What will it take? https://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference/RC2016/8august/14
- Mejias, S., Thompson, N., Sedas, R. M., Rosin, M., Soep, E., Peppler, K., Roche, J., Wong, J., Hurley, M., Bell, P., & Bevan, B. (2021). The trouble with STEAM and why we use it anyway. Science Education, 105(2), 209–231.
- Millar, R., & Osborne, J. F. (Eds.). (1998). Beyond 2000: Science education for the future. King's College London.
- Millar, V., Toscano, M., van Driel, J., Stevenson, E., Nelson, C., & Kenyon, C. (2019). University run science outreach programs as a community of practice and site for identity development. International Journal of Science Education, 41(18), 2579–2601.
- Moote, J., Archer, L., DeWitt, J., & MacLeod, E. (2019). Who has high science capital? An exploration of emerging patterns of science capital among students aged 17/18 in England. Research Papers in Education, 36(4), 402–422.
- Moote, J., Archer, L., DeWitt, J., & MacLeod, E. (2020). Comparing students' engineering and science aspirations from age 10 to 16: Investigating the role of gender, ethnicity, cultural capital, and attitudinal factors. Journal of Engineering Education, 109(1), 34–51.

- Nguyen, T.-H., Gasman, M., Washington Lockett, A., & Peña, V. (2021). Supporting Black women's pursuits in STEM. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(6), 879–905.
- Oon, P. T., Cheng, M. M. W., & Wong, A. S. L. (2020). Gender differences in attitude towards science: Methodology for prioritising contributing factors. International Journal of Science Education, 42(1), 89–112.
- Oon, P. T., & Fan, X. (2017). Rasch analysis for psychometric improvement of science attitude rating scales. International Journal of Science Education, 39(6), 683–700.
- Oon, P. T., & Subramaniam, R. (2018). Comparative study of middle school students' attitudes towards science: Rasch analysis of entire TIMSS 2011 attitudinal data for England, Singapore and the U.S.A. as well as psychometric properties of attitudes scale. International Journal of Science Education, 40(3), 268–290.
- 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. F., Simon, S., & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes towards science: A review of the literature and its implications. International Journal of Science Education, 25(9), 1049–1079.
- Patulny, R., Bellocchi, A., Olson, R. E., Khorana, S., McKenzie, J., & Peterie, M. (2019). Emotions in late modernity. Routledge. Peirce, C. S. (1894/1998). What is a sign? In N. Houser, A. De Tienne, J. R. Eller, C. L. Clark, A. C. Lewis, & D. B. Davis (Eds.), The essential Peirce Selected philosophical writings (1893–1913) (Vol. 2, pp. 4–10). Indiana University Press.
- Peirce, C. S. (1905/1998). What pragmatism is. In N. Houser, A. De Tienne, J. R. Eller, C. L. Clark, A. C. Lewis, & D. B. Davis (Eds.), The essential Peirce Selected philosophical writings (1893–1913) (Vol. 2, pp. 331–345). Indiana University Press.
- Peirce, C. S. (1907/1998). Pragmatism. In N. Houser, A. De Tienne, J. R. Eller, C. L. Clark, A. C. Lewis, & D. B. Davis (Eds.), The essential Peirce Selected philosophical writings Volume 2 (1893–1913) (pp. 398–433). Indiana University Press.
- Pekrun, R. (1992). The impact of emotions on learning and achievement: Towards a theory of cognitive/motivational mediators. Applied Psychology, 41(4), 359–376.
- Pekrun, R., & Bühner, M. (2014). Self-report measures of academic emotions. In R. Pekrun & L. Linnenbrink-Garcia (Eds.), International handbook of emotions in education (pp. 561–579). Routledge.
- 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.), Emotions in education (pp. 13–36). Academic Press.
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Barchfeld, P., & Perry, R. P. (2011). Measuring emotions in students' learning and performance: The Achievement Emotions Questinnaire (AEQ). Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36(1), 36–48.
- Perera, L. D. H. (2014). Parents' attitudes towards science and their children's science achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 36(18), 3021–3041.
- Phillips, T. B., Ballard, H. L., Lewenstein, B. V., & Bonney, R. (2019). Engagement in science through citizen science: Moving beyond data collection. Science Education, 103(3), 665–690.
- Potvin, P., & Hasni, A. (2014). Interest, motivation and attitude towards science and technology at K-12 levels: A systematic review of 12 years of educational research. Studies in Science Education, 50(1), 85–129.
- Potvin, P., Hasni, A., Sy, O., & Riopel, M. (2020). Two crucial years of science and technology schooling: A longitudinal study of the major influences on and interactions between self-concept, interest, and the intention to pursue S&T. Research in Science Education, 50(5), 1739–1761.
- Prain, V. (2020). Methodological challenges in researching students' aesthetic responses in science inquiry. In P. White , R. Tytler , J. C. Clark , & J. Ferguson (Eds.), Methodological approaches to STEM education research Volume 1 (pp. 21–33). Cambridge Scholars
- Pugh, K. J., & Girod, M. (2007). Science, art, and experience: Constructing a science pedagogy from Dewey's aesthetics. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18(1), 9–27.
- Rahm, J., & Moore, J. C. (2016). A case study of long-term engagement and identity-in-practice: Insights into the STEM pathways of four underrepresented youths. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(5), 768–801.
- Raker, J. R., Gibbons, R. E., & Cruz-Ramírez de Arellano, D. (2019). Development and evaluation of the organic chemistry-specific achievement emotions questionnaire (AEQ-OCHEM). Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(2), 163–183.
- Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2019). Investigating gender differences in mathematics and science: Results from the 2011 Trends in Mathematics and Science Survey. Research in Science Education, 49(1), 25–50.
- Rioux, J., & Smith, G. (2019). Both-ways science education: Place and context. Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts, 25, 90–105.
- Ritchie, S. M., Hudson, P., Bellocchi, A., Henderson, S., King, D., & Tobin, K. (2016). Evolution of self-reporting methods for identifying discrete emotions in science classrooms. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(3), 577–593.
- Rivera Maulucci, M. S. (2013). Emotions and positional identity in becoming a social justice science teacher: Nicole's story. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(4), 453–478.
- Rorty, R. (1991). Objectivity, relativism, and truth Philosophical papers (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Said, Z., Summers, R., Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Wang, S. (2016). Attitudes toward science among grades 3 through 12 Arab students in Oatar: Findings from a cross-sectional national study. International Journal of Science Education, 38(4), 621–643.
- Sáinz, M., & Müller, J. (2018). Gender and family influences on Spanish students' aspirations and values in STEM fields. International Journal of Science Education, 40(2), 188–203.
- Salta, K., & Koulougliotis, D. (2015). Assessing motivation to learn chemistry: Adaptation and validation of Science Motivation Questionnaire II with Greek secondary school students. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 16(2), 237–250.
- Savelsbergh, E. R., Prins, G. T., Rietbergen, C., Fechner, S., Vaessen, B. E., Draijer, J. M., & Bakker, A. (2016). Effects of innovative science and mathematics teaching on student attitudes and achievement: A meta-analytic study. Educational Research Review, 19(1), 158–172.
- Schumm, M. F., & Bogner, F. X. (2016). Measuring adolescent science motivation. International Journal of Science Education, 38(3), 434–449.
- Sfard, A., & Prusak, A. (2005). Telling identities: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity. Educational Researcher, 34(4), 14–22.
- Sha, L., Schunn, C., & Bathgate, M. (2015). Measuring choice to participate in optional science learning experiences during early adolescence. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(5), 686–709.

- Shaby, N., & Vedder-Weiss, D. (2020). Science identity trajectories throughout school visits to a science museum. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(5), 733–764.
- Sheldrake, R. (2016). Confidence as motivational expressions of interest, utility, and other influences: Exploring under-confidence and over-confidence in science students at secondary school. International Journal of Educational Research, 76(1), 50–65.
- Sheldrake, R. (2020). Changes in children's science-related career aspirations from age 11 to age 14. Research in Science Education, 50(4), 1435–1464.
- Sheldrake, R., Mujtaba, T., & Reiss, M. J. (2019). Students' changing attitudes and aspirations towards physics during secondary school. Research in Science Education, 49(6), 1809–1834.
- Shin, J., Lee, H., McCarthy-Donovan, A., Hwang, H., Yim, S., & Seo, E. (2015). Home and motivational factors related to science-career pursuit: Gender differences and gender similarities. International Journal of Science Education, 37(9), 1478–1503.
- Siry, C., & Brendel, M. (2016). The inseparable role of emotions in the teaching and learning of primary school science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(3), 803–815.
- Summers, R., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2018). Development and validation of an instrument to assess student attitudes toward science across grades 5 through 10. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(2), 172–205.
- Summers, R., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2019). An exploration of Illinois students' attitudes toward science using multivariate multilevel modelling with a cross-sectional sample of responses from grades 5 through 10. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(8), 1106–1134.
- Swarat, S., Ortony, A., & Revelle, W. (2012). Activity matters: Understanding student interest in school science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(4), 515–537.
- Tobin, K., Ritchie, S. M., Hudson, P., Oakley, J., & Mergard, V. (2013). Relationships between EC and the fluency of classroom interactions. Learning Environments Research, 16(1), 71–89.
- Toma, R. B. (2022). Perceived difficulty of school science and cost appraisals: A valuable relationship for the STEM pipeline? Research in Science Education, 52(2), 567–582.
- Tomas, L., Rigano, D., & Ritchie, S. M. (2016). Students' regulation of their emotions in a science classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(2), 234–260.
- Turner, J. H. (2007). Human emotions: A sociological theory. Routledge.
- Tytler, R. (2014). Attitudes, identity, and aspirations toward science. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 82–103). Routledge.
- Tytler, R., & Osborne, J. (2012). Student attitudes and aspirations towards science. In B. Fraser, K. Tobin & C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 597–625). Springer.
- Tytler, R., Prain, V., & Hannigan, S. (2022). Expanding the languages of science and how they are learnt. Research in Science Education, 52(1), 379–392.
- Varelas, M. (Ed.). (2012). Identity construction and science education research. Sense Publishers.
- Varelas, M., Settlage, J., & Mensah, F. M. (2015). Explorations of the structure-agency dialectic as a tool for framing equity in science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 439–447.
- Vedder-Weiss, D. (2018). Won't you give up your snack for the sake of science Emerging science identities in family everyday interaction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(8), 1211–1235.
- Vennix, J., den Brok, P., & Taconis, R. (2018). Do outreach activities in secondary STEM education motivate students and improve their attitudes towards STEM? International Journal of Science Education, 40(11), 1263–1283.
- Villanueva Baselga, S., Marimon Garrido, O., & González Burón, H. (2022). Drama-based activities for STEM education:
- Encouraging scientific aspirations and debunking stereotypes in secondary school students in Spain and the UK. Research in Science Education, 52(1), 173–190.
- Vincent-Ruz, P., & Schunn, C. D. (2018). The nature of science identity and its role as the driver of student choices. International Journal of STEM Education, 5(1), 1–12.
- Vossen, T. E., Henze, I., Rippe, R. C. A., Van Driel, J. H., & De Vries, M. J. (2018). Attitudes of secondary school students towards doing research and design activities. International Journal of Science Education, 40(13), 1629–1652.
- Waide-James, K., & Schwartz, R. (2019). "I don't think it's science:" African American girls and the figured world of school science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(6), 679–706.
- Wan, Z. H. (2021). Exploring the effects of intrinsic motive, utilitarian motive, and self-efficacy on students' science learning in the classroom using the expectancy-value theory. Research in Science Education, 51(3), 647–659.
- Wan, Z. H., & Lee, J. C. K. (2017). Hong Kong secondary school students' attitudes towards science: A study of structural models and gender differences. International Journal of Science Education, 39(5), 507–527.
- Wickman, P. O. (2006). Aesthetic experience in science education: Learning and meaning-making as situated talk and action. Routledge.
- Wickman, P. O. (2017). Back to the drawing board: Examining the philosophical foundations of educational research on aesthetics and emotions. In A. Bellocchi , C. Quigley , & K. Otrel-Kass (Eds.), Exploring emotions, aesthetics and wellbeing in science education research (pp. 9–37). Springer.
- 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.
- Wickman, P.-O., Prain, V., & Tytler, R. (2022). Aesthetics, affect, and making meaning in science education: An introduction. International Journal of Science Education, 44(5), 717–734.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953/1958). Philosophical investigations (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Basil Blackwell Limited.
- Wong, B. (2015). Careers "from" but not "in" science: Why are aspirations to be a scientist challenging for minority ethnic students? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(7), 979–1002.
- Wong, B. (2016). Minority ethnic students and science participation: A qualitative mapping of achievement, aspiration, interest and capital. Research in Science Education, 46(1), 113–127.
- Zembylas, M. (2021). The affective turn in educational theory. In G. W. Noblitt (Ed.), Oxford research encyclopedia of education. Oxford University Press.

Learning Environments

- Afari, E., Aldridge, J. M., Fraser, B. J., & Khine, M. S. (2013). Students' perceptions of the learning environment and attitudes in game-based mathematics classrooms. Learning Environments Research, 16, 131–150.
- Alansari, M., & Rubie-Davies, C. (2020). What about tertiary climate: Reflecting on five decades of class climate research. Learning Environments Research, 23(1), 1–25.
- Aldridge, J. M., & Bianchet, S. (2021). Using feedback about the learning environment as a starting point for co-construction. Learning Environments Research, 25, 939–955. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09403-9
- Aldridge, J. M., Dorman, J. P., & Fraser, B. J. (2004). Use of multitrait multimethod modelling to validate actual and preferred forms of the Technology-Rich Outcomes-Focused Learning Environment Inventory (TROFLEI). Australian Journal of Educational and Development 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. 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.
- Aldridge, J. M., & McChesney, K. (2021). Parents' and caregivers' perceptions of the school climate: Development and validation of the Parent and Caregiver Survey (PaCS). Learning Environments Research, 24(1), 23–41.
- Aldridge, J. M., McChesney, K., & Afari, E. (2018). Relationship between school climate, bullying and delinquent behaviours. Learning Environments Research, 21(2), 153–172.
- Aldridge, J. M., Rijken, P. E., & Fraser, B. J. (2021). Improving learning environments through whole-school collaborative action research. Learning Environments Research, 24(2), 183–205.
- 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.
- Alterator, S., & Deed, C. (Eds.). (2018). School space and its occupation: The conceptualisation and evaluation of innovative learning environments (Advances in Learning Environments Research series). Sense Publishers.
- Alzubaidi, E., Aldridge, J. M., & Khine, M. S. (2016). Learning English as a second language at the university level in Jordan: Motivation, self-regulation and learning environment perceptions. Learning Environments Research, 19(1), 133–152.
- Anderson, G. L., & Walberg, H. J. (1968). Classroom climate group learning. International Journal of Educational Sciences, 2, 175–180.
- Attai, S. L., Reyes, J. C., Davis, J. L., York, J. Ranney, K., & Hyde, T. W. (2021). Investigating the impact of flexible furniture in the elementary classroom. Learning Environments Research, 24(2), 153–167. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-020-09322-1
- Baars, S., Schellings, G. L. M., Krishnamurthy, S., Moore, J. P., den Brok, P. J., & van Wesemael, P. J. V. (2021). A framework for exploration of relationship between the psychosocial and physical learning environment. Learning Environment Research, 24(1),
- Baek, C. G., & Choi, H. J. (2002). The relationship between students' perceptions of classroom environment and their academic achievement in Korea. Asia-Pacific Journal of Education, 3(10), 125–135.
- Bell, L. M., & Aldridge, J. M. (2014). Student voice, teacher action research and classroom improvement. Sense.
- Bi, X. (2015). Associations between psychosocial aspects of English classroom environments and motivation types of Chinese tertiary-level English majors. Learning Environments Research, 18(1), 95–110.
- Bonanati, S., & Buhl, H. M. (2021). The digital home learning environment and its relation to children's ICT self-efficacy. Learning Environments Research, 25, 485–505. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09377-8
- Boone, W. J., & Staver, J. R. (2020). Advances in Rasch analysis in human sciences. Springer.
- Brekelmans, M., Levy, J., & Rodriguez, R. (1993). A typology of teacher communication style. In T. Wubbels & J. Levy (Eds.), Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education (pp. 46–55). Falmer Press.
- Brekelmans, M., Wubbels, T., & van Tartwijk, J. (2005). Teacher student relationships across the teaching career. International Journal of Educational Research, 43, 55–71.
- Cai, J. , Wen, Q. , Lombaerts, K. , Jaime, I. , & Cai, L. (2021). Assessing students' perceptions about classroom learning environments: The new what is happening in this class (NWIHIC) instrument. Learning Environments Research, 25, 601-618. https://doi.org/10.1007/s/10984-021-09383-w
- Charalampous, K., & Kokkinos, C. M. (2017). The Greek elementary "what is happening in this class?" (G-EWIHIC): A three-phase multi-sample mixed methods study. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 52, 55–70.

- 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.
- Cho, H. J. , Levesque-Bristol, C. , & Yough, M. (2021). How autonomy-supportive learning environments promote Asian international students' academic adjustment: A self-determination theory perspective. Learning Environments Research. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09401x
- Cohn, S. T., & Fraser, B. J. (2016). Effectiveness of student response systems in terms of learning environment, attitudes and achievement. Learning Environments Research, 19, 153–167.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Sage.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.). (2002). Handbook of self-determination research. Rochester University Press.
- 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., Mainhard, T., & Wubbels, T. (2019). Developments in quantitative methods and analyses for studying learning environments. In D. B. Zandvliet & B. J. Fraser (Eds.), Thirty years of learning environments: Looking back and looking forward (pp. 41–58). Brill Sense.
- 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.
- 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. P., Fraser, B., & McRobbie, C. (1995). Associations between school-level environment and science classroom environment in secondary schools. Research in Science Education, 25, 333–351.
- 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 (pp. 1451–1484). Springer.
- Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1981). Validity and use of my class inventory. Science Education, 65, 145-156.
- Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1983a). Validity and use of classroom environment scale. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5, 261–271.
- Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1983 b). 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, K. (Ed.). (2016). The translational design of schools: An evidence-based approach to aligning pedagogy and learning environments (Advances in Learning Environments Research Series). Sense Publishers.
- Fisher, K. (Ed.). (2019). The translational design of universities: An evidence based approach (Advances in Learning Environments Research Series). Sense Publishers.
- Fraser, B. J. (1979). Evaluation of a science-based curriculum. In H. Walberg (Ed.), Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy, and productivity (pp. 218–234). McCutchan.
- Fraser, B. J. (1998). Learning environment instruments: Development, validity and applications. Learning Environment Research, 1(1), 7–33.
- Fraser, B. J. (1990). Individualised classroom environment questionnaire. Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Fraser, B. J. (1994). Research on classroom and school climate. In D. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of science teaching and learning (pp. 493–541). Macmillan.
- Fraser, B. J. (1999). 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). Falmer Press.
- Fraser, B. J. (2012a). Classroom environment. Routledge (Originally published in 1986 by Croom Helm).
- Fraser, B. J. (2012b). 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). Springer.
- Fraser, B. J. (2014). Classroom learning environments: Historical and contemporary perspectives. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 104–119). Routledge.
- Fraser, B. J. (2019). Milestone in the evolution of the learning environments field over the past three decades. In D. B. Zandvliet & B. J. Fraser (Eds.), Thirty years of learning environments: Looking back and looking forward (pp. 1–19). Brill Sense.
- Fraser, B. J., & Aldridge, J. M. (2017). Improving classrooms through assessment of learning environments. In J. P. Bakken (Ed.), Classrooms volume 1: Assessment practices for teachers and student improvement strategies (pp. 91–107). Nova.
- 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., & 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. J., & Fisher, D. L. (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. 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. J., McLure, F. I., & Koul, R. B. (2021). Assessing classroom emotional climate in STEM classrooms: Developing and validating a questionnaire. Learning Environments Research, 24(1), 1–21.
- Fraser, B. J., & McRobbie, C. (1995). Science laboratory classroom environments at schools and universities: A cross-national study. Educational Research and Evaluation, 1, 289–317.
- Fraser, B. J., & Teh, G. (1994). Effect sizes associated with micro-PROLOG-based computer-assisted learning. Computers and Education: An International Journal, 23, 187–196.
- Fraser, B. J., & Treagust, D. F. (1986). Validity and use of an instrument for assessing classroom psychosocial environment in higher education. Higher Education, 15, 37–57.
- Fraser, B. J., Treagust, D. F., & Dennis, N. C. (1986). Development of an instrument for assessing classroom psychosocial environment at universities and colleges. Studies in Higher Education, 11, 43–54.
- Fraser, B. J., Welch, W. W., & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Using secondary analysis of national assessment data to identify predictors of junior high school students' outcomes. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 32, 37–50.
- Giallousi, M., Gialamas, V., & Pavlatou, E. A. (2013). A typology of chemistry classroom environments: Exploring the relationships between 10th grade students' perceptions, attitudes and gender. Learning Environments Research, 16, 349–366.
- Giallousi, M., Gialamas, V., Spyrellis, N., & Pavlatou, E. A. (2010). Development, validation, and use of a Greek-language questionnaire for assessing learning environments in grade 10 chemistry classes. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 8, 761–782.
- Glassner, A. (2022). Training yough at risk mentors in *Paths*, an innovative TE program: Promoting resilience, mental well-being and meaningful learning through a self-determined learning environment. Learning Environments Research, 25, 841–857. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09391-w
- 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.
- Goh, S. F., & Fraser, B. J. (2016). Learning environment in Singapore primary school classrooms: The ideal and the real. In K. Wallace (Ed.), Learning environments: Emerging theories, applications and future directions (pp. 125–141). Nova.
- 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.
- Hasan, A., & Fraser, B. J. (2015). Effectiveness of teaching strategies for engaging adults who experienced childhood difficulties in learning mathematics. Learning Environments Research, 18, 1–13.
- 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.
- Henderson, D., & Loh, M. (2019). Using classroom environment perceptions to guide teacher professional learning. In D. B. Zandvliet & B. J. Fraser (Eds.), Thirty years of learning environments: Looking back and looking forward (pp. 127–140). Brill Sense.
- Huang, R., Yang, J., & Zheng, L. (2013). The components and functions of smart learning environments for easy, engaged and effective learning. International Journal for Educational Media and Technology, 7(1), 4–14.
- Imms, W., Cleveland, B., & Fisher, K. (Eds.). (2016). Evaluating learning environments: Snapshots of emerging issues, methods and knowledge (Advances in Learning Environments Research Series). Sense Publishers.
- Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. L. (1973). The perceived environment in behavioral science. American Behavioral Scientist, 16, 801–828. Khine, M. S. (Ed.). (2020). Rasch measurement: Applications in quantitative educational research. Springer.
- Khine, M. S., Fraser, B. J., & Afari, E. (2020). Structural relationships between learning environments and students' non-cognitive outcomes: Secondary analysis of PISA data. Learning Environments Research, 23(3), 395–412.
- Khine, M. S., Fraser, B. J., Afari, E., Oo, Z., & Kyaw, T. T. (2018). Students' perceptions of the learning environment in tertiary science classrooms in Myanmar. Learning Environments Research, 21(1), 135–152.
- 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.
- Koch, A., Polnick, B., & Irby, B. (Eds.). (2014). Girls and women in STEM: A never ending story. Information Age Publishing.
- 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.
- Koul, R. B., McLure, F. I., & Fraser, B. J. (2021). Gender differences in classroom emotional climate and attitudes among students undertaking integrated STEM projects: A Rasch analysis. Research in Science & Technological Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2021.1981852
- Kwan, Y. W. (2020). Psychometric properties of a Chinese version of the constructivist learning environment survey among secondary-school students in Hong Kong. Learning Environments Research, 23(2), 167–184.
- 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.
- Lim, C.-T. D., & Fraser, B. J. (2018). Learning environments research in English classrooms. Learning Environments Research, 21(3), 433–449.
- Liu, L., & Fraser, B. J. (2013). Development and validation of an English classroom learning environment inventory and its application in China. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), Application of structural equation modeling in educational research and practice (pp. 75–89). Sense Publishers.
- Long, C. S., Sinclair, B. B., Fraser, B. J., Larson, T. R., & Harrell, P. E. (2022). Preservice teachers' perceptions of learning environments before and after pandemic-related course disruption. Learning Environments Research, 25(2), 343–357. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09376-9
- 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.
- 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.
- Martin-Dunlop, C., Hohmann, C., Alabanza Akers, M. A., Determan, J., Lewter, L., & Williams, I. (2019). Evaluating the impact of a purposefully-designed active learning space on outcomes and behaviours in an undergraduate architecture course. In D. B. Zandvliet & B. J. Fraser (Eds.), Thirty years of learning environments: Looking back and looking forward (pp. 72–101). Brill Sense.
- Maulana, R., & Helms-Lorenz, M. (2016). Observations and student perceptions of the quality of pre-service teachers' teaching behaviour: Construct representation and predictive quality. Learning Environments Research, 19, 335–357.
- Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M. C., den Brok, P., & Bosker, R. (2012). Teacher-student interpersonal relationships in Indonesian lower secondary education: Teacher and student perceptions. Learning Environment Research, 15, 251–271.
- McLure, F. I., Koul, R. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2021). University students' classroom emotional climate and attitudes during and after COVID-19 lockdown. Education Sciences (in press).
- McLure, F. I., Koul, R. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2022). Gender differences among students undertaking iSTEM projects in multidisciplinary vs unidisciplinary STEM classrooms in government vs nongovernment schools: Classroom emotional climate and attitudes. Learning Environments Research, 25, 917–937. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09329-9
- McRobbie, C. J., & Fraser, B. J. (1993). Associations between student outcomes and psychosocial science environment. Journal of Educational Research, 87, 78–85.
- Mogas, J., Palau, R., Fuentes, M., & Cebrian, G. (2022). Smart schools on the way: How school principals from Catalonia approach the future of education within the fourth industrial revolution. Learning Environments Research, 25, 875–893. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09398-3
- Moos, R. H. (1974). The social climate scales: An overview. 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. Jossey-Bass.
- Moos, R. H., & Trickett, E. J. (1974). Classroom environment scale manual. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). Explorations in personality. Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Noben, I., Maulana, R., Deinum, J. F., & Hofman, W. H. A. (2021). Measuring university teachers' teaching quality: A Rasch modelling approach. Learning Environments Research, 24(1), 87–107.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) . (2013). Innovative learning environments. OECD.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) . (2017). The OECD handbook for innovative learning environments. OECD.
- Parker, L. H., Rennie, L. J., & Fraser, B. J. (Eds.). (1996). Gender, science and mathematics: Shortening the shadow. Kluwer.
- 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). Nova Science Publishers.
- Pennings, H. J. M., Brekelmans, M., Wubbels, Th., van der Want, A. C., Claessens, L. C. A., & van Tartwijk, J. (2014). A nonlinear dynamical systems approach to real-time teacher behaviour: Differences between teachers. Nonlinear Dynamics, Psychology and Life Sciences, 18(1), 23–45.
- 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). Nova Science Publishers.
- Polat, H., & Karabatak, S. (2022). Effect of flipped classroom model on academic achievement, academic satisfaction and general belongingness. Learning Environments Research, 25, 159–182. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09355-0
- Prain, V. (2018). Using quantitative methods to evaluate students' post-occupancy perceptions of personalised learning in an innovative learning environment. In S. Alterator & C. Deed (Eds.), School space and its occupation: The conceptualisation and evaluation of innovative learning environments (pp. 223–241). Sense Publishers.
- Pulay, A., & Williamson, A. (2019). A case study comparing the influence of LED and fluorescent lighting on early childhood student engagement in a classroom setting. Learning Environments Research, 22(1), 13–24.
- Quek, C. L., Wong, A. F. L., & Fraser, B. J. (2005). 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.
- Rahayu, W., Putra, M. D. K., Faturochman, M., Sulaeman, E., & Koul, R. B. (2022). Development and validation of Online Classroom Learning Environment Inventory (OCLEI): The case study of Indonesia during the COVID-19 pandemic. Learning Environments Research, 25, 97–113. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09352-3
- Reinius, H., Korhonen, T., & Hakkarainen, K. (2021). The design of learning spaces matters: Perceived impact of the deskless school on learning and teaching. Learning Environments Research, 24, 339–354. https://doi-org/10.1007/s10984-020-09345-8 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(3), 267–287.
- Rincon-Gallardo, S., & Elmore, R. F. (2012). Transforming teaching and learning through social movement in Mexican public middle-schools. Harvard Educational Review, 82(4), 471–490.
- Robinson, E., & Fraser, B. J. (2013). Kindergarten students' and parents' perceptions of science classroom environments: Achievement and attitudes. Learning Environments Research, 16, 151–161.
- Rosenshine, B. (1970). Evaluation of classroom interaction. Review of Educational Research, 40, 279-300.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78.
- Scantlebury, K. (2012). Still part of the conversation: Gender issues in science education. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 499–512). Springer.
- 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.

- Scott, R., & Fisher, D. L. (2004). Development, validation and application of a Malay translation of the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction. Research in Science Education, 34(2), 173–194.
- 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.
- Sivan, A., & Cohen, A. (2021). The structure of teacher interpersonal behaviour in Hong Kong secondary schools. Learning Environments Research (in press).
- Skordi, P., & Fraser, B. J. (2019). Assessment of the psychosocial learning environment of university statistics classrooms. In K. Fisher (Ed.), The translational design of higher education learning environments and campuses: An evidence based approach (pp. 131–148). Brill Sense.
- Smith, E. (2008). Pitfalls and promises: The use of secondary data analysis in educational research. Journal of Educational Studies, 56(3), 323–339.
- Strayer, J. F. (2012). How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation and task orientation. Learning Environments Research, 15, 171–193.
- Sun, X., Mainhard, T., & Wubbels, T. (2017). Development and evaluation of a Chinese version of the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI). Learning Environments Research, 21(1), 1–17.
- Taylor, P. C., Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1997). Monitoring constructivist classroom learning environments. International Journal of Educational Research, 27, 293–302.
- Telli, S., Maulana, R., Helms-Lorenz, M. (2021). Students' perceptions of teaching behaviour in Turkish secondary schools: A Mokken scaling of my teacher questionnaire. Learning Environments Research, 24(2), 315–337. https://doi-org/10.1007/s10984-020-09329-8
- Teo, T., Unwin, S., Scherer, R., & Gardiner, V. (2021). Initial teacher training for twenty-first century skills in the Fourth Industrial Revolution (IR 4.0): A scoping review. Computers and Education, 170, 104223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104223 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). Kluwer.
- Walberg, H. J. (Ed.). (1979). Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy and productivity. McCutchan.
- Walberg, H. J., Fraser, B. J., & Welch, W. W. (1986). A test of a model of educational productivity among senior high school students. Journal of Educational Research, 79, 133–139.
- Wan, Z. H. (2022). What predicts students' critical thinking disposition? A comparison of the roles of classroom and family environments. Learning Environments Research, 25, 565–580. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09381-y
- Wan, Z. H., & Cheng, M. H. M. (2018). Classroom learning environment, critical thinking, and achievement in an interdisciplinary subject: A study of Hong Kong secondary school graduates. Educational Studies, 45(3), 285–304.
- 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 & Technological Education, 30, 49–63.
- Welch, A. G., Cakir, M., Peterson, C., & Ray, C. M. (2014). The relationship between gender and classroom environment in Turkish science classrooms. Educational Research and Reviews, 9(20), 893–903.
- Welch, W. W., & Walberg, H. J. (1972). A national experiment in curriculum evaluation. American Educational Research Journal, 9, 373–383.
- 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 & 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, T., & 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). Springer.
- Wubbels, T., 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). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Mainhard, T., den Brok, P., & van Tartwijk, J. (2016). Teacher student relationships and student achievement. In K. R. Wetzel & G. B. Ramani (Eds.), Handbook of social influences in school contexts: Social-emotional, motivation and cognitive outcomes (pp. 127–145). Routledge.
- Wubbels, T., den Brok, P., van Tartwijk, J., & Levy, J. (Eds.). (2012). Interpersonal relationships in education: An overview of research (Advances in Learning Environments Research Series). Sense Publishers.
- Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (Eds.). (1993). Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education. Falmer Press.
- 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.
- Zandvliet, D. B., & Fraser, B. J. (Eds.). (2019). Thirty years of learning environments: Looking back and looking forward (Advances in Learning Environments Research Series). Brill Sense.
- Zaragoza, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2017). Field-study classrooms as positive and enjoyable learning environments. Learning Environments Research, 20(1), 1–20.

Unpacking and Critically Synthesizing the Literature on Race and Ethnicity in Science Education

- Alexakos, K., Pride, L. D., Amat, A., Tsetsakos, P., Lee, K. J., Paylor-Smith, C., Zapata, C., Wright, S., & Smith, T. (2016). Mindfulness and discussing "thorny" issues in the classroom. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(3), 741–769. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-015-9718-0
- Andersen, L., & Ward, T. J. (2014). Expectancy-value models for the stem persistence plans of ninth-grade, high-ability students: A comparison between Black, Hispanic, and white students. Science Education, 98(2), 216–242. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21092 Archer, L., Dawson, E., DeWitt, J., Godec, S., King, H., Mau, A., Nomikou, E., & Seakins, A. (2017). Killing curiosity? An analysis of celebrated identity performances among teachers and students in nine London secondary science classrooms. Science Education, 101(5), 741–764. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21291
- Archer, L., Dawson, E., Seakins, A., & Wong, B. (2016). Disorientating, fun or meaningful? Disadvantaged families' experiences of a science museum visit. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(4), 917–939. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-015-9667-7

 Archer, L., Dewitt, J., & Osborne, J. (2015). Is science for us? Black students' and parents' views of science and science careers.

Science Education, 99(2), 199–237. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21146

- Archer, L., DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2010). "Doing" science versus "being" a scientist: Examining 10/11-year-old schoolchildren's constructions of science through the lens of identity. Science Education, 94(4), 617–639. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20399
- Archer, L., DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2012a). Science aspirations, capital, and family habitus: How families shape children's engagement and identification with science. American Educational Research Journal, 49(5), 881–908. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211433290
- Archer, L., DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2012b). "Balancing acts": Elementary school girls' negotiations of femininity, achievement, and science. Science Education, 96(6), 967–989. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21031
- Archer, L., DeWitt, J., & Willis, B. (2014). Adolescent boys' science aspirations: Masculinity, capital, and power. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21122
- Archer, L., Godec, S., Calabrese Barton, A., Dawson, E., Mau, A., & Patel, U. (2021). Changing the field: A Bourdieusian analysis of educational practices that support equitable outcomes among minoritized youth on two informal science learning programs. Science Education, 105(1), 166–203. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21602
- Archer, L., Nomikou, E., Mau, A., King, H., Godec, S., DeWitt, J., & Dawson, E. (2019). Can the subaltern "speak" science? An intersectional analysis of performances of "talking science through muscular intellect" by "subaltern" students in UK urban secondary science classrooms. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(3), 723–751. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-018-9870-4
- Atwater, M. M., Butler, M. B., Freeman, T. B., & Carlton Parsons, E. R. (2013). An examination of Black science teacher educators' experiences with multicultural education, equity, and social justice. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24(8), 1293–1313. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-013-9358-8
- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 3–24). Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching (4th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (2016). Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum and teaching (6th ed.), Routledge,
- Bianchini, J. A., Dwyer, H. A., Brenner, M. E., & Wearly, A. J. (2015). Facilitating science and mathematics teachers' talk about equity: What are the strengths and limitations of four strategies for professional learning? Science Education, 99(3), 577–610. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21160
- Bolshakova, V. L. J., Johnson, C. C., & Czerniak, C. M. (2011). "It depends on what science teacher you got": Urban science self-efficacy from teacher and student voices. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6(4), 961–997. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-011-9346-2
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America (5th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonnette, R. N., Crowley, K., & Schunn, C. D. (2019). Falling in love and staying in love with science: Ongoing informal science experiences support fascination for all children. International Journal of Science Education, 41(12), 1626–1643. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1623431
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). An invitation to reflexive sociology. University of Chicago Press.
- Bravo, M. A., Mosqueda, E., Solís, J. L., & Stoddart, T. (2014). Possibilities and limits of integrating science and diversity education in preservice elementary teacher preparation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(5), 601–619. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-013-9374-8
- Brenner, M. E., Bianchini, J. A., & Dwyer, H. A. (2016). Science and mathematics teachers working toward equity through teacher research: Tracing changes across their research process and equity views. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(8), 819–845. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-016-9490-3
- Brkich, K. L. (2014). Urban fifth graders' connections-making between formal earth science content and their lived experiences. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 9(1), 141–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-013-9505-8
- Brotman, J. S., & Mensah, F. M. (2013). Urban high school students' perspectives about sexual health decision-making: The role of school culture and identity. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 8(2), 403–431. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-012-9451-x 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9256-x
- Brown, B. A., Pérez, G., Ribay, K., Boda, P. A., & Wilsey, M. (2021). Teaching culturally relevant science in virtual reality: "When a problem comes, you can solve it with science". Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(1), 7–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1778248
- Brown, B. A., Ryoo, K., & Rodriguez, J. (2010). Pathway towards fluency: Using "disaggregate instruction" to promote science literacy. International Journal of Science Education, 32(11), 1465–1493. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690903117921
- Brown, J. C., & Crippen, K. J. (2016). The knowledge and practices of high school science teachers in pursuit of cultural responsiveness. Science Education, 101(1), 99–133. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21250
- Brown, J. C., & Livstrom, I. C. (2020). Secondary science teachers' pedagogical design capacities for multicultural curriculum design. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(8), 821–840. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1756588

- Burgin, S. R., McConnell, W. J., & Flowers, A. M. (2015). 'I actually contributed to their research': The influence of an abbreviated summer apprenticeship program in science and engineering for diverse high-school learners. International Journal of Science Education, 37(3), 411–445. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2014.989292
- 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. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212458142
- Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2018). A longitudinal study of equity-oriented STEM-rich making among youth from historically marginalized communities. American Educational Research Journal, 55(4), 761–800. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218758668 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20413
- Carlone, H. B., Johnson, A., & Scott, C. M. (2015). Agency amidst formidable structures: How girls perform gender in science class. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 474–488. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21224
- Carrier, S. J., Thomson, M. M., Tugurian, L. P., & Stevenson, K. T. (2014). Elementary science education in classrooms and outdoors: Stakeholder views, gender, ethnicity, and testing. International Journal of Science Education, 36(13), 2195–2220. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2014.917342
- Chapman, A., & Feldman, A. (2017). Cultivation of science identity through authentic science in an urban high school classroom. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(2), 469–491. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-015-9723-3
- Chapman, A., Rodriguez, F. D., Pena, C., Hinojosa, E., Morales, L., Del Bosque, V., Tijerina, Y., & Tarawneh, C. (2019). "Nothing is impossible": Characteristics of Hispanic females participating in an informal STEM setting. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(3), 723–737. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09947-6
- Chappell, M. J., & Varelas, M. (2020). Ethnodance and identity: Black students representing science identities in the making. Science Education, 104(2), 193–221. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21558
- Charity Hudley, A. H., & Mallinson, C. (2017). "It's worth our time": A model of culturally and linguistically supportive professional development for K-12 STEM educators. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(3), 637–660. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9743-7
- Chen, J. L., & Mensah, F. M. (2018). Teaching contexts that influence elementary preservice teachers' teacher and science teacher identity development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(5), 420–439. http://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1469187 Chesnutt, K., Jones, M. G., Hite, R., Cayton, E., Ennes, M., Corin, E. N., & Childers, G. (2018). Next generation crosscutting themes: Factors that contribute to students' understandings of size and scale. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(6), 876–900. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21443
- Clark, S. K., Lott, K., Larese-Casanova, M., Taggart, A. M., & Judd, E. (2020). Leveraging integrated science and disciplinary literacy instruction to teach first graders to write like scientists and to explore their perceptions of scientists. Research in Science Education, 51(4), 1153–1175. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09927-9
- Collins, P. H. (2016). Intersectionality (Key Concepts) [Kindle Android version].
- Cone, N. (2012). The effects of community-based service learning on preservice teachers' beliefs about the characteristics of effective science teachers of diverse students. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23(8), 889–907. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-012-93050
- Cornell, S., & Hartmann, D. (2007). Ethnicity and race: Making identities in a changing world. Pine Forge Press.
- Covarrubias, A. (2011). Quantitative intersectionality: A critical race analysis of the Chicana/o educational pipeline. Journal of Latinos and Education, 10(2), 86–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2011.556519
- Crenshaw, K. W. (2016). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), Foundations of critical race theory in education (2nd ed., pp. 223–250). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017), Critical race theory: An introduction (3rd ed.), New York University Press.
- Deneroff, V. (2016). Professional development in person: Identity and the construction of teaching within a high school science department. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(2), 213–233. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-013-9546-z
- DeWitt, J., & Archer, L. (2015). Who aspires to a science career? A comparison of survey responses from primary and secondary school students. International Journal of Science Education, 37(13), 2170–2192. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1071899
- DeWitt, J., Archer, L., & Mau, A. (2016). Dimensions of science capital: Exploring its potential for understanding students' science participation. International Journal of Science Education, 38(16), 2431–2449. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1248520
- DeWitt, J., Archer, L., & Osborne, J. (2013). Nerdy, brainy and normal: Children's and parents' constructions of those who are highly engaged with science. Research in Science Education, 43(4), 1455–1476. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-012-9315-0
- DeWitt, J. , Archer, L. , & Osborne, J. (2014). Science-related aspirations across the primary-secondary divide: Evidence from two surveys in England. International Journal of Science Education, 36(10), 1609-1629. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.871659
- DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Archer, L., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2013). Young children's aspirations in science: The unequivocal, the uncertain and the unthinkable. International Journal of Science Education, 35(6), 1037–1063. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2011.608197
- Dickerson, D. L., Eckhoff, A., Stewart, C. O., Chappell, S., & Hathcock, S. (2014). The examination of a pullout STEM program for urban upper elementary students. Research in Science Education, 44(3), 483–506. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-013-9387-5 Dimick, A. S. (2012). Student empowerment in an environmental science classroom: Toward a framework for social justice science education. Science Education, 96(6), 990–1012. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21035
- Dixson, A. D. , Rousseau Anderson, C. K. , & Donner, J. K. (2016). Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song. Taylor & Francis.
- Donovan, B. M. (2014). Playing with fire? The impact of the hidden curriculum in school genetics on essen-tialist conceptions of race. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(4), 462–496. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21138
- Donovan, B. M. (2016). Framing the genetics curriculum for social justice: An experimental exploration of how the biology curriculum influences beliefs about racial difference. Science Education, 100(3), 586–616. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21221

- Donovan, B. M. (2017). Learned inequality: Racial labels in the biology curriculum can affect the development of racial prejudice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(3), 379–411. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21370
- Donovan, B. M., Semmens, R., Keck, P., Brimhall, E., Busch, K. C., Weindling, M., Duncan, A., Stuhlsatz, M., Bracey, Z. B., Bloom, M., Kowalski, S., & Salazar, B. (2019). Toward a more humane genetics education: Learning about the social and quantitative complexities of human genetic variation research could reduce racial bias in adolescent and adult populations. Science Education, 103(3), 529–560. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21506
- Donovan, B. M., Weindling, M., Salazar, B., Duncan, A., Stuhlsatz, M., & Keck, P. (2021). Genomics literacy matters: Supporting the development of genomics literacy through genetics education could reduce the prevalence of genetic essentialism. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(4), 520–550. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21670
- Dorph, R., Bathgate, M. E., Schunn, C. D., & Cannady, M. A. (2018). When I grow up: The relationship of science learning activation to STEM career preferences. International Journal of Science Education, 40(9), 1034–1057. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1360532
- Dupuis, J., & Abrams, E. (2017). Student science achievement and the integration of Indigenous knowledge on standardized tests. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(3), 581–604. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9728-6
- Elmesky, R., & Seiler, G. (2007). Movement expressiveness, solidarity and the (re)shaping of African American students' scientific identities. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2(1), 73–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-007-9050-4
- Feagin, J. R. (2020). The white racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter-framing (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Fenton, S. (2010). Ethnicity (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Ferguson, S. L., & Lezotte, S. M. (2020). Exploring the state of science stereotypes: Systematic review and meta-analysis of the Draw-A-Scientist Checklist. School Science and Mathematics, 120(1), 55–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12382
- Gallard Martínez, A. J., Pitts, W., Ramos de Robles, S. L., Milton Brkich, K. L., Flores Bustos, B., & Claeys, L. (2019). Discerning contextual complexities in STEM career pathways: Insights from successful Latinas. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(4), 1079–1103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-018-9900-2
- Gamez, R., & Parker, C. A. (2018). Becoming science learners: A study of newcomers' identity work in elementary school science. Science Education, 102(2), 377–413. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21323
- Ganchorre, A. R., & Tomanek, D. (2012). Commitment to teach in under-resourced schools: Prospective science and mathematics teachers' dispositions. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23(1), 87–110. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9263-y
- Gomes, M. de F. C., Mortimer, E. F., & Kelly, G. J. (2011). Contrasting stories of inclusion/exclusion in the chemistry classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 33(6), 747–772. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.506665
- Gonzalez-Howard, M., & Suarez, E. (2021). Retiring the term English language learners: Moving toward linguistic justice through asset-oriented framing. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(5), 749–752. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21684
- Greenleaf, C. L., Litman, C., Hanson, T. L., Rosen, R., Boscardin, C. K., Herman, J., Schneider, S. A., Madden, S., & Jones, B. (2011). Integrating literacy and science in biology: Teaching and learning impacts of reading apprenticeship professional development. American Educational Research Journal, 48(3), 647–717. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210384839
- Grimberg, B. I., & Gummer, E. (2013). Teaching science from cultural points of intersection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(1), 12–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21066
- Grimes, N. K. (2013). The nanny in the schoolhouse: The role of femme-Caribbean identity in attaining success in urban science classrooms. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 8(2), 333–353. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-012-9476-1
- Habig, B., Gupta, P., Levine, B., & Adams, J. (2020). An informal science education program's impact on STEM major and STEM career outcomes. Research in Science Education, 50(3), 1051–1074. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9722-y
- Harper, S. G. (2017). Engaging Karen refugee students in science learning through a cross-cultural learning community. International Journal of Science Education, 39(3), 358–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1283547
- Hernandez, C., & Shroyer, M. G. (2017). The use of culturally responsive teaching strategies among Latina/o student teaching interns during science and mathematics instruction of CLD students. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(4), 367–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1343605
- Holland, D., Lachiotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). Identity and agency in cultural worlds. Harvard University Press. Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2003). Theoretical frameworks for African American women. New Directions for Student Services, 104, 19–27. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.104
- Huerta, M., Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., & Irby, B. J. (2014). Developing and validating a science notebook rubric for fifth-grade non-mainstream students. International Journal of Science Education, 36(11), 1849–1870. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.879623.
- Hughes, R. M., Nzekwe, B., & Molyneaux, K. J. (2013). The single-sex debate for girls in science: A comparison between two informal science programs on middle school students' STEM identity formation. Research in Science Education, 43(5), 1979–2007. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-012-9345-7
- Hughes, R. M., Schellinger, J., & Roberts, K. (2021). The role of recognition in disciplinary identity for girls. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(3), 420–455. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21665
- Jackson, J. K., & Ash, G. (2012). Science achievement for all: Improving science performance and closing achievement gaps. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23(7), 723–744. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9238-z
- Kane, J. M. (2012). Young African American children constructing academic and disciplinary identities in an urban science classroom. Science Education, 96(3), 457–487. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20483
- Kang, H., Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., Simpkins, D., Rhee, H., & Turner, C. (2019). How do middle school girls of color develop STEM identities? Middle school girls' participation in science activities and identification with STEM careers. Science Education, 103(2), 418–439. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21492
- Kang, H., & Zinger, D. (2019). What do core practices offer in preparing novice science teachers for equitable instruction? Science Education, 103(4), 823–853. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21507
- Kang, R., Skinner, F., & Hyatt, C. (2018). An activity theory analysis of African American students' experiences in advanced placement science courses. School Science and Mathematics, 118(8), 358–369. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12305
- Kanter, D. E., & Konstantopoulos, S. (2010). The impact of a project-based science curriculum on minority student achievement, attitudes, and careers: The effects of teacher content and pedagogical content knowledge and inquiry-based practices. Science Education, 94(5), 855–887. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20391

- King, N. S., & Pringle, R. M. (2019). Black girls speak STEM: Counter stories of informal and formal learning experiences. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(5), 539–569. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21513
- Kivisto, P., & Croll, P. R. (2012). Race and ethnicity: The basics. Routledge.
- Lee, O., Llosa, L., Jiang, F., O'Connor, C., Haas, A. (2016). School resources in teaching science to diverse student groups: An intervention's effect on elementary teachers' perceptions. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(7), 769–794. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-016-9487-y
- Liou, P.-Y., Desjardins, C. D., & Lawrenz, F. (2010). Influence of scholarships on STEM teachers: Cluster analysis and characteristics. School Science and Mathematics, 110(3), 128–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2010.00016.x
- Liou, P.-Y., & Lawrenz, F. (2011). Optimizing teacher preparation loan forgiveness programs: Variables related to perceived influence. Science Education, 95(1), 121–144. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20409
- Lofgran, B. B., Smith, L. K., & Whiting, E. F. (2015). Science self-efficacy and school transitions: Elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school. School Science and Mathematics, 115(7), 366–376. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12139
- López, N., Erwin, C., Binder, M., & Chavez, M. J. (2018). Making the invisible visible: Advancing quantitative methods in higher education using critical race theory and intersectionality. Race Ethnicity and Education, 21(2), 180–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1375185
- Madkins, T. C., & McKinney de Royston, M. (2019). Illuminating political clarity in culturally relevant science instruction. Science Education, 103(6), 1319–1346. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21542
- Maerten-Rivera, J., Myers, N., Lee, O., & Penfield, R. (2010). Student and school predictors of high-stakes assessment in science. Science Education, 94(6), 937–962. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20408
- Maltese, A. V., & Tai, R. H. (2011). Pipeline persistence: Examining the association of educational experiences with earned degrees in STEM among U.S. students. Science Education, 95(5), 877–907. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20441
- Marco-Bujosa, L. M., Friedman, A. A., & Kramer, A. (2021). Learning to teach science in urban schools: Context as content. School Science and Mathematics, 121(1), 46–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12441
- Marco-Bujosa, L. M., McNeill, K. L., & Friedman, A. A. (2020). Becoming an urban science teacher: How beginning teachers negotiate contradictory school contexts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(1), 3–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21583 Mark, S. L. (2018). A bit of both science and economics: A non-traditional STEM identity narrative. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(4), 983–1003. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-017-9832-2
- Mark, S. L., Id-Deen, L., & Thomas, S. (2020). Getting to the root of the matter: Pre-service teachers' experiences and positionalities with learning to teach in culturally diverse contexts. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(2), 453–483. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09956-5
- Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence, C., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K. (1993). Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment. Westview.
- Matuk, C., Hurwich, T., Spiegel, A., & Diamond, J. (2021). How do teachers use comics to promote engagement, equity, and diversity in science classrooms? Research in Science Education, 51(3), 685–732. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9814-8 Mavuru, L., & Ramnarain, U. D. (2020). Language affordances and pedagogical challenges in multilingual grade 9 natural sciences classrooms in South Africa. International Journal of Science Education, 2472–2492. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1655177 McCollough, C., & Ramirez, O. (2012). Cultivating culture: Preparing future teachers for diversity through family science learning events. School Science and Mathematics, 112(7), 443–451. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2012.00158.x
- McNew-Birren, J., Hildebrand, T., & Belknap, G. (2018). Strange bedfellows in science teacher preparation: Conflicting perspectives on social justice presented in a Teach for America-university partnership. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(2), 437–462. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9791-z
- Means, B., Wang, H., Wei, X., Lynch, S., Peters, V., Young, V., & Allen, C. (2017). Expanding STEM opportunities through inclusive STEM-focused high schools. Science Education, 101(5), 681–715. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21281
- Mensah, F. M. (2011). The DESTIN: Preservice teachers' drawings of the ideal elementary science teacher. School Science and Mathematics, 111(8), 379–388. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2011.00103.x
- Mensah, F. M. (2019). Finding voice and passion: Critical race theory methodology in science teacher education. American Educational Research Journal, 56(4), 1412–1456. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218818093
- Mensah, F. M., Brown, J. C., Titu, P., Rozowa, P., Sivaraj, R., & Heydari, R. (2018). Preservice and inservice teachers' ideas of multiculturalism: Explorations across two science methods courses in two different contexts. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(2), 12–147. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1425820
- Mensah, F. M., & Jackson, I. (2018). Whiteness as property in science teacher education. Teachers College Record, 120(1), 1–38. www.tcrecord.org ID Number: 21958.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress (pp. 3–34). Jossey-Bass.
- Morales-Doyle, D. (2017). Justice-centered science pedagogy: A catalyst for academic achievement and social transformation. Science Education, 101(6), 1034–1060. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21305
- Moseley, C., & Taylor, B. (2011). Analysis of environmental and general science teaching efficacy among instructors with contrasting class ethnicity distributions: A four-dimensional assessment. School Science and Mathematics, 111(5), 199–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2011.00079.x
- Mutegi, J. W., Sorge, B., Fore, G. A., & Gibau, G. S. (2019). A tale of two camps: A mixed methods investigation into racially disparate outcomes in a nanotechnology research experience. Science Education, 103(6), 1456–1477. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21548
- Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. Social Problems, 41(1), 152–176. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3096847
- Nazar, C. R., Calabrese Barton, A., Morris, C., & Tan, E. (2019). Critically engaging engineering in place by localizing counternarratives in engineering design. Science Education, 103(3), 638–664. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21500
- Nehmeh, G., & Kelly, A. M. (2018). Urban science teachers in isolation: Challenges, resilience, and adaptive action. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(6), 527–549. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1474425
- Noble, T., Suarez, C., Rosebery, A., O'Connor, M. C., Warren, B., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2012). "I never thought of it as freezing": How students answer questions on large-scale science tests and what they know about science. Journal of Research in Science

- Teaching, 49(6), 778–803. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21026
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21070
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Parker, C. (2014). Multiple influences: Latinas, middle school science, and school. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 9(2), 317–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9573-4
- Parker, C., Grigg, J., D'Souza, S., Mitchell, C., & Smith, E. (2020). Informed aspirations in science and engineering with upper elementary students after 1 year of a STEM intensive university-school district partnership. School Science and Mathematics, 120(6), 364–374. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12428
- Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. Qualitative Inquiry, 8(1), 7–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040200800102
- Parsons, E. C. (2014). Unpacking and critically synthesizing the literature on race and ethnicity in science education. In N. G.
- Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 167–186). Taylor & Francis.
- Parsons, E. C., & Bayne, G. U. (2012). Conceptualizations of context in science education research: Implications for equity. 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. 153–172). Springer.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 499–514. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.499
- Pitts, W. (2011). Potentialities beyond deficit perspectives: Globalization, culture and urban science education in the Bronx. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6(1), 89–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-010-9301-7
- Pringle, R. M., Brkich, K. M., Adams, T. L., West-Olatunii, C., & Archer-Banks, D. A. (2012). Factors influencing elementary teachers' positioning of African American girls as science and mathematics learners. School Science and Mathematics, 112(4), 217–229. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2012.00137.x
- 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(4), 367–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-012-9280-5
- Quinn, D. M., & Cooc, N. (2015). Science achievement gaps by gender and race/ethnicity in elementary and middle school: Trends and predictors. Educational Researcher, 44(6), 336–346. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X15598539
- Quintana, S. M. (1998). Children's developmental understanding of ethnicity and race. Applied & Preventative Psychology, 7, 27–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(98)80020-6
- Ramirez, O., McCollough, C. A., & Diaz, Z. (2016). Creating a model of acceptance: Preservice teachers interact with non-English-speaking Latino parents using culturally relevant mathematics and science activities at family learning events. School Science and Mathematics, 116(1), 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12150
- Ramnarain, U. D. (2011). Equity in science at South African schools: A pious platitude or an achievable goal? International Journal of Science Education, 33(10), 1353–1371. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.510855
- Ramnarain, U. D. , & de Beer, J. (2013). Science students creating hybrid spaces when engaging in an expo investigation project. Research in Science Education, 43(1), 99-116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-011-9246-1
- Rawson, C. H., & McCool, M. A. (2014). Just like all the other humans? Analyzing images of scientists in children's trade books. School Science and Mathematics, 114(1), 10–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12046Richardson
- Bruna, K. (2010). Mexican immigrant transnational social capital and class transformation: Examining the role of peer mediation in insurgent science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5(2), 383–422. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-009-9232-3
- Ridgeway, M. L., & Yerrick, R. K. (2018). Whose banner are we waving? Exploring STEM partnerships for marginalized urban youth. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(1), 59–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9773-1
- 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(3), 458–476. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20431
- Rivera Maulucci, M. S. (2010). Navigating role forces and the aesthetic|authentic caring dialectic: A novice urban science teacher's developmental trajectory. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5(3), 625–647. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-009-9221-6
- Rivera Maulucci, M. S. (2011). Language experience narratives and the role of autobiographical reasoning in becoming an urban science teacher. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6(2), 413–434. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-011-9323-9
- Rivera Maulucci, M. S. (2013). Emotions and positional identity in becoming a social justice science teacher: Nicole's story. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(4), 453–478. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21081Rivera
- Maulucci, M. S., & Mensah, F. M. (2015). Naming ourselves and others. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21196
- Ryu, M. (2013). "But at school ... I became a bit shy": Korean immigrant adolescents' discursive participation in science classrooms. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 8(3), 649–671. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-012-9406-2
- Ryu, M. (2015). Understanding Korean transnational girls in high school science classes: Beyond the model minority stereotype. Science Education, 99(2), 350–377. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21142
- Ryu, M. (2019). Mixing languages for science learning and participation: An examination of Korean-English bilingual learners in an after-school science learning programme. International Journal of Science Education, 41(10), 1303–1323. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1605229
- Ryu, M., & Sikorski, T. R. (2019). Tracking a learner's verbal participation in science over time: Analysis of talk features within a social context. Science Education, 103(3), 561–589. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21493Schindel
- Dimick, A. (2016). Exploring the potential and complexity of a critical pedagogy of place in urban science education. Science Education, 100(5), 814–836. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21233
- Scogin, S. C., Cavlazoglu, B., LeBlanc, J., & Stuessy, C. L. (2018). Inspiring science achievement: A mixed methods examination of the practices and characteristics of successful science programs in diverse high schools. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(3), 649–670. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9796-7
- Sedawi, W., Ben Zvi Assaraf, O., & Reiss, M. J. (2020). Indigenous children's connectedness to nature: The potential influence of culture, gender and exposure to a contaminated environment. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(4), 955–989. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-020-09982-8

- Seiler, G. (2011). Becoming a science teacher: Moving toward creolized science and an ethic of cosmopolitanism. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6(1), 13–32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-009-9240-3
- Settlage, J. (2011). Counter stories from white mainstream preservice teachers: Resisting the master narrative of deficit by default. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6(4), 803–836. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-011-9324-8
- Shady, A. (2014). Negotiating cultural differences in urban science education: An overview of teacher's first-hand experience reflection of cogen journey. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 9(1), 31–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-013-9486-7
- Sharma, R. A., & Honan, E. (2020). Fijian pre-service teachers' ideas about science and scientists. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(3), 335–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1706904
- Shaw, J. M., Lyon, E. G., Stoddart, T., Mosqueda, E., & Menon, P. (2014). Improving science and literacy learning for English language learners: Evidence from a pre-service teacher preparation intervention. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(5), 621–643. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-013-9376-6
- Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (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. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.1.16 Snodgrass Rangel, V., Vaval, L., & Bowers, A. (2020). Investigating underrepresented and first-generation college students' science and math motivational beliefs: A nationally representative study using latent profile analysis. Science Education, 104(6), 1041–1070. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21593
- Solórzano, D. G., & Huber, L. P. (2020). Racial microaggressions: Using critical race theory to respond to everyday racism. Teachers College Press.
- Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. Journal of Negro Education, 69(1–2), 60–73. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2696265 Solórzano, D. G., Villalpando, O., & Oseguera, L. (2005). Educational inequities and Latina/o undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4(3), 272–293. http://doi.org/10.1177/1538192705276550
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002a). A critical race counterstory of race, racism, and affirmative action. Equity & Excellence in Education, 35(2), 155–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/713845284
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002b). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. Qualitative Inquiry, 8(1), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040200800103
- Sondergeld, T. A., Provinzano, K., & Johnson, C. C. (2020). Investigating the impact of an urban community school effort on middle school STEM-related student outcomes over time through propensity score matched methods. School Science and Mathematics, 120(2), 90–103. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12387
- Southerland, S., Gallard, A., & Callihan, L. (2011). Examining teachers' hurdles to "science for all". International Journal of Science Education, 33(16), 2183–2213. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.530698
- Sparks, D. M. (2018). The process of becoming: Identity development of African American female science and mathematics preservice teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(3), 243–261. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1436359 Sparks, D. M. , & Pole, K. (2019). "Do we teach subjects or students?" Analyzing science and mathematics teacher conversations about issues of equity in the classroom. School Science and Mathematics, 119(7), 405–416. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12361 Sprague Martinez, L. , Bowers, E. , Reich, A. J. , Ndulue, U. J. , Le, A. A. , & Peréa, F. C. (2016). Engaging youth of color in applied science education and public health promotion. International Journal of Science Education, 38(4), 688–699. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1134850
- Stevenson, A. D., Gallard Martínez, A. J., Brkich, K. L., Flores, B. B., Claeys, L., & Pitts, W. (2019). Latinas' heritage language as a source of resiliency: Impact on academic achievement in STEM fields. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9789-6
- Subramaniam, K. (2013). Minority preservice teachers' conceptions of teaching science: Sources of science teaching strategies. Research in Science Education, 43(2), 687–709. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-012-9284-3
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. American Psychologist, 62(4), 271–286. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271
- Suriel, R. L., & Atwater, M. M. (2012). From the contribution to the action approach: White teachers' experiences influencing the development of multicultural science curricula. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(10), 1271–1295. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21057
- Swanson, L. H., Bianchini, J. A., & Lee, J. S. (2014). Engaging in argument and communicating information: A case study of English language learners and their science teacher in an urban high school. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(1), 31–64. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21124
- Swartz, D. (1997). Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. University of Chicago Press.
- Tan, E., Calabrese Barton, A., Kang, H., & O'Neill, T. (2013). Desiring a career in STEM-related fields: How middle school girls articulate and negotiate identities-in-practice in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(10), 1143–1179. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21123
- Taylor, J. A., Getty, S. R., Kowalski, S. M., Wilson, C. D., Carlson, J., & Van Scotter, P. (2015). An efficacy trial of research-based curriculum materials with curriculum-based professional development. American Educational Research Journal, 52(5), 984–1017. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831215585962
- Teo, T. W. (2015). Inside versus outside the science classroom: Examining the positionality of two female science teachers at the boundaries of science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10(2), 381–402. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9581-4 Terzian, S. G., & Rury, J. L. (2014). "A highly selected strain of guinea pigs": The Westinghouse science talent search and educational meritocracy, 1942–1958. Teachers College Record, 116(5), 1–33.
- Titu, P., Ring-Whalen, E. A., Brown, J. C., & Roehrig, G. H. (2018). Exploring changes in science teachers' attitudes toward culturally diverse students during an equity-focused course. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(5), 378–396. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1461006
- Tobin, K. (2009). Sociocultural perspectives on science and science education [keynote address]. 8th International Congress on Science Teaching and Learning, Barcelona, Spain.
- Tolbert, S., & Knox, C. (2016). "They might know a lot of things that I don't know": Investigating differences in preservice teachers' ideas about contextualizing science instruction in multilingual classrooms. International Journal of Science Education, 38(7),

1133–1149. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1183266

Tong, F., Irby, B. J., Lara-Alecio, R., Guerrero, C., Fan, Y., & Huerta, M. (2014). A randomized study of a literacy-integrated science intervention for low-socio-economic status middle school students: Findings from first-year implementation. International Journal of Science Education, 36(12), 2083–2109. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2014.883107

Underwood, J. B., & Mensah, F. M. (2018). An investigation of science teacher educators' perceptions of culturally relevant pedagogy. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(1), 46–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1423457

Upadhyay, B., Maruyama, G., & Albrecht, N. (2017). Taking an active stance: How urban elementary students connect sociocultural experiences in learning science. International Journal of Science Education, 39(18), 2528–2547. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1392645

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. http://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20447

Varelas, M., Tucker-Raymond, E., & Richards, K. (2015). A structure-agency perspective on young children's engagement in school science: Carlos's performance and narrative. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 516–529. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21211

Vincent-Ruz, P., & Schunn, C. D. (2021). Identity complexes and science identity in early secondary: Mono-topical or in combination with other topical identities. Research in Science Education, 51(Suppl1), S369–S390. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-09882-0 Visintainer, T. (2020). "I think at first glance people would not expect me to be interested in science": Exploring the racialized science experiences of high school students of color. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(3), 393–422. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21597

Wallace, C. S. (2013). Promoting shifts in preservice science teachers' thinking through teaching and action research in informal science settings. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24(5), 811–832. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-013-9337-0

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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-012-9380-8

Walls, L. (2016). Awakening a dialogue: A critical race theory analysis of U. S. nature of science research from 1967 to 2013. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(10), 1546–1570. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21266

Warmington, P. (2009). Taking race out of scare quotes: Race-conscious social analysis in an ostensibly post-racial world. Race Ethnicity & Education, 12(3), 281–296. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320903178253

Wee, B. (2012). A cross-cultural exploration of children's everyday ideas: Implications for science teaching and learning. International Journal of Science Education, 34(4), 609–627. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2011.579193

Weiland, I. (2015). An exploration of Hispanic mothers' culturally sustaining experiences at an informal science center. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(1), 84–106. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21190

Weis, L., Eisenhart, M., Cipollone, K., Stich, A. E., Nikischer, A. B., Hanson, J., Ohle Leibrandt, S., Allen, C. D., & Dominguez, R. (2015). In the guise of STEM education reform: Opportunity structures and outcomes in inclusive STEM-focused high schools. American Educational Research Journal, 52(6), 1024–1059. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831215604045

Wild, A. (2015). Relationships between high school chemistry students' perceptions of a constructivist learning environment and their STEM career expectations. International Journal of Science Education, 37(14), 2284–2305. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1076951

Wing, A. K. (1997). Critical race feminism: A reader. New York University Press.

Wong, B. (2012). Identifying with science: A case study of two 13-year-old "high achieving working class" British Asian girls. International Journal of Science Education, 34(1), 43–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.551671

Wong, B. (2015). Careers "from" but not "in" science: Why are aspirations to be a scientist challenging for minority ethnic students? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(7), 979–1002. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21231

Xu, J., Coats, L. T., & Davidson, M. L. (2012). Promoting student interest in science: The perspectives of exemplary African American teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 49(1), 124–154. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211426200

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(4), 915–939. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-011-9350-6

Yoon, J., & Martin, L. A. (2019). Infusing culturally responsive science curriculum into early childhood teacher preparation. Research in Science Education, 49(3), 697–710. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9647-x

You, H. S., Park, S., & Delgado, C. (2021). A closer look at US schools: What characteristics are associated with scientific literacy? A multivariate multilevel analysis using PISA 2015. Science Education, 105(2), 406–437. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21609

You, H. S., Park, S., Marshall, J. A., & Delgado, C. (2022). Interdisciplinary science assessment of carbon cycling: Construct validity evidence based on internal structure. Research in Science Education, 52(2), 473–492. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09943-9 Zamudio, M., Russell, C., Rios, F., & Bridgeman, J. L. (2010). Critical race theory matters: Education and ideology. Taylor & Francis. Zapata, M. (2013). Substantiating the need to apply a sociocultural lens to the preparation of teachers in an effort to achieve science reform. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 8(4), 777–801. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-013-9513-8

Zhang, L., & Barnett, M. (2015). How high school students envision their STEM career pathways. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10(3), 637–656. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-013-9557-9

Zirkel, S., & Pollack, T. M. (2016). "Just let the worst students go": A critical case analysis of public discourse about race, merit, and worth. American Educational Research Journal, 53(6), 1522–1555. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216676568

Gender Matters

Almukhambetova, A., & Kuzhabekova, A. (2021). Negotiating conflicting discourses. Female students' experiences in STEM majors in an international university in Central Asia. International Journal of Science Education, 1–24.

Andersson, S., & Johansson, A. (2016). Gender gap or program gap? Students' negotiations of study practice in a course in electromagnetism. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020112.

Archer, L., Dawson, E., Seakins, A., DeWitt, J., Godec, S., & Whitby, C. (2016). "I'm being a man here": Urban boys' performances of masculinity and engagement with science during a science museum visit. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 25(3), 438–485.

- Archer, L., DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2012a). "Balancing acts": Elementary school girls' negotiations of femininity, achievement, and science. Science Education, 96(6), 967–989.
- Archer, L., DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2012b). Science aspirations, capital, and family habitus how families shape children's engagement and identification with science. American Educational Research Journal, 49(5), 881–908.
- Archer, L., DeWitt, J., & Willis, B. (2014). Adolescent boys' science aspirations: Masculinity, capital, and power. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(1), 1–30.
- Archer, L., Moote, J., Francis, B., DeWitt, J., & Yeomans, L. (2017). The "exceptional" physics girl: A sociological analysis of multimethod data from young women aged 10–16 to explore gendered patterns of post-16 participation. American Educational Research Journal, 54(1), 88–126. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216678379
- Archer, L., Moote, J., & MacLeod, E. (2020a). Learning that physics is "not for me": Pedagogic work and the cultivation of habitus among advanced level physics students. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 1–38.
- Archer, L., Moote, J., & MacLeod, E. (2020b). Lighting the Fuse: Cultivating the masculine physics habitus A case study of victor aged 10–18. In Physics Education and Gender (pp. 29–51). Springer.
- Archer, S. M., & Kohler, A. (2020). Feminist science studies. Companion to Feminist Studies, 247–263.
- Avraamidou, L. (2020). "I am a young immigrant woman doing physics and on top of that I am Muslim": Identities, intersections, and negotiations. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(3), 311–341.
- Avraamidou, L. (2021). Identities in/out of physics and the politics of recognition. Journal of Research in Science Teaching (online first).
- Aycock, L. M., Hazari, Z., Brewe, E., Clancy, K. B., Hodapp, T., & Goertzen, R. M. (2019). Sexual harassment reported by undergraduate female physicists. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 15(1), 010121.
- Bacchi, C. (2012). Introducing the "what's the problem represented to be?" approach. In Engaging with Carol Bacchi: Strategic interventions and exchanges (pp. 21–24). The University of Adelaide Press.
- Bang, M., & Marin, A. (2015). Nature Culture constructs in science learning: Human/non-human agency and intentionality. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 530–544.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28(3), 801–831.
- Barad, K. (2007). Meeting the universe halfways. Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. Duke University Press.
- Barthelemy, R. S. (2020). LGBT+ physicists qualitative experiences of exclusionary behavior and harassment. European Journal of Physics, 41(6), 065703.
- Barthelemy, R. S., McCormick, M., & Henderson, C. (2016). Gender discrimination in physics and astronomy: Graduate student experiences of sexism and gender microaggressions. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020119.
- Bazzul, J., & Sykes, H. (2011). The secret identity of a biology textbook: Straight and naturally sexed. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6(2), 265–286.
- Berg, A.-J., & Lie, M. (1995). Feminism and constructivism: Do artifacts have gender? Science, Technology, & Human Values, 20(3), 332–351.
- Brickhouse, N. W., & Potter, J. T. (2001). Young women's scientific identity formation in an urban context. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 965–980.
- Butler, J. (1993). Critically queer. GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 1(1), 17-32.
- Butler, J. (1999). Gender Trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity. Routledge.
- Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2009). Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 46(1), 50–73.
- Carli, L. L., Alawa, L., Lee, Y., Zhao, B., & Kim, E. (2016). Stereotypes about gender and science: Women ≠ scientists. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40(2), 244–260.
- 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(8), 1187–1218.
- Carlone, H. B., Johnson, A., & Scott, C. M. (2015). Agency amidst formidable structures: How girls perform gender in science class. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 474–488.
- Carlone, H. B., Webb, A. W., Archer, L., & Taylor, M. (2015). What kind of boy does science? A critical perspective on the science trajectories of four scientifically talented boys. Science Education, 99(3), 438–464. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21155
- Carter, D. F., Dueñas, J. E. R., & Mendoza, R. (2019). Critical examination of the role of STEM in propagating and maintaining race and gender disparities. Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, 39–97.
- Castro, A. R., & Collins, C. S. (2021). Asian American women in STEM in the lab with "White men named John". Science Education, 105(1), 33–61.
- Charleston, L., Adserias, R. P., Lang, N. M., & Jackson, J. F. (2014). Intersectionality and STEM: The role of race and gender in the academic pursuits of African American women in STEM. Journal of Progressive Policy & Practice, 2(3), 273–293.
- Cheryan, S., Ziegler, S. A., Montoya, A. K., & Jiang, L. (2017). Why are some STEM fields more gender balanced than others? Psychological Bulletin, 143(1), 1.
- Clance, P. R., & Imes, S. A. (1978). The imposter phenomenon in high achieving women: Dynamics and therapeutic intervention. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 15(3), 241.
- Clancy, K. B., Lee, K. M., Rodgers, E. M., & Richey, C. (2017). Double jeopardy in astronomy and planetary science: Women of color face greater risks of gendered and racial harassment. Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 122(7), 1610–1623. Connell, R. W. (2005). Masculinities. Polity.
- Connell, R. W. (2013). Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cooper, K. M., Brownell, S. E., & Gormally, C. (2019). Coming out to the class: Identifying factors that influence college biology instructor decisions about revealing their LGBQ identities in class. Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 25(3).
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimi-nation doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 139.

- Curran, F. C., & Kellogg, A. T. (2016). Understanding science achievement gaps by race/ethnicity and gender in kindergarten and first grade. Educational Researcher, 45(5), 273–282. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x16656611
- Danielsson, A., King, H., Godec, S., & Nyström, A.-S. (accepted). The identity turn in science education research: A review of a consolidating field. Accepted for publication in Cultural Studies in Science Education.
- Dawson, E., Archer, L., Seakins, A., Godec, S., DeWitt, J., King, H., Mau, A., & Nomikou, E. (2019). Selfies at the science museum: Exploring girls' identity performances in a science learning space. Gender and Education, 1–18.
- Day, J., Stang, J. B., Holmes, N., Kumar, D., & Bonn, D. (2016). Gender gaps and gendered action in a first-year physics laboratory. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020104.
- Deemer, E. D., Thoman, D. B., Chase, J. P., & Smith, J. L. (2014). Feeling the threat: Stereotype threat as a contextual barrier to women's science career choice intentions. Journal of Career Development, 41(2), 141–158.
- Eaton, A. A., Saunders, J. F., Jacobson, R. K., & West, K. (2020). How gender and race stereotypes impact the advancement of scholars in STEM: Professors' biased evaluations of physics and biology post-doctoral candidates. Sex Roles, 82(3), 127–141.
- Eddy, S. L., Brownell, S. E., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Gender gaps in achievement and participation in multiple introductory biology classrooms. CBE Life Sciences Education, 13(3), 478–492.
- Eliasson, N., Karlsson, K. G., & Sørensen, H. (2017). The role of questions in the science classroom How girls and boys respond to teachers' questions. International Journal of Science Education, 39(4), 433–452.
- Eliasson, N., Sørensen, H., & Karlsson, K. G. (2016). Teacher student interaction in contemporary science classrooms: Is participation still a question of gender? International Journal of Science Education, 38(10), 1655–1672.
- Fox, C. W., & Paine, C. T. (2019). Gender differences in peer review outcomes and manuscript impact at six journals of ecology and evolution. Ecology and Evolution, 9(6), 3599–3619.
- Francis, B., Archer, L., Moote, J., DeWitt, J., MacLeod, E., & Yeomans, L. (2017). The construction of physics as a quintessentially masculine subject: Young people's perceptions of gender issues in access to physics. Sex Roles, 76(3), 156–174. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0669-z
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. Review of Research in Education, 99–125.
- Godec, S. (2018). Sciencey girls: Discourses supporting working-class girls to identify with science. Education Sciences, 8(1), 19.
- Godec, S. (2020). Home, school and the museum: Shifting gender performances and engagement with science. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 41(2), 147–159.
- Godec, S., Patel, U., Archer, L., & Dawson, E. (2020). Young peoples' tech identity performances: Why materiality matters. International Journal of STEM Education, 7(1), 1–12.
- Gok, T. (2014). Peer instruction in the physics classroom: Effects on gender difference performance, conceptual learning, and problem solving. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 13(6), 776.
- Gonsalves, A. J. (2014). "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, 2(9), 503–521.
- Gonsalves, A. J. (2020). Constructing inside-ness to physics: How matter comes to matter in physics identity work. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(4), 911–921.
- Gonsalves, A. J., & Danielsson, A. (2020). Physics education and gender: Identity as an analytic lens for research. Springer.
- Gonsalves, A. J., Danielsson, A., & Pettersson, H. (2016). Masculinities and experimental practices in physics: The view from three case studies. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020120.
- Götschel, H. (2019). Teaching queering physics: An agenda for research and practice. In STEM of desire (pp. 125–145). Brill Sense. Graves, A. L., Hoshino-Browne, E., & Lui, K. P. (2017). Swimming against the tide: Gender bias in the physics classroom. Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 23(1).
- Grunspan, D. Z., Eddy, S. L., Brownell, S. E., Wiggins, B. L., Crowe, A. J., & Goodreau, S. M. (2016). Males under-estimate academic performance of their female peers in undergraduate biology classrooms. PLoS ONE, 11(2), e0148405.
- Gunckel, K. L. (2019a). Repairing elementary school science. Theory Into Practice, 58(1), 71–79.
- Gunckel, K. L. (2019b). What does queer theory have to do with teaching science in elementary schools? In STEM of desire (pp. 147–159). Brill Sense.
- Günther-Hanssen, A. (2020). A swing and a child: How scientific phenomena can come to matter for preschool children's emergent science identities. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(4), 885–910.
- Günther-Hanssen, A., Danielsson, A. T., & Andersson, K. (2020). How does gendering matter in preschool science: Emergent science, 'neutral'environments and gendering processes in preschool. Gender and Education, 32(5), 608–625.
- Harding, S. (1986). The science question in feminism. Open University Press.
- Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives. Cornell University Press.
- Hasse, C. (2002). Gender diversity in play with physics: The problem of premises for participation in activities. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 9(4), 250–269.
- Hasse, C. (2015). The material co-construction of hard science fiction and physics. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10(4), 921–940.
- Hazari, Z., Brewe, E., Goertzen, R. M., & Hodapp, T. (2017). The importance of high school physics teachers for female students' physics identity and persistence. The Physics Teacher, 55(2), 96–99.
- Henderson, R., Sawtelle, V., & Nissen, J. M. (2020). Gender & self-efficacy: A call to physics educators. The Physics Teacher, 58(5), 345–348.
- Henderson, R., Stewart, G., Stewart, J., Michaluk, L., & Traxler, A. (2017). Exploring the gender gap in the conceptual survey of electricity and magnetism. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 13(2), 020114.
- Hofer, S. I. (2015). Studying gender bias in physics grading: The role of teaching experience and country. International Journal of Science Education, 37(17), 2879–2905. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1114190
- Holland, D., Lachicotte Jr, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (2001). Identity and agency in cultural worlds. Harvard University Press.
- Ivie, R., White, S., & Chu, R. Y. (2016). Women's and men's career choices in astronomy and astrophysics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020109.
- Jacobs, J. E. (2005). Twenty-five years of research on gender and ethnic differences in math and science career choices: What have we learned? New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2005(110), 85–94.

- Johansson, A. (2018). Negotiating intelligence, nerdiness, and status in physics master's studies. Research in Science Education, 1–22.
- Johansson, A., & Berge, M. (2020). Lecture Jokes: Mocking and reproducing celebrated subject positions in physics. In Physics education and gender (pp. 97–113). Springer.
- Kalender, Z. Y., Marshman, E., Schunn, C. D., Nokes-Malach, T. J., & Singh, C. (2019). Gendered patterns in the construction of physics identity from motivational factors. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 15(2), 020119.
- Kalender, Z. Y., Marshman, E., Schunn, C. D., Nokes-Malach, T. J., & Singh, C. (2020). Damage caused by women's lower self-efficacy on physics learning. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 16(1), 010118.
- Kang, J., Hense, J., Scheersoi, A., & Keinonen, T. (2019). Gender study on the relationships between science interest and future career perspectives. International Journal of Science Education, 41(1), 80–101.
- Kanny, M. A., Sax, L. J., & Riggers-Piehl, T. A. (2014). Investigating forty years of STEM research: How explanations for the gender gap have evolved over time. Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 20(2).
- Keller, E. F. (1982). Feminism and science. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 7(3), 589-602.
- Keller, E. F. (1987). On the need to count past two in our thinking about gender and science. New Ideas in Psychology, 5(2), 275–287. Kelly, A. M. (2016). Social cognitive perspective of gender disparities in undergraduate physics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020116.
- Kim, A. Y., Sinatra, G. M., & Seyranian, V. (2018). Developing a STEM identity among young women: A social identity perspective. Review of Educational Research, 88(4), 589–625.
- Knaier, M. L. (2019). What makes girls and boys so desirable?: STEM education beyond gender binaries. In STEM of desire (pp. 209–221). Brill Sense.
- Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 3(3), 149–164.
- Leslie, S.-J., Cimpian, A., Meyer, M., & Freeland, E. (2015). Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines. Science, 347(6219), 262–265.
- Letts, W. (2001). When science is strangely alluring: Interrogating the masculinist and heteronormative nature of primary school science. Gender and Education, 13(3), 261–274.
- Letts, W., & Fifield, S. (2019). STEM of desire: Queer theories and science education. Brill| Sense.
- Levine, M., Serio, N., Radaram, B., Chaudhuri, S., & Talbert, W. (2015). Addressing the STEM gender gap by designing and implementing an educational outreach chemistry camp for middle school girls. Journal of Chemical Education, 92(10), 1639–1644.
- Lock, R. M., & Hazari, Z. (2016). Discussing underrepresentation as a means to facilitating female students' physics identity development. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020101.
- Makarova, E., Aeschlimann, B., & Herzog, W. (2019). The gender gap in STEM fields: The impact of the gender stereotype of math and science on secondary students' career aspirations. Frontiers in Education, 4, Article 60.
- Maries, A., Karim, N. I., & Singh, C. (2018). Is agreeing with a gender stereotype correlated with the performance of female students in introductory physics? Physical Review Physics Education Research, 14(2), 020119.
- Mark, S. L. (2018). A bit of both science and economics: A non-traditional STEM identity narrative. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(4), 983–1003.
- Marshman, E. M., Kalender, Z. Y., Nokes-Malach, T., Schunn, C., & Singh, C. (2018). Female students with A's have similar physics self-efficacy as male students with C's in introductory courses: A cause for alarm? Physical Review Physics Education Research, 14(2), 020123.
- Mattsson, T. (2015). "Good girls": Emphasised femininity as cloning culture in academia. Gender and Education, 27(6), 685–699. Mensah, F. M. (2019). Finding voice and passion: Critical race theory methodology in science teacher education. American Educational Research Journal, 56(4), 1412–1456.
- Meyer, M., Cimpian, A., & Leslie, S.-J. (2015). Women are underrepresented in fields where success is believed to require brilliance. Frontiers in Psychology, 6, 235.
- Miller, D. I., Eagly, A. H., & Linn, M. C. (2015). Women's representation in science predicts national gender-science stereotypes: Evidence from 66 nations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 107(3), 631.
- Miller, D. I., & Halpern, D. F. (2014). The new science of cognitive sex differences. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18(1), 37–45. Mim, S. A. (2020). Masculinity of science: Unveiling gendered challenges of female science teachers in Bangladesh. Gender and Education, 1–16.
- Moshfeghyeganeh, S., & Hazari, Z. (2021). Effect of culture on women physicists' career choice: A comparison of Muslim majority countries and the West. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 17(1), 010114.
- Nehmeh, G., & Kelly, A. M. (2020). Facilitating the self-determination of undergraduate women in physics: The role of external validation. Research in Science & Technological Education, 1–22.
- Nissen, J. M. (2019). Gender differences in self-efficacy states in high school physics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 15(1), 013102.
- Nissen, J. M., & Shemwell, J. T. (2016). Gender, experience, and self-efficacy in introductory physics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020105.
- Ong, M., Smith, J. M., & Ko, L. T. (2018). Counterspaces for women of color in STEM higher education: Marginal and central spaces for persistence and success. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(2), 206–245.
- Orlander, A. A. (2016). "So, what do men and women want? Is it any different from what animals want?" Sex education in an upper secondary school. Research in Science Education, 46(6), 811–829.
- Orlander, A. A. (2020). When "scary" science "just feels wrong": How the facts in a masculine fact-based debate couldn't stop science students' feminine feelings. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(1), 265–285.
- Ottemo, A., Gonsalves, A. J., & Danielsson, A. T. (2021). (Dis) embodied masculinity and the meaning of (non) style in physics and computer engineering education. Gender and Education, 1–16.
- Potvin, G., & Hazari, Z. (2016). Student evaluations of physics teachers: On the stability and persistence of gender bias. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020107.
- Potvin, G. , Hazari, Z. , Tai, R. H. , & Sadler, P. M. (2009). Unraveling bias from student evaluations of their high school science teachers. Science Education, 93(5), 827-845.

Quinn, D. M., & Cooc, N. (2015). Science achievement gaps by gender and race/ethnicity in elementary and middle school: Trends and predictors. Educational Researcher, 44(6), 336–346. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x15598539

Ramsey, L. R. (2017). Agentic traits are associated with success in science more than communal traits. Personality and Individual Differences, 106, 6–9.

Reddy, L. (2017). Gender differences in attitudes to learning science in grade 7. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 21(1), 26–36.

Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2015). Sex differences in mathematics and science achievement: A meta-analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress assessments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 107(3), 645.

Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2019). Investigating gender differences in mathematics and science: Results from the 2011 Trends in Mathematics and Science Survey. Research in Science Education, 49(1), 25–50.

Reiss, M. J. (1998). The representation of human sexuality in some science textbooks for 14–16 year olds. Research in Science & Technological Education, 16(2), 137–149.

Reiss, M. J. (2019). Thinking like a fox: Queering the science classroom when teaching about sex and sexuality. In STEM of desire (pp. 255–267). Brill Sense.

Reuben, E., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2014). How stereotypes impair women's careers in science. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(12), 4403–4408.

Ringrose, J., & Renold, E. (2010). Normative cruelties and gender deviants: The performative effects of bully discourses for girls and boys in school. British Educational Research Journal, 36(4), 573–596.

Rosa, K. (2018). Science identity possibilities: A look into Blackness, masculinities, and economic power relations. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(4), 1005–1013.

Rosa, K., & Mensah, F. M. (2016). Educational pathways of Black women physicists: Stories of experiencing and overcoming obstacles in life. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020113.

Rüschenpöhler, L., & Markic, S. (2020). Secondary school students' chemistry self-concepts: Gender and culture, and the impact of chemistry self-concept on learning behaviour. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 21(1), 209–219.

Sansone, D., & Carpenter, C. S. (2020). Turing's children: Representation of sexual minorities in STEM. PLoS ONE, 15(11), e0241596.

Scantlebury, K. (2014). Gender matters: Building on the past, recognizing the present, and looking towards the future. In N. Lederman & S. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 187–203). Routledge.

Scantlebury, K., & Baker, D. (2007). Gender issues in science education research: Remembering where the difference lies. Handbook of Research on Science Education, 1, 257–285.

Scantlebury, K., Danielsson, A. T., Hussénius, A., Gullberg, A., & Andersson, K. (2019). Using spacetimemattering to engage science education with matter and material feminism. In Material practice and materiality: Too long ignored in science education (pp. 39–50). Springer.

Schiebinger, L. (1991). The mind has no sex? Women in the origins of modern science. Harvard University Press.

Schiebinger, L. (2014). Gendered innovations: Harnessing the creative power of sex and gender analysis to discover new ideas and develop new technologies. Triple Helix, 1(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40604-014-0009-7

Schwab, K., Samans, R., Zahidi, S., Leopold, T. A., Ratcheva, V., Hausmann, R., & Tyson, L. D. (2017). The global gender gap report 2017. World Economic Forum.

Seyranian, V., Madva, A., Duong, N., Abramzon, N., Tibbetts, Y., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2018). The longitudinal effects of STEM identity and gender on flourishing and achievement in college physics. International Journal of STEM Education, 5(1), 1–14.

Simon, R. M., Wagner, A., & Killion, B. (2017). Gender and choosing a STEM major in college: Femininity, masculinity, chilly climate, and occupational values. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(3), 299–323.

Sjöström, J. (2019). Didactic modelling for socio-ecojustice. Journal for Activist Science and Technology Education, 10(1).

Skibba, R. (2019). Women in physics. Nature Reviews Physics, 1(5), 298-300.

Smith, J. L., Brown, E. R., Thoman, D. B., & Deemer, E. D. (2015). Losing its expected communal value: How stereotype threat undermines women's identity as research scientists. Social Psychology of Education, 18(3), 443–466.

Sue, D. W. (2010). Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact. John Wiley & Sons.

Taasoobshirazi, G., Puckett, C., & Marchand, G. (2019). Stereotype threat and gender differences in biology. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17(7), 1267–1282.

Taylor, C. A. (2013). Objects, bodies and space: Gender and embodied practices of mattering in the classroom. Gender and Education, 25(6), 688–703.

Tellhed, U., Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2017). Will I fit in and do well? The importance of social belongingness and self-efficacy for explaining gender differences in interest in STEM and HEED majors. Sex Roles, 77(1), 86–96.

Todd, B. L. , & Zvoch, K. (2019). The effect of an informal science intervention on middle school girls' science affinities. International Journal of Science Education, 41(1), 102-122.

Traweek, S. (1988). Beamtimes and lifetimes. The world of high energy physicists. Harvard University Press.

Traxler, A. L. , Cid, X. C. , Blue, J. , & Barthelemy, R. (2016). Enriching gender in physics education research: A binary past and a complex future. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020114.

Traxler, A. L., Henderson, R., Stewart, J., Stewart, G., Papak, A., & Lindell, R. (2018). Gender fairness within the force concept inventory. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 14(1), 010103.

Valla, J. M., & Ceci, S. J. (2014). Breadth-based models of women's underrepresentation in STEM fields: An integrative commentary on schmidt (2011) and Nye et al. (2012). Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9(2), 219–224. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614522067

Verdín, D., Godwin, A., & Benedict, B. (2020). Exploring first-year engineering students' innovation self-efficacy beliefs by gender and discipline. Journal of Civil Engineering Education, 146(4), 04020006.

Voyer, D., & Voyer, S. D. (2014). Gender differences in scholastic achievement: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 140(4), 1174.

Wade-Jaimes, K., & Schwartz, R. (2019). "I don't think it's science:" African American girls and the figured world of school science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(6), 679–706.

- Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. L. (2017). Gender gap in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM): Current knowledge, implications for practice, policy, and future directions. Educational Psychology Review, 29(1), 119–140. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9355-x
- Wang, M.-T., Eccles, J. S., & Kenny, S. (2013). Not lack of ability but more choice: Individual and gender differences in choice of careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Psychological Science, 24(5), 770–775.
- Whitten, B. L., Foster, S. R., Duncombe, M. L., Allen, P. E., Heron, P., McCullough, L., Shaw, K. A., Taylor, B. A. P., & Zorn, H. M. (2003). What works? Increasing the participation of women in undergraduate physics. Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 9 (3&4), 239–258.
- Witteman, H. O., Hendricks, M., Straus, S., & Tannenbaum, C. (2019). Are gender gaps due to evaluations of the applicant or the science? A natural experiment at a national funding agency. The Lancet, 393(10171), 531–540.
- Wulff, P., Hazari, Z., Petersen, S., & Neumann, K. (2018). Engaging young women in physics: An intervention to support young women's physics identity development. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 14(2), 020113.
- Yoder, J. B., & Mattheis, A. (2016). Queer in STEM: Workplace experiences reported in a national survey of LGBTQA individuals in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics careers. Journal of Homosexuality, 63(1), 1–27.

Multilingual Learners in Science Education

Adamuti-Trache, M., & Sweet, R. (2014). Science, technology, engineering and math readiness: Ethno-linguistic and gender differences in high-school course selection patterns. International Journal of Science Education, 36(4), 610–634.

Afitska, O., & Heaton, T. J. (2019). Mitigating the effect of language in the assessment of science: A study of English-language learners in primary classrooms in the United Kingdom. Science Education, 103(6), 1396–1422.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1989). Science for all Americans. Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Oxford University Press.

Amin, T., & Badreddine, D. (2020). Teaching science in Arabic: Diglossia and discourse patterns in the elementary classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2290–2330.

Bacon, C. K. (2020). "It's not really my job": A mixed methods framework for language ideologies, monolingualism, and teaching emergent bilingual learners. Journal of Teacher Education, 71(2), 172–187.

Barrett, N. E., & Liu, G. Z. (2016). Global trends and research aims for English academic oral presentations: Changes, challenges, and opportunities for learning technology. Review of Educational Research, 86(4), 1227–1271.

Bezemer, J., & Kress, G. (2015). Multimodality, learning and communication: A social semiotic frame. Routledge.

Block, N. C. (2020). Evaluating the efficacy of using sentence frames for learning new vocabulary in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(3), 454–478.

Bonello, C. (2020). Teaching science in multilingual contexts: An exploratory study into the experiences and insights of Maltese science teachers as they learn about teaching in multilingual scenarios. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2407–2425.

Bravo, M. A., Mosqueda, E., Solís, J. L., & Stoddart, T. (2014). Possibilities and limits of integrating science and diversity education in preservice elementary teacher preparation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(5), 601–619.

Britsch, S. (2020). "Nosotras no empezamos a hacer eso": A social semiotic view of a sheltered science investigation. TESOL Quarterly, 54(2), 310–347.

Buxton, C. A., Allexsaht-Snider, M., Kayumova, S., Aghasaleh, R., Choi, Y. J., & Cohen, A. (2015). Teacher agency and professional learning: Rethinking fidelity of implementation as multiplicities of enactment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 489–502.

Buxton, C. A., & Caswell, L. (2020). Next generation sheltered instruction to support multilingual learners in secondary science classrooms. Science Education, 104(3), 555–580.

Buxton, C. A., Harper, S., Payne, D., & Allexsaht-Snider, M. (2017). Using the sociology of associations to rethink STEM education. Educational Studies, 53(6), 587–600.

Buxton, C. A., & Lee, O. (2014). English learners in science education. In Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 218–236). Routledge.

Capitelli, S., Hooper, P., Rankin, L., Austin, M., & Caven, G. (2016). Understanding the development of a hybrid practice of inquiry-based science instruction and language development: A case study of one teacher's journey through reflections on classroom practice. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(3), 283–302.

Cardozo-Gaibisso, L., Kim, S., Buxton, C., & Cohen, A. (2020). Thinking beyond the score: Multidimensional analysis of student performance to inform the next generation of science assessments. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(6), 856–878.

Charamba, E. (2020). Translanguaging in a multilingual class: A study of the relation between students' languages and epistemological access in science. International Journal of Science Education, 42(11), 1779–1798.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2(2), 71–83.

Curran, F. C., & Kitchin, J. (2019). Why are the early elementary race/ethnicity test score gaps in science larger than those in reading or mathematics? National evidence on the importance of language and immigration context in explaining the gap-in-gaps. Science Education, 103(3), 477–502.

Dafouz, E., Hüttner, J., & Smit, U. (2018). New contexts, new challenges for TESOL: Understanding disciplinary reasoning in oral interactions in English-medium instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 52(3), 540–563.

Dawson, E. (2014). "Not designed for us": How science museums and science centers socially exclude low-income, minority ethnic groups. Science Education, 98(6), 981–1008.

DiCerbo, P. A., Anstrom, K. A., Baker, L. L., & Rivera, C. (2014). A review of the literature on teaching academic English to English language learners. Review of Educational Research, 84(3), 446–482.

Enderle, P., Cohen, S., & Scott, J. (2020). Communicating about science and engineering practices and the nature of science: An exploration of American Sign Language resources. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(6), 968–995.

- Every Student Succeeds Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015). www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf
- Fine, C. G. M., & Furtak, E. M. (2020). A framework for science classroom assessment task design for emergent bilingual learners. Science Education, 104(3), 393–420.
- Frantz, R. S., Starr, L. E., & Bailey, A. L. (2015). Syntactic complexity as an aspect of text complexity. Educational Researcher, 44(7), 387–393.
- Gamez, R., & Parker, C. A. (2018). Becoming science learners: A study of newcomers' identity work in elementary school science. Science Education, 102(2), 377–413.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Giamellaro, M. (2014). Primary contextualization of science learning through immersion in content-rich settings. International Journal of Science Education, 36(17), 2848–2871.
- Giamellaro, M. (2017). Dewey's yardstick: Contextualization as a crosscutting measure of experience in education and learning. SAGE Open, 7(1).
- Glass, R., & Oliveira, A. W. (2014). Science language accommodation in elementary school read-alouds. International Journal of Science Education, 36(4), 577–609.
- González-Howard, M., & McNeill, K. L. (2016). Learning in a community of practice: Factors impacting English-learning students' engagement in scientific argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(4), 527–553.
- González-Howard, M., McNeill, K. L., Marco-Bujosa, L. M., & Proctor, C. P. (2017). "Does it answer the question or is it French fries?": An exploration of language supports for scientific argumentation. International Journal of Science Education, 39(5), 528–547.
- González-Howard, M., & Suárez, E. (2021). Retiring the term English language learners: Moving toward linguistic justice through asset-oriented framing. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(5), 749–752. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21684
- Grapin, S. E. (2019). Multimodality in the new content standards era: Implications for English learners. TESOL Quarterly, 53(1), 30–55.
- Grapin, S. E. (2021). Toward asset-oriented and definitionally clear terminology: A comment on González-Howard and Suárez (2021). Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(5), 753–755.
- Grapin, S. E., & Lee, O. (2022). WIDA English language development standards framework, 2020 edition: Key shifts and emerging tensions. TESOL Quarterly, 56(2), 827–839.
- Grapin, S. E., Llosa, L., Haas, A., Goggins, M., & Lee, O. (2019). Precision: Toward a meaning-centered view of language use with English learners in the content areas. Linguistics and Education, 50(1), 71–83.
- Hand, B., Shelley, M. C., Laugerman, M., Fostvedt, L., & Therrien, W. (2018). Improving critical thinking growth for disadvantaged groups within elementary school science: A randomized controlled trial using the science writing heuristic approach. Science Education, 102(4), 693–710.
- Harman, R., Buxton, C., Cardozo-Gaibisso, L., Jiang, L., & Bui, K. (2020). Culturally sustaining systemic functional linguistics praxis in science classrooms. Language and Education, 35(2), 106–122.
- Harper, S. G. (2017). Engaging Karen refugee students in science learning through a cross-cultural learning community. International Journal of Science Education, 39(3), 358–376.
- Harris, C. J., Krajcik, J. S., Pellegrino, J. W., & McElhaney, K. W. (2016). Constructing assessment tasks that blend disciplinary core ideas, crosscutting concepts, and science practice for classroom formative applications. SRI International.
- Heineke, A. J., & Giatsou, E. (2020). Learning from students, teachers, and schools: Field-based teacher education for emergent bilingual learners. Journal of Teacher Education, 71(1), 148–161.
- Heineke, A. J., Smetana, L., & Carlson Sanei, J. (2019). A qualitative case study of field-based teacher education: One candidate's evolving expertise of science teaching for emergent bilinguals. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(1), 80–100.
- Hernandez, C., & Shroyer, M. G. (2017). The use of culturally responsive teaching strategies among Latina/o student teaching interns during science and mathematics instruction of CLD students. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(4), 367–387.
- Hopkins, M., Lowenhaupt, R., & Sweet, T. M. (2015). Organizing English learner instruction in new immigrant destinations: District infrastructure and subject-specific school practice. American Educational Research Journal, 52(3), 408–439.
- Huerta, M., Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., & Irby, B. J. (2014). Developing and validating a science notebook rubric for fifth-grade non-mainstream students. International Journal of Science Education, 36(11), 1849–1870.
- Jackson, J. K., Huerta, M., Garza, T., & Narvaez, R. (2019). Examining the effects of a professional development initiative on English learning and economically disadvantaged adolescents' scores on a high-stakes science test. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(2), 122–143.
- Johnson, A. (2020). Summer credit recovery impact on newcomer English learners. American Educational Research Journal, 57(4), 1757–1790.
- Jung, K. G., & Brown, J. C. (2016). Examining the effectiveness of an academic language planning organizer as a tool for planning science academic language instruction and supports. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(8), 847–872.
- Kangas, S. E., & Cook, M. (2020). Academic tracking of English learners with disabilities in middle school. American Educational Research Journal, 57(6), 2415–2449.
- Kanno, Y., & Kangas, S. E. (2014). "I'm not going to be, like, for the AP" English language learners' limited access to advanced college-preparatory courses in high school. American Educational Research Journal, 51(5), 848–878.
- Karlsson, A., Nygård Larsson, P., & Jakobsson, A. (2019). Multilingual students' use of translanguaging in science classrooms. International Journal of Science Education, 41(15), 2049–2069.
- Kibler, A., Valdés, G., & Walqui, A. (2014). What does standards-based educational reform mean for English language learner populations in primary and secondary schools? TESOL Quarterly, 48(4), 873–874.
- Lan, S. W., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2019). English language learners' participation in the discourse of a multilingual science classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 41(9), 1246–1270.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). Reflecting on the cognitive-social debate in second language acquisition. The Modern Language Journal, 7, 773–787.
- Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory. Oxford University Press.
- Lavery, M. R., Nutta, J., & Youngblood, A. (2019). Analyzing student learning gains to evaluate differentiated teacher preparation for fostering English learners' achievement in linguistically diverse classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 70(4), 372–387.

- Leckie, A., & Wall, A. (2017). Language for science: Preservice teachers develop science concepts through language study. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(5), 468–484.
- Lee, O. (2017). Common core state standards for ELA/literacy and Next Generation Science Standards: Convergences and discrepancies using argument as an example. Educational Researcher, 46(2), 90–102.
- Lee, O. (2018). English language proficiency standards aligned with content standards. Educational Researcher, 47(5), 317–327.
- Lee, O. (2019). Aligning English language proficiency standards with content standards: Shared opportunity and responsibility across English learner education and content areas. Educational Researcher, 48(8), 534–542.
- Lee, O. (2021). Asset-oriented framing of science and language learning with multilingual learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(7). https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21694
- Lee, O., Llosa, L., Grapin, S., Haas, A., & Goggins, M. (2019). Science and language integration with English learners: A conceptual framework guiding instructional materials development. Science Education, 103(2), 317–337.
- Lee, O., Llosa, L., Jiang, F., Haas, A., O'Connor, C., & Van Booven, C. D. (2016). Elementary teachers' science knowledge and instructional practices: Impact of an intervention focused on English language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(4), 579–597.
- Lee, O., Miller, E., & Januszyk, R. (2015). NGSS for all students. NSTA Press.
- Lee, O., Quinn, H., & Valdés, G. (2013). Science and language for English language learners in relation to Next Generation Science Standards and with implications for Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics. Educational Researcher, 42(4), 223–233.
- Lee, O., & Stephens, A. (2020). English learners in STEM subjects: Contemporary perspectives on STEM subjects and language with English learners. Educational Researcher, 49(6), 426–432.
- Lemmi, C., Brown, B. A., Wild, A., Zummo, L., & Sedlacek, Q. (2019). Language ideologies in science education. Science Education, 103(4), 854–874.
- Llosa, L., Lee, O., Jiang, F., Haas, A., O'Connor, C., Van Booven, C. D., & Kieffer, M. J. (2016). Impact of a large-scale science intervention focused on English language learners. American Educational Research Journal, 53(2), 395–424.
- Lo, Y. Y., & Lo, E. S. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of English-medium education in Hong Kong. Review of Educational Research, 84(1), 47–73.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators (pp. 55–73). Routledge.
- Lyon, E. G. (2017). Exploring secondary science teachers' enactment of assessment practices to reflect responsive science teaching for English learners. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(8), 674–698.
- Lyon, E. G., Stoddart, T., Bunch, G. C., Tolbert, S., Salinas, I., & Solis, J. (2018). Improving the preparation of novice secondary science teachers for English learners: A proof of concept study. Science Education, 102(6), 1288–1318.
- Mavuru, L., & Ramnarain, U. D. (2020). Language affordances and pedagogical challenges in multilingual grade 9 natural sciences classrooms in South Africa. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2472–2492.
- Meier, V., Aminger, W., McLean, M., Carpenter, S. L., Moon, S., Hough, S., & Bianchini, J. A. (2020). Preser-vice secondary science teachers' understanding of academic language: Moving beyond "just the vocabulary". Science Education, 104(2), 222–251. Meyer, X. S., & Crawford, B. A. (2015). Multicultural inquiry toward demystifying scientific culture and learning science. Science Education, 99(4), 617–637.
- Meyerhöffer, N., & Dreesmann, D. C. (2019a). English-bilingual biology for standard classes development, implementation and evaluation of an English-bilingual teaching unit in standard German high school classes. International Journal of Science Education, 41(10), 1366–1386.
- Meyerhöffer, N., & Dreesmann, D. C. (2019b). The exclusive language of science? Comparing knowledge gains and motivation in English-bilingual biology lessons between non-selected and preselected classes. International Journal of Science Education, 41(1), 1–20
- Mislevy, R. J., & Durán, R. P. (2014). A sociocognitive perspective on assessing EL students in the age of Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards. TESOL Quarterly, 48(3), 560–585.
- Msimanga, A., & Lelliott, A. (2014). Talking science in multilingual contexts in South Africa: Possibilities and challenges for engagement in learners home languages in high school classrooms. International Journal of Science Education, 36(7), 1159–1183. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). English learners in STEM subjects: Transforming classrooms, schools, and lives. National Academies Press.
- National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. National Academies Press.
- National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academies Press.
- Next Generation Science Standards Lead States . (2013b). Appendix D "All standards, all students": Making Next Generation Science Standards accessible to all students. National Academies Press.
- NGSS Lead States . (2013a). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.
- Noble, T., Sireci, S. G., Wells, C. S., Kachchaf, R. R., Rosebery, A. S., & Wang, Y. C. (2020). Targeted linguistic simplification of science test items for English learners. American Educational Research Journal, 57(5), 2175–2209. *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).
- Ollerhead, S. (2020). "The pre-service teacher tango": Pairing literacy and science in multilingual Australian classrooms. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2493–2512.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. Applied Linguistics Review, 6(3), 281–307.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. Educational Researcher, 41(3), 93–97.
- Pyle, D., Pyle, N., Lignugaris Kraft, B., Duran, L., & Akers, J. (2017). Academic effects of peer-mediated interventions with English language learners: A research synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 87(1), 103–133.
- Rivard, L. P., & Gueye, N. R. (2016). Enhancing literacy practices in science classrooms through a professional development program for Canadian minority-language teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 38(7), 1150–1173.

- Rutt, A. A., & Mumba, F. M. (2020). Developing secondary pre-service science teachers' instructional planning abilities for language-and-literacy-integrated science instruction in linguistically diverse classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(8), 841–868. Ryoo, K. (2015). Teaching science through the language of students in technology-enhanced instruction. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 24(1), 29–42.
- Ryoo, K., & Bedell, K. (2019). Supporting linguistically diverse students' science learning with dynamic visualizations through discourse-rich practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(3), 270–301.
- Ryoo, K., Bedell, K., & Swearingen, A. (2018). Promoting linguistically diverse students' short-term and long-term understanding of chemical phenomena using visualizations. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 27(6), 508–522.
- Ryu, M. (2015a). Positionings of racial, ethnic, and linguistic minority students in high school biology class: Implications for science education in diverse classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(3), 347–370.
- Ryu, M. (2015b). Understanding Korean transnational girls in high school science classes: Beyond the model minority stereotype. Science Education, 99(2), 350–377.
- Ryu, M. (2019). Mixing languages for science learning and participation: An examination of Korean-English bilingual learners in an after-school science-learning programme. International Journal of Science Education, 41(10), 1303–1323.
- Salloum, S., & BouJaoude, S. (2020). Language in teaching and learning science in diverse Lebanese multilingual classrooms: Interactions and perspectives. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2331–2363.
- Seah, L. H., Clarke, D. J., & Hart, C. E. (2014). Understanding the language demands on science students from an integrated science and language perspective. International Journal of Science Education, 36(6), 952–973.
- Seah, L. H., & Silver, R. E. (2020). Attending to science language demands in multilingual classrooms: A case study. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2453–2471.
- Seah, L. H., & Yore, L. D. (2017). The roles of teachers' science talk in revealing language demands within diverse elementary school classrooms: A study of teaching heat and temperature in Singapore. International Journal of Science Education, 39(2), 135–157.
- Shaw, J. M., Lyon, E. G., Stoddart, T., Mosqueda, E., & Menon, P. (2014). Improving science and literacy learning for English language learners: Evidence from a pre-service teacher preparation intervention. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(5), 621–643
- Siegel, M. A. (2014). Developing preservice teachers' expertise in equitable assessment for English learners. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(3), 289–308.
- Siegel, M. A., Menon, D., Sinha, S., Promyod, N., Wissehr, C., & Halverson, K. L. (2014). Equitable written assessments for English language learners: How scaffolding helps. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(6), 681–708.
- Siry, C., & Gorges, A. (2020). Young students' diverse resources for meaning making in science: Learning from multilingual contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2364–2386.
- Smith, L. K., Hanks, J. H., & Erickson, L. B. (2017). Secondary biology textbooks and national standards for English learners. Science Education, 101(2), 302–332.
- Solano-Campos, A., Hopkins, M., & Quaynor, L. (2020). Linguistically responsive teaching in preservice teacher education: A review of the literature through the lens of cultural-historical activity theory. Journal of Teacher Education, 71(2), 203–217.
- Suárez, E. (2020). "Estoy explorando science": Emergent bilingual students problematizing electrical phenomena through translanguaging. Science Education, 104(5), 791–826.
- Swanson, L. H., Bianchini, J. A., & Lee, J. S. (2014). Engaging in argument and communicating information: A case study of English language learners and their science teacher in an urban high school. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(1), 31–64.
- Terrazas-Arellanes, F. E., Gallard, M. A. J., Strycker, L. A., & Walden, E. D. (2018). Impact of interactive online units on learning science among students with learning disabilities and English learners. International Journal of Science Education, 40(5), 498–518.
- Tolbert, S., & Knox, C. (2016). "They might know a lot of things that I don't know": Investigating differences in preservice teachers' ideas about contextualizing science instruction in multilingual classrooms. International Journal of Science Education, 38(7), 1133–1149.
- Tretter, T. R., Ardasheva, Y., Morrison, J. A., & Karin Roo, A. (2019). Strengthening science attitudes for newcomer middle school English learners: Visually enriched integrated science and language instruction. International Journal of Science Education, 41(8), 1015–1037.
- Umansky, I. M. (2016). Leveled and exclusionary tracking: English learners' access to academic content in middle school. American Educational Research Journal, 53(6), 1792–1833.
- Ünsal, Z., Jakobson, B., Wickman, P. O., & Molander, B. O. (2018). Gesticulating science: Emergent bilingual students' use of gestures. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(1), 121–144.
- Ünsal, Z., Jakobson, B., Wickman, P. O., & Molander, B. O. (2020). Jumping pepper and electrons in the shoe: Using physical artefacts in a multilingual science class. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2387–2406.
- Valdés, G. (2015). Latin@s and the intergenerational continuity of Spanish: The challenges of curricularizing language. International Multilingual Research Journal, 9(4), 253–273.
- Valdés-Sánchez, L., & Espinet, M. (2020). Coteaching in a science-CLIL classroom: Changes in discursive interaction as evidence of an English teacher's science-CLIL professional identity development. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2426–2452. Van Laere, E., Aesaert, K., & van Braak, J. (2014). The role of students' home language in science achievement: A multilevel approach. International Journal of Science Education, 36(16), 2772–2794.
- Varelas, M., Pieper, L., Arsenault, A., Pappas, C. C., & Keblawe-Shamah, N. (2014). How science texts and hands-on explorations facilitate meaning making: Learning from Latina/o third graders. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(10), 1246–1274. Weiland, I. (2015). An exploration of Hispanic mothers' culturally sustaining experiences at an informal science center. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(1), 84–106.
- Weinburgh, M., Silva, C., Smith, K. H., Groulx, J., & Nettles, J. (2014). The intersection of inquiry-based science and language: Preparing teachers for ELL classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(5), 519–541.
- WIDA Consortium . (2020). WIDA English language development standards framework, 2020 edition. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/resource/WIDAELD-Standards-Framework-2020.pdf Williams, M., & Tang, K. S. (2020). The implications of the non-linguistic modes of meaning for language learners in science: A review. International Journal of Science Education, 42(7), 1041–1067.

Wilmes, S. E., & Siry, C. (2018). Interaction rituals and inquiry-based science instruction: Analysis of student participation in small-group investigations in a multilingual classroom. Science Education, 102(5), 1107–1128.

Wilmes, S. E., & Siry, C. (2020). Science notebooks as interactional spaces in a multilingual classroom: Not just ideas on paper. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(7), 999–1027.

Wilson-Lopez, A., Sias, C., Smithee, A., & Hasbún, I. M. (2018). Forms of science capital mobilized in adolescents' engineering projects. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(2), 246–270.

Wu, S. C., Silveus, A., Vasquez, S., Biffi, D., Silva, C., & Weinburgh, M. (2019). Supporting ELLs' use of hybrid language and argumentation during science instruction. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(1), 24–43.

Zhang, Y. (2016). Multimodal teacher input and science learning in a middle school sheltered classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(1), 7–30.

Special Needs and Talents in Science Learning

Adu-Boateng, S., & Goodnough, K. (2021). Examining a science teacher's instructional practices in the adoption of inclusive pedagogy: A qualitative case study. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2021.1915605 Andersen, L., & Nash, B. L. (2016). Making science accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities. Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities, 19(1), 17–38. http://doi.org/10.14448/jsesd.09.0002

Andersen, L., Nash, B. L., & Bechard, S. (2018). Articulating the validity evidence for a science alternate assessment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(6), 826–848. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21441

Apanasionok, M. M., Hastings, R. P., Grindle, C. F., Watkins, R. C., & Paris, A. (2019). Teaching science skills and knowledge to students with developmental disabilities: A systematic review. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(7), 847–880. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21531

Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. A. (2010). Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching. Guilford Publications.

Armstrong, T. (2012). Neurodiversity in the classroom: Strength-based strategies to help students with special needs succeed in school and life. ASCD.

Atchison, C. L., Marshall, A. M., & Collins, T. D. (2019). A multiple case study of inclusive learning communities enabling active participation in geoscience field courses for students with physical disabilities. Journal of Geoscience Education, 67(4), 472–486. https://doi.org/10.1080/10899995.2019.1600962

Aydeniz, M., Cihak, D. F., Graham, S. C., & Retinger, L. (2012). Using inquiry-based instruction for teaching science to students with learning disabilities. International Journal of Special Education, 27(2), 189–206.

Bancroft, S. F., & Nyirenda, E. M. (2020). Equity-focused K-12 science teacher professional development: A review of the literature 2001–2017. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(2), 151–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1685629

Barnard-Brak, L., Johnsen, S. K., Hannig, A. P., & Wei, T. (2015). The incidence of potentially gifted students within a special education population. Roeper Review, 37(2), 74–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2015.1008661

Bell, E. C. , & Silverman, A. M. (2019). Access to math and science content for youth who are blind or visually impaired. Journal of Blindness Innovation and Research, 9(1). http://doi.org/10.5241/9-152

Benny, N., & Blonder, R. (2016). Factors that promote/inhibit teaching gifted students in a regular class: Results from a professional development program for chemistry teachers. Education Research International, 2016, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/2742905 Boda, P. A. (2019). Conceptualizing the margins in science education: The limits of multicultural analyses. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(2), 493–514. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09926-x

Boda, P. A. (2021). The conceptual and disciplinary segregation of disability: A phenomenography of science education graduate student learning. Research in Science Education, 51, 1725–1758. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-9828-x

Boyle, S., Rizzo, K. L., & Taylor, J. C. (2020). Reducing language barriers in science for students with special educational needs. Asia-Pacific Science Education, 6(2), 364–387. https://doi.org/10.1163/23641177-BJA10006

Brendel, M., Siry, C., Haus, J. M., & Breedijk-Goedert, F. (2019). Transforming praxis in science through dialogue towards inclusive approaches. Research in Science Education, 49(3), 767–786. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9642-2

Brusca-Vega, R., Alexander, J., & Kamin, C. (2014). In support of access and inclusion: Joint professional development for science and special educators. Global Education Review, 1(4), Article 4. https://ger.mercy.edu/index.php/ger/article/view/42

Cairns, D., & Areepattamannil, S. (2019). Exploring the relations of inquiry-based teaching to science achievement and dispositions in 54 countries. Research in Science Education, 49(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9639-x

Cameron, A., O'Neill, R., & Quinn, G. (2016). Deaf students using sign language in mainstream science classrooms. In A. W. Oliveira & M. Weinburgh (Eds.), Science teacher preparation in content-based second language acquisition (pp. 341–362). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43516-9 19

Carabajal, I. G., Marshall, A. M., & Atchison, C. L. (2017). A synthesis of instructional strategies in geoscience education literature that address barriers to inclusion for students with disabilities. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 531–541. https://doi.org/10.5408/16-211.1

Carnahan, C. R., Williamson, P., Birri, N., Swoboda, C., & Snyder, K. K. (2016). Increasing comprehension of expository science text for students with autism spectrum disorder. Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 31(3), 208–220. http://doi.org/10.1177/1088357615610539

CAST (2018). Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2. CAST. http://udlguidelines.cast.org

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention . (2021). Learning disorders in children. www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/child-development/learning-disorder.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention . (2022). Developmental disabilities. www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/developmentaldisabilities/index.html

Chiu, Y. T., & Wild, T. (2021). Incorporating the expanded core curriculum into science. British Journal of Visual Impairment, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/02646196211029341

Collins, B. C., Terrell, M., & Test, D. W. (2017). Using a simultaneous prompting procedure to embed core content when teaching a potential employment skill. Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, 40(1), 36–44.

- Comarú, M. W., Lopes, R. M., Braga, L. A. M., Batista Mota, F., & Galvão, C. (2021). A bibliometric and descriptive analysis of inclusive education in science education. Studies in Science Education, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2021.1897930
- Connor, D. J. (2012). Does dis/ability now sit at the table(s) of social justice and multicultural education? A descriptive survey of three recent anthologies. Disability Studies Quarterly, 32(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v32i3.1770
- Connor, D. J., Gabel, S. L., Gallagher, D. J., & Morton, M. (2008). Disability studies and inclusive education Implications for theory, research, and practice. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 12 (5–6), 441–457. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802377482 Cooc, N., & Kiru, E. W. (2018). Disproportionality in special education: A synthesis of international research and trends. The Journal of Special Education, 52(3), 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022466918772300
- Davis, L. J. (Ed.). (2016). The disability studies reader (5th ed.). Routledge. https://doi-org/10.4324/9781315680668
- deBrey, C., Snyder, T. D., Zhang, A., & Dillow, S. A. (2021). Digest of education statistics 2019 (NCES 2021–009). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- de Graaf, A., Westbroek, H., & Janssen, F. (2019). A practical approach to differentiated instruction: How biology teachers redesigned their genetics and ecology lessons. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(1), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1523646
- Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking, and Technology (DO-IT) . (n.d.). Mobility impairments. www.washington.edu/doit/mobility-impairments
- Dixson, D. D., Worrell, F. C., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Subotnik, R. F. (2016). Beyond perceived ability: The contribution of psychosocial factors to academic performance. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1377(1), 67–77. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13210
- Doabler, C. T., Therrien, W. J., Longhi, M. A., Roberts, G., Hess, K. E., Maddox, S.A., Uy, J., Lovette, G.E., Fall, A-M., Kimmel, G.L., Benson, S., VanUitert, V.J., Wilson, S.E., Powell, S.R., Sampson, V., & Toprac, P. (2021). Efficacy of a second-grade science program: Increasing science outcomes for all students. Remedial and Special Education, 42(3), 140–154. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0741932521989091
- Dovigo, F. (2017). Special educational needs and inclusive practices: An international perspective. Sense Publishers. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-857-0
- Ehsan, H. , Rispoli, M. , Lory, C. , & Gregori, E. (2018). A systematic review of STEM instruction with students with autism spectrum disorders. Review Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 5(4), 327-348. http://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-018-0142-8
- Enderle, P., Cohen, S., & Scott, J. (2020). Communicating about science and engineering practices and the nature of science: An exploration of American Sign Language resources. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(6), 968–995. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21619
- Espin, C. A., Busch, T. W., Lembke, E. S., Hampton, D. D., Seo, K., & Zukowski, B. A. (2013). Curriculum-based measurement in science learning: Vocabulary-matching as an indicator of performance and progress. Assessment for Effective Intervention, 38(4), 203–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508413489724
- Every Student Succeeds Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015). www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1177
- Farkas, G., Morgan, P. L., Hillemeier, M. M., Mitchell, C., & Woods, A. D. (2020). District-level achievement gaps explain black and hispanic overrepresentation in special education. Exceptional Children, 86(4), 374–392. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402919893695 Foley-Nicpon, M., & Candler, M. M. (2018). Psychological interventions for twice-exceptional youth. In S. I. Pfeiffer, E. Shaunessy-Dedrick, & M. Foley-Nicpon (Eds.), APA handbook of giftedness and talent (pp. 545–558). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000038-035
- Fraleigh-Lohrfink, K. J., Schneider, M. V., Whittington, D., & Feinberg, A. P. (2013). Increase in science research commitment in a didactic and laboratory-based program targeted to gifted minority high-school students. Roeper Review, 35(1), 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2013.740599
- Frantz, R. S., & McClarty, K. L. (2016). Gifted education's reflection of country-specific cultural, political, and economic features. Gifted and Talented International, 31(1), 46–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332276.2016.1220794
- Garwood, J. D., Werts, M. G., Mason, L. H., Harris, B., Austin, M. B., Ciullo, S. Magner, K., Koppenhaver, D.A., & Shin, M. (2019). Improving persuasive science writing for secondary students with emotional and behavioral disorders educated in residential treatment facilities. Behavioral Disorders, 44(4), 227–240. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0198742918809341
- Gomes, C. V., & Mensah, F. M. (2016). Sounding out science: Using assistive technology for students with learning differences in middle school science classes. In M. J. Urban & D. A. Falvo (Eds.), Improving K-12 STEM education outcomes through technological integration (pp. 44–67). IGI Global.
- Green, T. F. (1964). A topology of the teaching concept. Studies in Philosophy and Education, 3(4), 284–319. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00375980
- Griffiths, A. J., Nash, A. M., Maupin, Z., & Mathur, S. K. (2020). Her voice: Engaging and preparing girls with disabilities for science, technology, engineering, and math careers. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 12(3), 293–301. http://doi.org/10.26822/jejee.2020358223
- Gubbels, J., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2014). Cognitive, socioemotional, and attitudinal effects of a triarchic enrichment program for gifted children. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 37(4), 378–397. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353214552565
- Guerrero, A. D., Rodriguez, M. A., & Flores, G. (2011). Disparities in provider elicitation of parents' developmental concerns for US children. Pediatrics, 128(5), 901–909. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2011-0030
- Hall, M. L., Eigsti, I.-M., Bortfeld, H., & Lillo-Martin, D. (2017). Auditory deprivation does not impair executive function, but language deprivation might: Evidence from a parent-report measure in deaf native signing children. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 22(1), 9–21. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enw054
- Heinrich, S., Collins, B. C., Knight, V., & Spriggs, A. D. (2016). Embedded simultaneous prompting procedure to teach STEM content to high school students with moderate disabilities in an inclusive setting. Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 51(1), 41–54. www.jstor.org/stable/26420363
- Huffling, L., Benavides, A., Matthews, C. E., Compton, M. V., Kurtts, S., & Carlone, H. B. (2018). Learning frog calls when you can't hear: Fieldwork with high school students who are deaf and hard-of-hearing. In M. Koomen, S. Kahn, C. L. Atchison, & T. A. Wild (Eds.), Towards inclusion of all learners through science teacher education (pp. 165–174). Brill Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368422 018

- Hwang, J., & Taylor, J. (2016). Stemming on STEM: A STEM education gramework for students with disabilities. Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.14448/jsesd.09.0003
- IDEA Part B Child Count and Educational Environments Collection (2019). https://www2-ed-gov.programs/osepidea/618-data/static-tables/index.html
- IDEA Regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 300 (2016).
- Im, S. , & Kim, O.-J. (2014). An approach to teach science to students with limited language proficiency: In the case of students with hearing impairment. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 12(6), 1393–1406. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-013-9465-1
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA], 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).
- Israel, M., Wang, S., & Marino, M. T. (2016). A multilevel analysis of diverse learners playing life science video games: Interactions between game content, learning disability status, reading proficiency, and gender. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(2), 324–345. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21273
- Izzo, M. V., & Bauer, W. M. (2015). Universal design for learning: Enhancing achievement and employment of STEM students with disabilities. Universal Access in the Information Society, 14(1), 17–27. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-013-0332-1
- Jarrell, A., & Lajoie, S. P. (2017). The regulation of achievements emotions: Implications for research and practice. Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 58(3), 276–287. https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000119
- Jeannis, H., Joseph, J., Goldberg, M., Seelman, K., Schmeler, M., & Cooper, R. A. (2018). Full-participation of students with physical disabilities in science and engineering laboratories. Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology, 13(2), 186–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/17483107.2017.1300348
- Jimenez, B. A., Browder, D. M., Spooner, F., & Dibiase, W. (2012). Inclusive inquiry science using peer-mediated embedded instruction for students with moderate intellectual disability. Exceptional Children, 78(3), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291207800303
- Kahn, S. (2015). Another "M" for STEM? Moral considerations for advancing STEM literacy. K-12 STEM Education, 1(4), 149–156. www.learntechlib.org/p/209561/
- Kahn, S. (2018). From access to assets: Strength-based visions for inclusive science education. In M. Koomen, S. Kahn, C. L. Atchison, & T. A. Wild (Eds.), Towards inclusion of all learners through science teacher education (pp. 105–114). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368422 012
- 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(2), 13–35. https://doi.org/10.14448/jsesd.06.0001
- Kahn, S., Hartman, S., & Samblanet, M. (2018). Promoting "science for all" through teacher candidate collaboration and community engagement. Innovations in Science Teacher Education, 3(2). https://innovations.theaste.org/promoting-science-for-all-through-teacher-candidate-collaboration-and-community-engagement/
- Kahn, S., & Lewis, A. R. (2014). Survey on teaching science to K-12 students with disabilities: Teacher preparedness and attitudes. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(8), 885–910. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9406-z
- Kahn, S., Pigman, R., & Ottley, J. (2017). A tale of two courses: Exploring teacher candidates' translation of science and special education methods instruction into inclusive science practices. Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities, 20(1), 50–68. https://doi.org/10.14448/jsesd.08.0004
- Kaldenberg, E. R., Watt, S. J., & Therrien, W. J. (2015). Reading instruction in science for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. Learning Disability Quarterly, 38(3), 160–173. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0731948714550204
- Kamhi, A. G., & Catts, H. W. (2014). Language and reading disabilities. Pearson.
- Kang, D. Y., & Martin, S. N. (2018). Improving learning opportunities for special education needs (SEN) students by engaging preservice science teachers in an informal experiential learning course. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2018.1505599
- Kingsbury, C. G., Sibert, E. C., Killingback, Z., & Atchison, C. L. (2020). "Nothing about us without us:" The perspectives of autistic geoscientists on inclusive instructional practices in geoscience education. Journal of Geoscience Education, 68(4), 302–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/10899995.2020.1768017
- King-Sears, M. E., & Johnson, T. M. (2020). Universal design for learning chemistry instruction for students with and without learning disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 41(4), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0741932519862608
- Kizilaslan, A., Zorluoglu, S. L., & Sozbilir, M. (2020). Improve learning with hands-on classroom activities: Science instruction for students with visual impairments. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1732110
- Knight, V. F., Creech-Galloway, C. E., Karl, J. M., & Collins, B. C. (2018). Evaluating supported eText to teach science to high school students with moderate intellectual sisability. Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 33(4), 227–236. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088357617696273
- Knight, V. F., Spooner, F., Browder, D. M., Smith, B. R., & Wood, C. L. (2013). Using systematic instruction and graphic organizers to teach science concepts to students with autism spectrum disorders and intellectual disability. Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 28(2), 115–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088357612475301
- Knight, V. F., Wood, L., McKissick, B. R., & Kuntz, E. M. (2020). Teaching science content and practices to students with intellectual disability and autism. Remedial and Special Education, 41(6), 327–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932519843998
- Knight, V. F., Wright, J., Wilson, K., & Hooper, A. (2019). Teaching digital, block-based coding of robots to high school students with autism spectrum disorder and challenging behavior. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 49(8), 3113–3126. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-019-04033-w
- Koehler, K., Wild, T., & Tikkun, S. (2018). Implications of 3-D printing for teaching Geoscience concepts to students with visual impairments. Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities, 21(1), 49–81. https://doi.org/10.14448/jsesd.10.0004 Koomen, M. H. (2016). Inclusive science education: Learning from Wizard. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(2), 293–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-015-9668-6
- Koomen, M. H. (2018a). A good teacher makes science lighthearted: Experiences in learning science from Alejandro. In M. Koomen , S. Kahn , C. L. Atchison , & T. A. Wild (Eds.), Towards inclusion of all learners through science teacher education (pp. 43–51). Brill Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368422_005
- Koomen, M. H. (2018b). Some of them have problems, too, like me: Content and disciplinary literacy for all. In M. Koomen, S. Kahn, C. L. Atchison, & T. A. Wild (Eds.), Towards inclusion of all learners through science teacher education (pp. 251–262). Brill Sense.

- https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368422 027
- Koomen, M. H., Kahn, S., Atchison, C. L., & Wild, T. A. (Eds.). (2018). Towards inclusion of all learners through science teacher education. Brill Sense.
- Koomen, M. H., Kahn, S., & Shume, T. (2022). Including all learners through science teacher education. In J. Luft & G. Jones (Eds.), Handbook of research on science teacher education (pp. 363–375). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003098478-32
- Lang, R., Ramdoss, S., Sigafoos, J., Green, V. A., van der Meer, L., Tostanoski, A., Lee, A., & O'Reilly, M. F. (2014). Assistive technology for postsecondary students with disabilities. In G. Lancioni & N. Singh (Eds.), Assistive technologies for people with diverse abilities (pp. 53–76). Springer. https://doi-org/10.1007/978-1-4899-8029-8
- Lauterbach, A. A., Benedict, A. E., Yakut, A. D., & Garcias, A. A. (2020). Improving vocabulary outcomes in inclusive secondary science classrooms through professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(1), 56–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1661738
- Lederman, J. S., & Bartels, S. (2018). Assessing the ultimate goal of science education: Scientific literacy for all! In M. Koomen, S. Kahn, C. L. Atchison, & T. A. Wild (Eds.), Towards inclusion of all learners through science teacher education (pp. 277–285). Brill Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368422 030
- Lederman, J. S., Bartels, S., Lederman, N., & Gnanakkan, D. (2014). Demystifying nature of science. Science and Children, 52(1), 40.
- Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2014). Research on teaching and learning of Nature of Science. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 600–620). Routledge. https://doi-org/10.4324/9780203097267 Librea-Carden, M. R., Mulvey, B. K., Borgerding, L. A., Wiley, A. L., & Ferdous, T. (2021). "Science is accessible for everyone": Preservice special education teachers' nature of science perceptions and instructional practices. International Journal of Science Education, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1893857
- Love, T. S., Roy, K. R., & Marino, M. T. (2020). Inclusive makerspaces, fab labs, and STEM labs: How can instructors make appropriate accommodations and modifications while maintaining a safer teaching and learning environment for ALL students and themselves? Technology & Engineering Teacher, 79(5), 23–27.
- Madden, L., Schuler, A., Friedman, M., Panday, S., & Koehler, D. (2018). Looking through the window to help teach others: Science stories of three young women. In M. Koomen, S. Kahn, C. L. Atchison, & T. Wild (Eds.), Towards inclusion of all learners through science teacher education (pp. 59–67). Brill Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368422 007
- Maeng, J. L., & Bell, R. L. (2015). Differentiating science instruction: Secondary science teachers' practices. International Journal of Science Education, 37(13), 2065–2090. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1064553
- Marino, M. T., Israel, M., Beecher, C. C., & Basham, J. D. (2013). Students' and teachers' perceptions of using videogames to enhance science instruction. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 22, 667–680. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-012-9421-9 Martínez-Álvarez, P. (2017). Special ways of knowing in science: Expansive learning opportunities with bilingual children with learning disabilities. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(3), 521–553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9732-x
- Mason, L. H., & Hedin, L. R. (2011). Reading science text: Challenges for students with learning disabilities and considerations for teachers. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26(4), 214–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2011.00342.x
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20057
- McGinnis, J. R. (2003). The morality of inclusive verses exclusive settings. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 195–216). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4996-X_11
- McGinnis, J. R., & Kahn, S. (2014). Special needs and talents in science learning. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 237–259). Routledge. https://doi-org/10.4324/9780203097267
- McGinnis, J. R., & Stefanich, G. P. (2007). Special needs and talents in science learning. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), The handbook of research in science education (pp. 287–318). Lawrence Erlbaum Press.
- McGrath, A. L., & Hughes, M. T. (2018). Students with learning disabilities in inquiry-based science classrooms: A cross-case analysis. Learning Disability Quarterly, 41(3), 131–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948717736007
- McKissick, B. R., Davis, L. L., Spooner, F., Fisher, L. B., & Graves, C. (2018). Using computer-assisted instruction to teach science vocabulary to students with autism spectrum disorder and intellectual disability. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 37(4), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/8756870518784270
- McLeskey, J., Barringer, M.-D., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M., Jackson, D., Kennedy, M., Lewis, T., Maheady, L., Rodriguez, J., Scheeler, M. C., Winn, J., & Ziegler, D. (2017, January). High-leverage practices in special education. Council for Exceptional Children & CEEDAR Center.
- McMahon, D. D., Cihak, D. F., Wright, R. E., & Bell, S. M. (2016). Augmented reality for teaching science vocabulary to postsecondary education students with intellectual disabilities and autism. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 48(1), 38–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2015.1103149
- Miller, B. T., Doughty, T., & Krockover, G. (2015). Using science inquiry methods to promote self-determination and problem-solving skills for students with moderate intellectual disability. Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 50(3), 356–368. www.jstor.org/stable/24827516
- Miller, B. T., Krockover, G. H., & Doughty, T. (2013). Using iPads to teach inquiry science to students with a moderate to severe intellectual disability: A pilot study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(8), 887–911. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21091 Miller, B. T., & Taber-Doughty, T. (2014). Self-monitoring checklists for inquiry problem-solving: Functional problem-solving methods for students with intellectual disability. Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 555–567. www.jstor.org/stable/24582351
- 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(4), 677–697. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-008-9133-z Moon, N. W., Todd, R. L., Morton, D. L., & Ivey, E. (2012). Accommodating students with disabilities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Center for Assistive Technology and Environmental Access, Georgia Institute of Technology. Morris, J., Slater, E., Fitzgerald, M. T., Lummis, G. W., & van Etten, E. (2021). Using local rural knowledge to enhance STEM learning for gifted and talented students in Australia. Research in Science Education, 51(1), 61–79. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-9823-2
- Mullet, D. R., Kettler, T., & Sabatini, A. (2018). Gifted students' conceptions of their high school STEM education. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 41(1), 60–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353217745156

- Mulvey, B. K., Chiu, J. L., Ghosh, R., & Bell, R. L. (2016). Special education teachers' nature of science instructional experiences. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(4), 554–578. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21311
- Mumba, F., Banda, A., & Chabalengula, V. M. (2015). Chemistry teachers' perceived benefits and challenges of inquiry-based instruction in inclusive chemistry classrooms. Science Education International, 26(1), 180–194. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1064034 Mutch-Jones, K., Puttick, G., & Minner, D. (2012). Lesson study for accessible science: Building expertise to improve practice in inclusive science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(8), 1012–1034. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21034 NAGC . (2013). NAGC CEC teacher preparation standards in gifted and talented education. www.nagc.org/resources-publications/resources/national-standards-gifted-and-talented-education
- NAGC . (2019). What is giftedness? NAGC. www.nagc.org/resources-publications/resources/what-giftedness
- Nagle, K., Newman, L. A., Shaver, D. M., & Marschark, M. (2016). College and career readiness: Course taking of deaf and hard of hearing secondary school students. American Annals of the Deaf, 160(5), 467–482. www.jstor.org/stable/26235239
- National Assessment of Educational Progress . (2018). About NAEP. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) . (2022). Students with disabilities. Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgg.National
- Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics . (2019). Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering: 2019. Special Report NSF 19–304. Alexandria, VA. www.nsf.gov/statistics/wmpd/
- NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.
- Nusbaum, E. A., & Steinborn, M. L. (2019). A "visibilizing" project: "Seeing" the ontological erasure of disability in teacher education and social studies curricula. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 34(1).
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Corwith, S. (2018). Poverty, academic achievement, and giftedness: A literature review. Gifted Child Quarterly, 62(1), 37–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986217738015
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Thomson, D. (2015). Talent development as a framework for gifted education. Gifted Child Today, 38(1), 49–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217514556531
- Plucker, J. A., & Peters, S. J. (2016). Excellence gaps in education. Harvard Education Press.
- Raven, S., & Whitman, G. M. (2019). Science in silence: How educators of the deaf and hard-of-hearing teach science. Research in Science Education, 49(4), 1001–1012. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-9847-7
- Reed, D. K., Petscher, Y., & Truckenmiller, A. J. (2017a). The contribution of general reading ability to science achievement. Reading Research Quarterly, 52(2), 253–266. www.jstor.org/stable/26622542
- Reed, D. K., Whalon, K., Lynn, D., Miller, N., & Smith, K. (2017b). A comparison of general and content-specific literacy strategies for learning science content. Exceptionality, 25(2), 77–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2016.1196441
- Reis, S. M., Baum, S. M., & Burke, E. (2014). An operational definition of twice-exceptional learners: Implications and applications. Gifted Child Quarterly, 58(3), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986214534976
- Renken, M., Scott, J., Enderle, P., & Cohen, S. (2021). "It's not a deaf thing, it's not a black thing; it's a deaf black thing." A study of the intersection of adolescents' deaf, race, and STEM identities. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 16(4), 1105–1136. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-021-10023-1
- Renzulli, J. S. (2021). The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented. In J. Renzulli & S.M. Reis (Eds.), Reflections on gifted education (pp. 193–210). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003237693-11 Reynaga-Peña, C. G., & López-Suero, C. D. (2020). Strategies and technology aids for teaching science to blind and visually impaired students. In T. D. Álvarez Robles, F. Álvarez Rodríguez, & E. Benítez-Guerrero (Ed.), User-centered software development for the blind and visually impaired: Emerging research and opportunities (pp. 26–37). IGI Global. http://doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-8539-8 ch002
- Riley, T., Webber, M., & Sylva, K. (2017). Real engagement in active problem solving for Māori boys: A case study in a New Zealand secondary school. Gifted and Talented International, 32(2), 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332276.2018.1522240
- Rinn, A. N., Mun, R. U., & Hodges, J. (2020). 2018–2019 state of the states in gifted education. National Association for Gifted Children and the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. www.nagc.org/2018-2019-state-states-gifted-education Rivera, C. J., Hudson, M. E., Weiss, S. L., & Zambone, A. (2017). Using a multicomponent multimedia shared story intervention with an iPad to teach content picture vocabulary to students with developmental disabilities. Education and Treatment of Children, 40(3), 327–352. https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2017.0014
- Rizzo, K. L., & Taylor, J. C. (2016). Effects of inquiry-based instruction on science achievement for students with disabilities: An analysis of the literature. Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities, 19(1), 16. https://doi.org/10.14448/jsesd.09.0001 Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rosenblum, L. P., Ristvey, J., & Hospitál, L. (2019). Supporting elementary school students with visual impairments in science classes. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 113(1), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X19833801
- Sanders, S., Ennis, R. P., & Losinski, M. (2018). Effects of TWA on science text comprehension of students with emotional and behavior disorders in a special day school. Education and Treatment of Children, 41(4), 483–505. http://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2018.0026
- Seifert, K., & Espin, C. (2012). Improving reading of science text for secondary students with learning disabilities: Effects of text reading, vocabulary learning, and combined approaches to instruction. Learning Disability Quarterly, 35(4), 236–247. https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948712444275
- Shifrer, D., Muller, C., & Callahan, R. (2014). Disproportionality and learning disabilities: Parsing apart race, socioeconomic status, and language. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 44(3), 246–257. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4133990/
- Smith, B. R., Spooner, F., & Wood, C. L. (2013). Using embedded computer-assisted explicit instruction to teach science to students with autism spectrum disorder. Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders, 7(3), 433–443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2012.10.010 Spektor-Levy, O., & Yifrach, M. (2019). If science teachers are positively inclined toward inclusive education, why is it so difficult? Research in Science Education, 49(3), 737–766. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9636-0
- Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence. Cambridge University Press.
- Stoeger, H., Balestrini, D. P., & Ziegler, A. (2018). International perspectives and trends in research on giftedness and talent development. In S. Pfeiffer, M. Foley-Nicpon, & E. Shaunessy-Dedrick (Eds.), APA handbook of giftedness and talent (pp. 25–39). American Psychological Association. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0000038-002

- Stokes, A., Feig, A. D., Atchison, C. L., & Gilley, B. (2019). Making geoscience fieldwork inclusive and accessible for students with disabilities. Geosphere, 15(6), 1809–1825. https://doi.org/10.1130/GES02006.1
- Subotnik, R. F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Worrell, F. C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed direction forward based on psychological science. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12(1), 3–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611418056
- Sumida, M. (2016). Scientific giftedness in Japanese society. In K. Taber & M. Sumida (Eds.), International perspectives on science education for the gifted: Key issues and challenges (pp. 126–139). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315814247
- Sumida, M., & Taber, K. S. (Eds.). (2017). Policy and practice in science education for the gifted: Approaches from diverse national contexts. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315814155
- Swanson, L. H., & Bianchini, J. A. (2015). Co-planning among science and special education teachers: How do different conceptual lenses help to make sense of the process? Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10(4), 1123–1153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9582-3
- Taber, K. S., & Sumida, M. (Eds.). (2016). International perspectives on science education for the gifted: Key issues and challenges. Routledge. ISBN 9780815360872
- Taber, K. S., Sumida, M., & McClure, L. (Eds.). (2017). Teaching gifted learners in STEM subjects: Developing talent in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Taylor & Francis.
- Taylor, J. (2016). Research-based instructional strategies in science for students with EBD. Beyond Behavior, 25(3), 34–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/107429561602500306
- Taylor, J. (2018, November 15). Assessment for all science students: Meeting science and SPED goals [Conference Presentation]. Virginia Association of Science Teachers (VAST) Donna Sterling Pre-Conference.
- Taylor, J., & Hwang, J. (2021). Science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics remote instruction for students with disabilities. Intervention in School and Clinic, 57(2), 111–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512211001858
- Taylor, J., Hwang, J., Rizzo, K. L., & Hill, D. A. (2020). Supporting science-related instruction for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities: A review and analysis of research studies. Science Educator, 27(2), 102–113.
- Taylor, J., Rizzo, K. L., Hwang, J., & Hill, D. (2020). A review of research on science instruction for students with autism spectrum disorder. School Science and Mathematics, 120(2), 116–125. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12388
- Therrien, W. J., Taylor, J. C., Hosp, J. L., Kaldenberg, E. R., & Gorsh, J. (2011). Science instruction for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26(4), 188–203.
- Therrien, W. J., Taylor, J. C., Watt, S., & Kaldenberg, E. R. (2014). Science instruction for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Remedial and Special Education, 35(1), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932513503557
- Thurston, L. P., Shuman, C., Middendorf, B. J., & Johnson, C. (2017). Postsecondary STEM education for students with disabilities: Lessons learned from a decade of NSF funding. Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 30(1), 49–60. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1144615
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). Differentiated instruction. In. J. A. Plucker & C. M. Callahan (Eds.), Critical issues and practices in gifted education: What the research says (2nd ed., pp. 197–210). Prufrock Press.
- Tsinajinie, G., Kirboyun, S., & Hong, S. (2021). An outdoor project-based learning program: Strategic support and the roles of students with visual impairments interested in STEM. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30(1), 74–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09874-0
- Tzuriel, D., Bengio, E., & Kashy-Rosenbaum, G. (2011). Cognitive modifiability, emotional-motivational factors, and behavioral characteristics among gifted versus nongifted children. Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology, 10(3), 253–279. https://doi.org/10.1891/1945–8959.10.3.253
- Van Tassel-Baska, J. B. (1995). The development of talent through curriculum. Roeper Review, 18(2), 98–102. http://doi.org/10.1080/02783199509553708
- Van Tassel-Baska, J. B., Hubbard, G. F., & Robbins, J. I. (2021). Differentiation of instruction for gifted learners: Collated evaluative studies of teacher classroom practices. In S. R. Smith (Ed.), Handbook of giftedness and talent development in the Asia-Pacific. Springer International Handbooks of Education. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3041-4 45
- Wang, C. W., & Neihart, M. (2015). Academic self-concept and academic self-efficacy: Self-beliefs enable academic achievement of twice-exceptional students. Roeper Review, 37(2), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2015.1008660
- Warner, L. R. (2008). A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research. Sex Roles, 59(5), 454–463. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9504-5
- Watt, S. J., Therrien, W. J., & Kaldenberg, E. R. (2014). Meeting the diverse needs of students with EBD in inclusive science classrooms. Beyond Behavior, 23(2), 14–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/107429561402300203
- Wei, X., Yu, J. W., Shattuck, P., & Blackorby, J. (2017). High school math and science preparation and post-secondary STEM participation for students with an autism spectrum disorder. Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 32(2), 83–92. http://doi.org/10.1177/1088357615588489
- Wexler, J., Mitchell, M. A., Clancy, E. E., & Silverman, R. D. (2017). An investigation of literacy practices in high school science classrooms. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 33(3), 258–277.
- Wild, T., Hilson, M., & Farrand, K. (2013). Conceptual understanding of geological concepts by students with visual impairments. Journal of Geoscience Education, 61(2), 222–230. https://doi.org/10.5408/12-379.1
- Wild, T., & Koehler, K. (2017). Science education. In C. Holbrook, C. Kamei-Hannan, & T. McCarthy (Eds.), Foundations of education volume II (2nd ed.). AFB Press.
- Worrell, F. C. , Subotnik, R. F. , Olszewski-Kubilius, P. , & Dixson, D. D. (2019). Gifted students. Annual Review of Psychology, 70(1), 551-576. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102846
- Wu, Y., Chen, M., Lo, Y., & Chiang, C. (2020). Effects of peer-mediated instruction with AAC on science learning and communitive responses of students with significant cognitive disabilities in taiwan. Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 45(3), 178–195. https://doi.org/10.1177/1540796919900955
- Yoon, J., Kim, K. J., & Koo, K. (2020). Enrichment program for the ethnic minority of gifted and talented students in science and engineering. International Journal of Science Education, Part B, 10(1), 36–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/21548455.2020.1714092 Zeidler, D. L. (2014). Socioscientific issues as a curriculum emphasis: Theory, research and practice. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 697–726). Routledge. https://doi-org/10.4324/9780203097267

Zimmer, K. E., McHatton, P. A., Driver, M. K., Datubo-Brown, C. A., & Steffen, C. (2018). Innovative communities: Embedding special education faculty in science methods courses. Teacher Education Quarterly, 45(4), 73–92. www.jstor.org/stable/26762170 Zygouris-Coe, V. I. (2015). Teaching discipline-specific literacies in grades 6–12: Preparing students for college, career, and workforce demands. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073162

Science Education in Urban and Rural Contexts

Abbott, I. (1992). La'au Hawai'i: Traditional Hawaiian uses of plants. Bishop Museum Press.

Abell, S. K., & Lederman, N. (Eds). (2007). Handbook of research on science education. Routledge.

Abrams, E., & Middleton, M. (2017). Towards multidimensional approaches to research on rural science education. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 12, 167–176.

Ahmed, F. Z., & Boser, U. (2014). America's leaking pipeline for teachers of color: Getting more teachers of color into the classroom. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED561065

Aikens, N. L., & Barbarin, O. (2008). Socioeconomic differences in reading trajectories: The contribution of family, neighborhood, and school contexts. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100(2), 235–251. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.2.235

Akuma, F. V., & Callaghan, R. (2019). Teaching practices linked to the implementation of inquiry-based practical work in certain science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 64–90.

Al-Balushi, S. M., & Martin-Hansen, L. (2019). The development of students' justifications for their positions regarding two theoretical models: Electron cloud or sodium chloride crystal – After engaging in different learning activities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 1011–1036.

Albrecht, N., & Upadhyay, B. (2018). What do refugee mothers want in U.S. school science: Learning from the perceptions of science of three Somali mothers. The Urban Review, 50, 604–629. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-018-0458-9

Archer, L., Dawson, E., De Witt, J., Godec, S., King, H., Mau, A., Nomikou, E., & Seakins, A. (2017). Killing curiosity? An analysis of celebrated identity performances among teachers and students in nine London secondary science classrooms. Science Education, 101, 741–764.

Archibald, J.-A. (2008). Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body and spirit. UBC Press.

Ardoin, N. M., Bowers, A. W., Roth, N. W., & Holthuis, N. (2018). Environmental education and K-12 student outcomes: A review and analysis of research, The Journal of Environmental Education, 49(1), 1–17. http://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2017.1366155 Avery, L. M. (2013). Rural science education: Valuing local knowledge. Theory Into Practice, 52(1), 28–35. http://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2013.743769

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 3–24). Macmillan.

Basu, S. J., & Barton, A. C. (2007). Developing a sustained interest in science among urban minority youth. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 466–489.

Beasley, M. A., & Fischer, M. J. (2012). Why they leave: The impact of stereotype threat on the attrition of women and minorities from science, math and engineering majors. Social Psychology of Education, 15(4), 427–448.

Beckwith, M. W. (1940). Hawaiian mythology: By Martha Beckwith. Publ. for the Folklore Foundation of Vassar College. Yale University Press, Humphrey Milford Oxford University Press.

Berkowitz, R., Moore, H., Astor, R. A., & Benbenishty, R. (2017). A research synthesis of the associations between socioeconomic background, inequality, school climate, and academic achievement. Review Educational Research, 87, 425–469. http://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316669821

Betancur, L., Votruba-Drzal, E., & Schunn, C. (2018). Socioeconomic gaps in science achievement. International Journal of STEM Education, 5(38). http://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0132-5

Bialik, K. (2018). Key findings in American life in urban, suburban and rural areas. https://pewrsr.ch/2IAXvTP

Boda, P. A., & Brown, B. (2019). Priming urban learners' attitudes toward the relevancy of science: A mixed-methods study testing the importance of context. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 567–596.

Boizonella, F. (2016). Urban culture: Definition and contextualization.

www.researchgate.net/publication/305936766_Urban_Culture_Definition_and_Contextualization

Borgerding, L. A. (2017). High school biology evaluation learning experiences in a rural context: A case of and for cultural border crossing. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 12, 53–79.

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, 878–898.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). Reproduction in education, society and culture (2nd ed.) (R. Nice, Trans.). Sage Publications.

Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 371–399. Breen, R., & Jonsson, J. O. (2005). Inequality of opportunity in comparative perspective: Recent research on educational attainment and social mobility. Annual Review of Sociology, 31, 223–243.

Brooks, A. (1997). Postfeminisms: Feminism, cultural theory and cultural forms. Routledge.

Brown, J., Ring-Whalen, E., Roehrig, G., & Ellis, J. (2018). Advancing culturally responsive science education in secondary classrooms through an induction course. International Journal of Designs for Learning, 9(1), 14–33.

Burdick-Will, J., & Logan, J. (2017). Schools at the rural-urban boundary: Blurring the divide? The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 672(1), 185–201.

Cajete, G. (1994). Look to the mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education. Kivaki Press.

Calabrese Barton, A. (2003). Teaching science for social justice. Teachers College Press.

Calabrese Barton, A. (2007). Science learning in urban settings. In S. K. Abell & N. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. I). Routledge.

Calabrese Barton, A. & Tan, E. (2009). Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 50–73. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20269

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & O'Neill, T. (2014). Science education in urban contexts: New conceptual tools and stories of possibilities. In N. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II). Routledge.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Upadhyay, B. (2010). Teaching and learning science for social justice: Introduction to the special issue. Equity and Excellence in Education, 43, 1–5.

Carlone, H., & Johnson, A. (2012). Unpacking "culture" in cultural studies of science education: Cultural difference versus cultural production. Ethnography and Education, 7, 151–173.

Chapman, A., & Feldman, A. (2017). Cultivation of science identity through authentic science in an urban high school classroom. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 12, 469–491.

Chappell, M. J., & Varelas, M. (2018). Ethnodance and identity: Black students representing science identities in the making. Science Education. 104. 193–221.

Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97(6), 1045–1060.

Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Jones, M. R., & Porter, S. R. (2018). Race and economic opportunity in the United States: An intergenerational perspective. www.equality-of-opportunity.org/assets/documents/race_paper.pdf

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, 1247–1268.

Chinn, P. W. U. (2012). Developing teachers' place-based and culture-based pedagogical content knowledge and agency. In B. J. Fraser (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education. Springer. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7 23

Chinn, P. W. U. (2014). Educating for scientific literacy, citizenship, and sustainability: Learning from Native Hawaiian perspectives. In M. P. Mueller, D. J. Tippins, & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), Assessing schools for generation R (responsibility): A guide to legislation and school policy in science education. Springer.

Chinn, P. W. U. (2015). Place and culture-based professional development: Cross-hybrid learning and the construction of ecological mindfulness. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10(1), 121–134.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, 94, S95–S120. www.jstor.org/stable/2780243

Collins, P. H. (2010). The new politics of community. American Sociological Review, 75(7), 1–30.

Collins, P. H. (2016). Intersectionality. Polity Press.

Collins, R. (2004). Interaction ritual chains. Princeton University Press.

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, 347–366.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. Stanford Law Review, 43(6), 1241–1299.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage publications.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). Critical race theory: An introduction (2nd ed.). New York University Press.

Dewey, J. (1920). Reconstruction in philosophy. H. Holt and Company.

Dickinson, J., Shirk, J., Bonter, D., Bonney, R., Crain, Martin, Phillips, T., & Purcell (2012). The current state of citizen science as a tool for ecological research and public engagement. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 10, 291–297. http://doi.org/10.1890/110236

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. American Psychologist, 55(1), 34–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.34

Diener, E. (2002). Will money increase subjective well-being? Social Indicators Research, 57, 119–169.

DiMaggio, P. (1997). Culture and cognition. Annual Review of Sociology, 23, 263–287.

Duncan, G. J., Morris, P. A., & Rodrigues, C. (2011). Does money really matter? Estimating impacts of family income on young children's achievement with data from random-assignment experiments. Development Psychology, 47, 1263–1279.

Duncan-Andrade, J., & Morrell, E. (2008). The art of critical pedagogy: Possibilities of moving from theory to practice in urban schools. Peter Lang Publishers.

Echazarra, A., & Radinger, T. (2019). Learning in rural schools: Insights from PISA, TALIS and the literature. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 196. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/8b1a5cb9-en

Emdin, C. (2010). Chapter seven: What is urban education? Counterpoints, 215, 101-111. www.jstor.org/stable/42980440

Flanagan, C., Gallay, E., Pykett, A., & Smallwood, M. (2019). The environmental commons in urban communities: The potential of place-based education. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 226. http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00226.

https://research.childrenandnature.org/research/place-based-stewardship-education-in-urban-communities-promotes-knowledge-skills-and-motivation-needed-for-sustaining-common-pool-resources/

Freire, P. (1970, 1993). Pedagogy of the oppressed (M. B. Ramos, Trans.; D. Macedo, Intro., 30th anniversary ed.). The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Fuentes, N., & Rojas, M. (2001). Economic theory and subjective well-being: Mexico. Social Indicators Research, 53, 289–314.

Gamez, R., & Parker, C. A. (2018). Becoming science learners: A study of newcomers' identity work in elementary school science. Science Education, 102, 377–413.

Gandolfi, H. E. (2020). "It's a lot of people in different places working on many ideas": Possibilities from global history of science to learning about nature of science. Journal of Research on Science Teaching, 58(4), 551–588.

Gay, G. (2000). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice. Teachers College Press.

Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. Review of Research in Education, 25, 99–125.

Gonsalves, A. (2014). "Science isn't just what we learn in school": Interaction rituals that value youth voice in out-of-school-time science. Canadian Journal of Education, 37, 185–208.

González, N. (1995). The funds of knowledge for teaching project. Practicing Anthropology, 17, 3-6.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, K. (2005). Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003a). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. Educational Researcher, 32(4), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032004003

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003b). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. American Educational Research Journal, 40(3), 619–654. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312040003619

Gutiérrez, K., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. Educational Researcher, 32, 19–25.

Hammond, L. (2001). Notes from California: An anthropological approach to urban science education for language minority families. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 983–999. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.1043

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

Harris, C. J., Penuel, W. R., D'Angelo, C. M., DeBarger, A. H., Gallagher, L. P., Kennedy, C. A., Cheng, G. H., & Krajcik, J. S. (2015). Impact of project-based curriculum materials on student learning in science: Results of a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(10), 1362–1385.

Harris, R. S., & Hodges, C. B. (2018). STEM education in rural schools: Implications of untapped potential. National Youth-At-Risk Journal, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.20429/nyarj.2018.030102

Harwell, M., & LeBeau, B. (2010). Student eligibility for a free lunch as an SES measure in education research. Educational Researcher, 39, 120–131.

Hay, R. (1998). Sense of place in developmental context. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 18, 5–29. ISSN 0272–4944. https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.1997.0060

Hill, P. W., McQuillan, J., Hebets, E. A., Spiegel, A. N., & Diamond, J. (2018). Informal science experiences among Urban and Rural youth: Exploring differences at the intersections of socioeconomic status, gender and ethnicity. Journal of STEM Outreach, 1, 1–12.

hooks, b. (1984). Feminist theory: From the margins to the center. South End Press.

Huang, X., Lederman, N. G., & Cai, C. (2017). Improving Chinese junior high school students' ability to ask critical questions. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(8), 963–987.

Iseke, J. (2013). Indigenous storytelling as research. International Review of Qualitative Research, 6(4), 559-577.

Iseke, J., & Brennus, B. (2011). Learning life lessons from Indigenous storytelling with Tom McCallum. In G. J. S. Dei (Ed.), Indigenous philosophies and critical education (pp. 245–261). Peter Lang.

Isserman, A. M. (2005). In the national interest: Defining rural and urban correctly in research and public policy. International Regional Science Review, 28(4), 465–499.

Jencks, C., & Phillips, M. (1998). The Black-White test score gap. Brookings Institution Press.

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, 4–29.

Johnson, J., Showalter, D., Klein, R., & Lester, C. (2014). Why rural matters 2013–2014: The condition of rural education in the 50 states. Rural Schools and Community Trust. www.ruraledu.org/user_uploads/file/2013-14-Why-Rural-Matters.pdf

Kane, J. M. (2015). The structure-agency dialectic in contested science spaces: "Do earthworms eat apples?" Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(4), 461–473.

Kang, H., Barton, A. C., Tan, E., Simpkins, S. D., Rhee, H., & Turner, C. (2018). How do middle school girls of color develop STEM identities? Middle school girls' participation in science activities and identification with STEM careers. Science Education, 103, 418–439.

Kassam, K. S., Avery, L. M., & Ruelle, M. J. (2017). The cognitive relevance of Indigeneous and rural: Why is it critical to survival? Cultural Studies in Science Education, 12, 97–118.

Katz, M. B. (1995). Improving poor people: The welfare state, the 'underclass', and urban schools as history. Princeton University Press.

Kealiikanakaoleohaililani, K., Kurashima, N., Francisco, K., Giardina, C., Louis, R., Mc Millen, H., Asing, C., Asing, K., Block, T., Browning, M., Camara, K., Camara, L., Dudley, M., Frazier, M., Gomes, N., Gordon, A., Gordon, M., Heu, L., Irvine, A., Kaawa, N., Kirkpatrick, S., Leucht, E., Perry, C., Replogle, J., Salbosa, L.-L., Sato, A., Schubert, L., Sterling, A., Uowolo, A., Uowolo, J., Walker, B., Whitehead, A., & Yogi, D. (2018). Ritual + sustainability science? A portal into the science of aloha. Sustainability, 10: 3478. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103478. www.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/pubs/57782

Klett, J. (2014). Sound on sound: Situating interaction in sonic object settings. Sociological Theory, 32, 147–161.

Kohut, M. (2019). Changing minds or rhetoric? How students use their many natures of science to talk about evolution. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14, 839–862.

Krueger, A., & Sutton, J. (2001). EDThoughts: What we know about science teaching and learning. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED).

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

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32(3), 465–491. Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts. Sage Publications.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.

Lederman, N. G., & Abell, S. K. (2014). Handbook of research on science education. Routledge.

Lee, S. C., Nugent, G., Kunz, G. M., Houston, J., & DeChenne-Peters, S. (2018). Case study: Value-added benefit of distance-based instructional coaching on science teachers' inquiry instruction in rural schools. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(3), 179–199. http://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1432226

Lee, V. E., & Burkam, D. T. (2002). Inequality at the starting gate: Social background differences in achievement as children begin school. Economic Policy Institute.

Lester, F. (2005). On the theoretical, conceptual, and philosophical foundations for research in mathematics education. International Reviews on Mathematical Education, 37(6), 457–467.

Lucero, M. M., Petrosino, A. J., & Delgado, C. (2017). Exploring the relationship between secondary science teachers' subject matter knowledge and knowledge of student conceptions while teaching evolution by natural selection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(2), 219–246.

Maarseveen, R. V. (2020). The urban rural-education gap: Do cities indeed make us smarter? www.cpb.nl/sites/default/files/omnidownload/CPB-Discussion-Paper-412-The-urban-rural-education-gap.pdf

Maerten-Rivera, J., Myers, N., Lee, O., & Penfield, R. (2010), Student and school predictors of high-stakes assessment in science. Science Education, 94, 937–962.

Mangiante, E. S. (2018). Planning for reform-based science: Case studies of two urban elementary teachers. Research in Science Education, 48, 207–232.

Marco-Bujosa, L. M., McNeill, K. L., & Friedman, A. A. (2020). Becoming an urban science teacher: How beginning teachers negotiate contradictory school contexts. Journal of Research on Science Teaching, 57(1), 3–32.

Mark, S. (2018). A bit of both science and economics: A non-traditional STEM identity narrative. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 13, 983–1003.

Mark, S., Id-Deen, L., & Thomas, S. (2020). Getting to the root of the matter: Pre-service teachers' experiences and positionalities with learning to teach in culturally diverse contexts. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15, 453–483.

Martinez, A., & Christnacht, C. (2021, January 26). Women are nearly half of U.S. workforce but only 27% of STEM workers. www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/01/women-making-gains-in-stem-occupations-but-still-underrepresented.html

Maui News (2017, October 6). DAR: October sees greatest number of shark bites. https://mauinow.com/2017/10/06/dar-october-sees-greatest-number-of-shark-bites/

McIntyre, E., Swazy, R. A., & Greer, S. (2001). Agricultural field day. Linking rural cultures to school lessons. In E. McIntyre, A. Rosebery, & N. González (Eds.), Classroom diversity. Connecting curriculum to students' lives (pp. 76–84). Heinemann.

McNeill, K. L., Gonzalez-Howard, M., Katsh-Singer, R., & Loper, S. (2017). Moving beyond pseudoargumentation: Teachers' enactments of an educative science curriculum focused on argumentation. Science Education, 101, 426–457.

Moll, L. (2005). Reflections and possibilities. In N. González, L. Moll, & C. Amanti (Eds.), Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms (pp. 278–287). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Moll, L., 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, 132–141.

Moll, L., & González, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language minority children. Journal of Reading Behavior, 25, 439–456. Morales-Doyle, D. (2016). Students as curriculum critics: Standpoints with respect to relevance, goals, and science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 749–773.

Morgan, P. L., Farkas, G., Hillemeier, M. M., & Maczuga, S. (2016). Science achievement gaps begin very early, persist, and are largely explained by modifiable factors. Educational Researcher, 45, 18–35.

Mueller, C. W., & Parcel, T. L. (1981). Measures of socioeconomic status: Alternatives and recommendations. Child Development, 52(1), 13–20. https://doi.org/10.2307/1129211

Murphy, S. (2020). Science education success in a rural Australian school: Practices and arrangements contributing to high senior science enrolments and achievement in an isolated rural school. Research in Science Education, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09947-5

National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP] . (2019). The nations report card.

www.nationsreportcard.gov/science/nation/achievement/?grade=4

National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] . (2017). Digest of education statistics. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest National Forum of Educational Statistics . (2015). Improving the measurement of socioeconomic status for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: A theoretical foundation. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/research-center/socioeconomic_factors.pdf National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. The National Academies Press.

National Research Council [NRC] . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18290

Nisbet, J. (2005). What is educational research? Changing perspectives through the 20th century. Research Papers in Education, 20(1), 25-44. doi:10.1080/0267152052000341327

Nixon, R. S., Luft, J. A., & Ross, R. J. (2017). Prevalence and predictors of out-of-field teaching in the first year. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(9), 1197–1218.

Nugent, G., Kunz, G., Houston, J., Wu, C., Patwardhan, I., Lee, S., DeChenne-Peters, S. E., & Luo, L. (2018). The effectiveness of a summer institute and remotely delivered science instructional coaching in middle and high school. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(8), 760–784.

OECD . (2015), PISA 2015 technical report, www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2015-technical-report/

Olitsky, S. (2021). Identity, agency, and the internal conversation of science and math teachers implementing instructional reforms in high-need urban schools. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 16, 19–45.

Oliver, J. S. (2007). Rural science education. In S. K. Abell & N. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. I). Routledge.

Oliver, J. S., & Hodges, G. W. (2014). Rural science education: New ideas, redirections, and broadened definitions. In N. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II). Routledge.

Orr, A. J. (2003). Black-white differences in achievement: The importance of wealth. Sociology of Education, 76, 281–304.

Paprzycki, P., Tuttle, N., Czerniak, C. M., Molitor, S., Kadervaek, J., & Mendnhall, R. (2017). The impact of a framework-aligned science professional development program on literacy and mathematics achievement of K-3 students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(9), 1174–1196.

Paris, D., & Alim, S. H. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. Harvard Educational Review, 84, 85–100.

Permentier, M., Bolt, G., & van Ham, M. (2011). Determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction and perception of neighbourhood reputation. Urban Studies, 48, 977–996. http://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010367860

Posner, G. J. (2004). Analyzing the curriculum. McGraw Hill.

Pringle, R. M., Mesa, J., & Hayes, L. (2020). Meeting the demands of science reforms: A comprehensive professional development for practicing middle school teachers. Research in Science Education, 50, 709–737.

Pukui, M. K. (1983). 'Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian proverbs & poetical sayings. Bishop Museum Press.

Quansah, R. E., Sakyi-Hagan, N. A., & Essiam, C. (2019). Challenges affecting the teaching and learning of integrated science in rural junior high schools in Ghana. Science Education International, 30(4), 329–333.

Rahm, J., & Moore, J. C. (2016). A case study of long-term engagement and identity-in-practice: Insights into the STEM pathways of four underrepresented youths. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(5), 768–801.

Ramnarain, U. (2016). Understanding the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on inquiry-based science education at township schools in South African. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(4), 598–619.

Reed, K. (2010). Multicultural education for rural schools: Creating relevancy in rural America. The Rural Educator, 31(2), 15–20.

Ridgeway, M. L., & Yerrick, R. K. (2018). Whose banner are we waving? Exploring STEM partnerships for marginalized urban youth. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13, 59–84.

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 Childhood Development and Care, 178, 527–536.

Rios-Aguilar, C., Kiyama, J. M., Gravitt, M., & Moll, L. (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, 163–184.

Rivard, L. P., & Gueye, N. R. (2016). Enhancing literacy practices in science classrooms through a professional development program for Canadian minority language teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 38(7), 1150–1173. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1183267

Rivera Maulucci, M. S. (2010). Resisting the marginalization of science in an urban school: Coactivating social, cultural, materials, and strategic resources. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 840–860.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking. Cognitive development in social context. Oxford University Press.

Rosebery, A. A., Warren, B., & Raymond, E. T. (2016). Developing interpretive power in science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(10), 1571–1600.

Rutkowskia, D., Rutkowskia, L., Wild, J., & Burroughs, N. (2018). Poverty and educational achievement in the U.S.: A less-biased estimate using PISA 2012 data. Journal of Children and Poverty, 24, 47–67.

Saleh, A., Yuxin, C., Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Glazewski, K., Mott, B. W., & Lester, J. C. (2020). Coordinating scaffolds for collaborative inquiry in a game-based learning environment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 1490–1518.

Sandholtz, J. H., & Ringstaff, C. (2016). The influence of contextual factors on the sustainability of professional development outcomes. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(2), 205–226.

Schafft, K. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2010). Rural education for the twenty-first century: Identity, place, and community in a globalizing world. The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Schilke, O., & Rossman, G. (2018). It's only wrong if it's transactional: Moral perceptions of obfuscated exchange. American Sociological Review, 83, 1079–1107.

Schleicher, A. (2018). World class: How to build a 21st-century school system, strong performers and successful reformers in education. OECD Publishing. https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264300002-en

Scogin, S. C., & Stuessy, C. L. (2015). Encouraging greater student inquiry engagement in science through motivational support by online scientist-mentors. Science Education, 99(2), 312–349.

Sedawi, W., Assaraf, O. B. Z., & Reiss, M. J. (2020). Indigeneous children's connectedness to nature: The potential influence of culture, gender and exposure to a contaminated environment. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 15, 955–989.

Semken, S., Ward, E. G., Moosavi, S., & Chinn, P. W. U. (2017). Place-based education in geoscience: Theory, research, practice, and assessment. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 542–562. http://doi.org/10.5408/17-276.1

Shemwell, J. T., Avargil, S., & Capps, D. (2015). Grappling with long-term learning in science: A qualitative study of teachers' views of developmentally oriented instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(8), 1163–1187.

Shepherd, H. (2011), The cultural context of cognition: What the implicit association test tells us about how culture works. Sociological Forum, 26, 121–143.

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, 713–726.

Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. Review of Educational Research, 75(3), 417–453. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003417

Smith, L. T. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. University of Oxford Press.

Sorhagen, N. S. (2013). Early teacher expectations disproportionately affect poor children's high school performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 105(2), 465–477. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031754

Stance, L. J. (2012). Tough fronts: The impact of street culture on schooling. Routledge.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(5), 797–811. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.797

Sternberg, T. (2003). What is an "expert student?" Educational Researcher, 32, 5-9.

Stockard, J., Rohlfing, C. M., & Richment, G. L. (2021, January 26). Equity for women and underrepresented minorities in STEM: Graduate experiences and career plans in chemistry. PNAS, 118(4), e2020508118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2020508118

Stovall, D. (2006). We can relate: Hip-hop culture, critical pedagogy, and the secondary classroom. Urban Education, 41, 585–602. Sundararaman, I. (2020). "World would move ahead!": Exploring the learning of science and aspirations in the urban context through a case study. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 15, 775–792.

Tan, C. Y., Liu, P., & Wong, W. L. V. (2020). Different patterns of relationships between principal leadership and 15-year-old students' science learning: How school resources, teacher quality, and school socioeconomic status make a difference. Frontiers of Psychology, 11, 1–19.

Trends in International Mathematics and Scientific Studies [TIMMS] . (2019). TIMMS 2019 international results in mathematics and science. https://timss2019.org/reports/

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). Space and place: The perspective of experience. University of Minnesota Press.

United States Department of Agriculture [USDA] . (2019). Rural poverty and well-being. www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being/

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. (2010). Elementary school science teachers' perceptions of social justice: A study of two elementary teachers. Equity and Excellence in Education, 43, 56–71.

Upadhyay, B., Atwood, E., & Tharu, B. (2020). Actions for sociopolitical consciousness in a high school science class: A case study of ninth grade class with predominantly indigenous students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(7), 1119–1147. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21626

Upadhyay, B., Atwood, E., & Tharu, B. (2021). Antiracist pedagogy in a high school science class: A case of high school science teacher in an Indigenous high school. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(5), 518–536. http://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1869886

Upadhyay, B., & Gifford, A. (2011). Changing lives: Coteaching immigrant students in a middle school science classroom. In C.

Murphy & K. Scantlebury (Eds.), Coteaching in international contexts: Research and practice (pp. 267–283). Springer.

Upadhyay, B., Maruyama, G., & Albrecht, N. (2017). Taking an active stance: How urban elementary students connect sociocultural experiences in learning science. International Journal of Science Education, 39, 2528–2547.

Valencia, R. (2010). Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice. Taylor and Francis.

van Ewijk, R., & Sleegers, P. (2010). Peer ethnicity and achievement: A meta-analysis into the compositional effect. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 21, 237–265.

Varelas, M., Morales-Doyle, D., Raza, S., Segura, D., Canales, K., & Mitchener, C. (2017). Community organizations' programming and the development of community science teachers. Science Education, 102, 60–84.

Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G., & Greenberg, J. B. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among US-Mexican households. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 23, 313–335.

Villalba, C. M. H. (2014). Socioeconomic status (SES). In A. C. Michalos (Ed.), Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research (pp. 267–311). Springer.

Vyas, S., & Kumaranayake, L. (2006). Constructing socio-economic status indices: How to use principal components analysis. Health Policy and Planning, 21, 459–468.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978a). Socio-cultural theory. Mind in Society, 6, 52-58.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978b). Speech and thinking. In R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), Collected works (Vol. 1, N. Minick, Trans., pp. 39–285). Plenum.

Wacquant, L. (2007). Territorial stigmatization in the age of advanced marginality. Thesis Eleven, 91(1), 66–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513607082003

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. Science. 331, 1447–1451.

Wang, M., Kleit, R. G., Cover, J., & Fowler, C. S. (2012). Spatial variation in the US poverty: Beyond metropolitan and non-metropolitan. Urban Studies, 49(3), 563–585.

Welsh, R. O., & Swain, W. A. (2020). (Re)defining urban education: A conceptual review and empirical exploration of the definition of urban education. Educational Researcher, 49(2), 90–100.

Wendell, K. B., Swenson, J. E. S., & Dalvi, T. S. (2018). Epistemological framing and novice elementary teachers' approaches to learning and teaching engineering design. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 956–982.

Wertsch, J. (1991). Voices in the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. Harvard University Press.

Williams, R. (1995). The sociology of culture. University of Chicago Press.

Wilson-Lopez, A., Sias, C., Smithee, A., & Hasbun, I. M. (2018). Forms of science capital mobilized in adolescents' engineering practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(2), 246–270.

Wong, B. (2015). Careers "from" but not "in" science: Why are aspirations to be a scientist challenging for minority ethnic students? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(7). 979–1002.

Yang, Y., Liu, X., & Gardella Jr., J. A. (2019). Effects of a professional development program on science teacher knowledge and practice, and student understanding of interdisciplinary science concepts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 1028–1057. Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. Race Ethnicity and Education, 8, 69–91.

Zimmerman, H. T., & Weible, J. L. (2017). Learning in and about rural places: Connections and tensions between students' everyday experiences and environmental quality issues in their community. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 12, 7–31.

Zipin, L. (2009). Dark funds of knowledge, deep funds of pedagogy: Exploring boundaries between life-worlds and schools. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 30(3), 317–331. http://doi.org/10.1080/01596300903037044

Culturally Responsive Science Education for Indigenous and Ethnic Minority Students

Aikenhead, G. S. (2017). Enhancing school mathematics culturally: A path of reconciliation. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 17(2), 73–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/14926156.2017.1308043

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.

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 of instructional planning. International Journal of Science Education, 27(1), 15–42.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Improving science teachers' conceptions of nature of science: A critical review of literature. International Journal of Science Education, 22(7), 665–701.

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

Aikenhead, G. S., & Elliot, D. (2010). An emerging decolonizing science education in Canada. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 10(4), 321–338.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Ogawa, M. (2007). Indigenous science revisited. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 2(3), 539–620. Akena, F. A. (2012). Critical analysis of the production of Western knowledge and its implications for Indigenous knowledge and decolonization. Journal of Black Studies, 43(6), 599–619.

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

and Science Education, 5(3), 287-318.

Beets, P., & Le Grange, L. (2005). "Africanising" assessment practices: Does the notion of ubuntu hold any promise? South African Journal of Higher Education, 19, 1197–1207.

Bishop, A. J. (1990). Western mathematics: The secret weapon of cultural imperialism. Race and Class, 32(2), 51–63.

Botha, M. M. (2007). Africanising the curriculum: An exploratory study. South African Journal of Higher Education, 21(2), 202-216.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, J. D. (1992). An invitation to reflective sociology. The University of Chicago Press.

Brock-Utne, B., Desai, Z., & Qorro, M. (Eds.). (2006). Focus on fresh data on the language of instruction debate in Tanzania and South Africa. African Minds.

Cajete, G. A. (1999). Igniting the sparkle: An indigenous science education model. Kivaki Press.

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.

Chisholm, I. M. (1994). Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 14, 43–67.

Chomsky, N. (2000). Language and thought. Moyer Bell.

Cronje, A., De Beer, J., & Ankiewicz, P. (2015). The development and use of an instrument to investigate science teachers' views on indigenous knowledge. African Journal for Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 19(3), 319–332.

Davis, S. H., & Ebbe, K. (1995). Traditional knowledge and sustainable development. Proceedings of a conference held at the World Bank.

Dei, G. J. S., Hall, B. L., & Rosenberg, D. G. (2000). Indigenous knowledges in global contexts: Multiple readings in our world. Toronto University of Toronto Press.

Department of Basic Education . (2011). Curriculum and assessment policy statement grades 10–12. Physical sciences. Government Printing Works.

Department of Education . (2002). Revised national curriculum statement for grades R-9 (Schools) – Natural sciences. Department of Education.

Desai, Z., Qorro, M., & Brock-Utne, B. (2010). Educational challenges in multilingual societies. African Minds.

Diwu, C., & Ogunniyi, M. B. (2012). Dialogical argumentation instruction as a catalytic agent for the integration of school science with indigenous knowledge systems. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 16(3), 333–347.

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

Erduran, S., Simon, S., & Osborne, J. (2004). TAPping into argumentation: Development in the use of Toulmin's argumentation pattern in studying science discourse. Science Education, 88, 915–953.

Fuhai, A. (2017). The basis for integrating local knowledge into the school curriculum for Tibetans in Southern Gansu. Chinese Education & Society, 50(1), 12–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2016.1262182

Garroutte, E. M. (1999). American Indian science education: The second test. American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 23, 91–114.

Ghebru, S., & Ogunniyi, M. (2017). Pre-service science teachers' understanding of argumentation. African Journal of Research in Mathematics. Science and Technology Education, 21(1), 49–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/18117295.2016.1254493

Gilday, C. (1995). Traditional knowledge, land, and the environment. In S. H. Davis & K. Ebbe (Eds.), Traditional knowledge and sustainable development (pp. 9–10). Proceedings of a conference held at the World Bank.

Gill, D., & Levidow, L. (1989). Anti-racist science teaching. Free Association Books.

Govender, N. (2011). South African primary school teachers' scientific and indigenous conceptions of the earth-moon-sun system. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 15(2), 154–167.

Gunstone, R., & White, R. (2000). Goals, methods and achievements of research in science education. In R. Millar, J. Leach, & J. Osborne (Eds.), Improving science education: The contribution of research. Open University Press.

Habermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and human interest. Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1999). The inclusion of the other, MIT Press.

Hewson, M. G. (2015). Embracing indigenous knowledge in science and medical teaching. Springer.

Hewson, M. G., & Ogunniyi, M. B. (2011). Argumentation-teaching as a method to introduce indigenous knowledge into science classrooms: Opportunities and challenges. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6(3), 679–692.

Iwuanyanwu, P. N. (2020). Nature of problem-solving skills for 21st Century STEM Learners: What teachers need to know. Journal of STEM Teacher Education. 55 (1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.30707/JSTE55.1/MMDZ8325

Iwuanyanwu, P. N. (2022). What students gain by learning through argumentation. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 34(1), 97–107.

Iwuanyanwu, P. N., & Ogunniyi, M. B. (2018). Scientific and indigenous worldviews of pre-service teachers in an interactive learning environment. In L. M. Semali & A. Singambi -(Eds.), Proceedings of the 4th Annual Conference of the African Association for the Study of Indigenous Knowledge Systems (pp. 287–304).

Iwuanyanwu, P. N., & Ogunniyi, M. B. (2020). Effects of Dialogical Argumentation Instructional Model on pre-service teachers' ability to solve conceptual mathematical problems in physics. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 24(1), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/18117295.2020.1748325

Khuzwayo, H., & Ogunniyi, M. B. (2016). Ending the "occupation of our minds": The adoption of Ubuntu in teaching and learning of mathematics and science. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of the African Association for the Study of Indigenous Knowledge Systems (pp. 123–132). Universidade Pedagogica.

Kim, M. (2017). Indigenous knowledge in Canadian science curricula: Cases from Western Canada. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12, 605–613. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-016-9759-z

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.

McComas, W. F. (1998). The nature of science in science education: Rationales and strategies. Dordreecht: Kluver Academic Publishers.

McKinley, E., & Gan, J. S. (2014). Culturally responsive science education for indigenous and ethnic minority students. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Bell (Eds.), Second handbook of research in science education. Routledge.

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 of science education handbook (pp. 541–554). Springer.

Moyo, P., & Kizito, R. (2014). Prospects and challenges of using argumentation instructional method to indigenous school science teaching. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 18(2), 113–124.

McKinley, E. (2005). Locating the global: Culture, language and science education for indigenous students. International Journal of Science Education, 27(2), 27–41.

Msimanga, A., Denley, P., & Gumede, N. (2017). The pedagogical role of language in science teaching and learning in South Africa: A review of research 1990–2015. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 21(3), 245–255. Nichol, R., & Robinson, J. (2000). Pedagogical challenges in making mathematics relevant for indigenous Australians. International

Journal of Mathematics Education in Science & Technology, 31(4), 495–505.

Ogawa, M. (1995). Science education in a multiscience perspectives. Science Education, 79(5), 583–593.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (1988). Adapting western science to traditional African culture. International Journal of Science Education, 10(1), 1–9. Ogunniyi, M. B. (2004). The challenge of preparing and equipping science teachers in higher education with knowledge and skills to

or preparing and equipping science teachers in higher education with knowledge and skills to integrate science and indigenous knowledge systems for learners. South African Journal of Higher Education, 18(3), 289–304.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (2007a). Teachers' stances and practical arguments regarding a science-indigenous knowledge curriculum, paper 1. International Journal of Science Education, 29(8), 963–985.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (2007b). Teachers' stances and practical arguments regarding a science-indigenous knowledge curriculum, paper 2. International Journal of Science Education, 29(10), 1189–1207.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (2011). The context of training teachers to implement a socially relevant science education in Africa. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 15(3), 98–121.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (2017). African indigenous cosmologies and the African way of life. Plenary paper. Proceedings of the African Association for the Study of Indigenous Knowledge Systems (pp. 14–26). University of the Witwatersrand.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (2020). Tapping the potential of ubuntu for a science that promotes social justice and moral responsibility. In H. A. Yacoubian & L. H. Hansson (Eds.), Nature of science for social justice (pp. 157–176). Springer.

Ogunniyi, M. B., & Rollnick, M. (2015). Pre-service science teacher education in Africa: Prospects and challenges. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26, 65–79.

Popper, K. (2001). All life is problem solving. Routledge and Human Sciences Research Council.

Reddy, V., Visser, M., Winnaar, L., Arends, F., Juan, A., Prinsloo, C. H., & Isdale, K. (2016). TIMSS 2015: Highlights of mathematics and science achievement of grade 9 South African learners. Human Sciences Research Council. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11910/10673

Rodney, W. (2005). How Europe underdeveloped Africa. Panaf Publishing, Inc.

Rogan, J. M., & Grayson, D. J. (2003). Towards a theory of curriculum implementation with particular reference to science education in developing countries. International Journal of Science Education, 25(10), 1171–1204.

Skoumios, M. (2009). The effect of socio-cognitive conflict on students' dialogical Argumentation about floating and sinking. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 4(4), 381–399.

Snively, G., & Corsiglia, J. (2001). Discovering indigenous science: Implications for science education. Science Education, 85(1), 6–34.

Sotero, M. C., Alves, Â. G. C., Arandas, J. K. G., & Modeiros, M. F. T. (2020). Local and scientific knowledge in the school context: Characterization and content of published works. Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine, 16, 23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13002-020-00373-5

Thomson, N. (2010). Science education researchers as orthographers: Documenting keiyo (Kenya) knowledge, learning and narratives about snakes. International Journal of Science Education, 25(1), 89–115.

Wane, N. N. (2009). Indigenous education and cultural resistance: A decolonizing project. Curriculum Inquiry, 39(1), 159–178. Webb, P. (2013). Xhosa indigenous knowledge: Stakeholder awareness, valeu, and choice. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11, 89–110.

Yacoubian, H. A., & Hansson, L. (2020). Nature of science for social justice. Springer.

Ziman, J. (2000). Real science: What it is, and what it means. Cambridge University Press.

Discourse Practices in Science Learning

Agar, M. (1991). The biculture in bilingual. Language in Society, 20(2), 167-182.

Agar, M. (1994). The intercultural frame. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18(2), 221–237.

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

Alim, H. S., & Smitherman, G. (2012). Articulate while Black: Barack Obama, language, and race in the US. Oxford University Press. Aronowitz, S. (1988). Science as power: Discourse and ideology in modern society. University of Minnesota Press.

Arons, A. B. (1977). The various language: An inquiry approach to the physical sciences. Oxford University Press.

Asterhan, C. S. C. (2013). Epistemic and interpersonal dimension of peer argumentation: Conceptualization and quantitative assessment. In M. Baker, J. Andriessen, & S. Järvelä (Eds.), Affective learning together. Social and emotional dimensions of collaborative learning (pp. 251–271). Routledge.

Ault, C. R. (1998). Criteria of excellence for geological inquiry: The necessity of ambiguity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35, 189–212.

Avraamidou, L. (2020a). Science identity as a landscape of becoming: Rethinking recognition and emotions through an intersectionality lens. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15, 323–345. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09954-7

Avraamidou, L. (2020b). "I am a young immigrant woman doing physics and on top of that I am Muslim": Identities, intersections, and negotiations. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 311–341.

Baker, M., Andriessen, J., & Järvelä, S. (Eds.). (2013). Introduction: Visions of learning together. In M. Baker, J. Andriessen, & S. Järvelä (Eds.), Affective learning together. Social and emotional dimensions of collaborative learning (pp. 1–30). Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.

Ballenger, C. (1997). Social identities, moral narratives, scientific argumentation: Science talk in a bilingual classroom. Language and Education, 11(1), 1-14.

Barton, A. C., & Tan, E. (2010). We be burnin'! Agency, identity, and science learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19(2), 187–229.

Bazerman, C. (1982). Discourse paths of different disciplines. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, Los Angeles.

Bazerman, C. (1988). Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science. University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C. (2006). Analyzing the multidimensionality of texts. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), Handbook of complementary methods in education research (pp. 77–94). American Educational Research Association.

Bell, P., & Linn, M. C. (2000). Scientific arguments as learning artifacts: Designing for learning from the web with KIE. International Journal of Science Education, 22, 797–817.

Bellocchi, A. (2019). Early career science teacher experiences of social bonds and emotion management. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 322–347.

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.

Bravo-Torija, B., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2018). Developing an initial learning progression for the use of evidence in decision-making contexts. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 16, 619–638.

Brocos, P., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2020). What to eat here and now: Contextualization of scientific argumentation from a place-based perspective. In I. Sanchez-Tapia (Ed.), International perspectives on the contextualization of science education (pp. 15–46). Springer.

Brown, B. A. (2004). Discursive identity: Assimilation into the culture of science and its implications for minority students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 810–834.

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., Donovan, B., & Wild, A. (2019). Language and cognitive interference: How using complex scientific language limits cognitive performance. Science Education, 103, 750–769.

Brown, B. A., Mangram, C., Sun, K., Cross, K., & Raab, E. (2017). Representing racial identity: Identity, race, the construction of the African American STEM students. Urban Education, 52(2), 170–206.

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., & Ryoo, K. (2008). Teaching science as a language: A "content-first" approach to science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 529–553.

Brown, B. A., & Spang, E. (2008). Double talk: Synthesizing everyday and science language in the classroom. Science Education, 92, 708–732.

Buxton, C. A., Allexsaht-Snider, M., & Rivera, C. (2013). Science, language, and families: Constructing a model of steps to college through language-rich science inquiry. In J. A. Bianchini, V. L. Akerson, A. C. Barton, O. Lee, & A. J. Rodriguez (Eds.), Moving the equity agenda forward (pp. 241–259). Springer Netherlands.

Buxton, C. A., & Lee, O. (2014). English learners in science education. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 204–222). Routledge.

Cameron, D. (2001). Working with spoken discourse. Sage.

Campbell, Y. C., & Filimon, C. (2018). Supporting the argumentative writing of students in linguistically diverse classrooms: An action research study. RMLE Online, 41(1), 1-10.

Chappell, M. J., & Varelas, M. (2020). Ethnodance and identity: Black students representing science identities in the making. Science Education, 104, 193–221.

Charamba, E. (2020). Translanguaging in a multilingual class: A study of the relation between students' languages and epistemological access in science. International Journal of Science Education, 42, 1779–1798.

Chen, H.-T., Wang, H.-H., Lu, Y.-Y., & Hong, Z.-R. (2019). Bridging the gender gap of children's engagement in learning science and argumentation through a modified argument-driven inquiry. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17(4), 635–655.

Cheuk, T. (2016). Discourse practices in the new standards: The role of argumentation in common core-era next generation science standards classrooms for English language learners. The Electronic Journal for Research in Science & Mathematics Education, 20(3).

Chinn, C. A., Barzilai, S., & Duncan, R. G. (2020). Disagreeing about how to know. The instructional value of explorations into knowing. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 167–180.

Chinn, C. A., Rinehart, R. W., & Buckland, L. A. (2014). Epistemic cognition and evaluating information: Applying the AIR model of epistemic cognition. In D. Rapp & J. Braasch (Eds.), Processing inaccurate information (pp. 425–454). MIT Press.

Clegg, T., & Kolodner, J. (2014). Scientizing and cooking: Helping middle-school learners develop scientific dispositions. Science Education, 98, 36–63.

Córdova, R. A., & Balcerzak, P. (2016). Co-constructing cultural landscapes for disciplinary learning in and out of school: The next generation science standards and learning progressions in action. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11, 1223–1242.

Culbertson, J. , & Adger, D. (2014). Language learners privilege structured meaning over surface frequency. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111, 5842-5847.

Davis, J. P., & Bellocchi, A. (2018). Objectivity, subjectivity, and emotion in school science inquiry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 1419–1447.

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

Duncan, R. G., Chinn, C. A., & Barzilai, S. (2018). Grasp of evidence: Problematizing and expanding the next generation science standards' conceptualization of evidence. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 907–937.

Duschl, R. A. (2020). Practical reasoning and decision making in science: Struggles for truth. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 187–192.

Duschl, R. A., & Osborne, J. (2002). Supporting and promoting argumentation discourse in science education. Studies in Science Education, 38, 39–72.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2016). Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model (5th ed.). Pearson.

Elby, A., Macrander, C., & Hammer, D. (2016). Epistemic cognition in science. In J. A. Greene, W. A. Sandoval, & I. Bråten (Eds.), Handbook of epistemic cognition. Routledge.

Emdin, C. (2010). Urban science education for the hip-hop generation. Sense Publishers Rotterdam.

Enderle, P., Cohen, S., & Scott, J. (2020). Communicating about science and engineering practices and the nature of science: An exploration of American Sign Language resources. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 968–995.

Enderle, P., Grooms, J., & Sampson, V. (2013). The use of argumentation in science education to promote the development of science proficiency: A comparative case study. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, Fall 2013, 1–10. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED564062

Erduran, S. (2001). Philosophy of chemistry: An emerging field with implications for chemistry education. Science & Education, 10, 581–593.

Erduran, S. (2020). Nature of "STEM"? Science & Education, 29, 781–784.

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, 915–933.

Erickson, F. (1982). Money tree, lasagna bush, salt and pepper: Social construction of topical cohesion in a conversation among Italian-Americans. Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk, 43–70.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Blackwell Publishing.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, 2, 357–378.

Fang, Z. (2005). Scientific literacy: A systemic functional linguistics perspective. Science Education, 89, 335–347.

Feinstein, N. W., & Waddington, D. I. (2020). Individual truth judgments or purposeful, collective sensemaking? Rethinking science education's response to the post-truth era. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 155–166.

Ferguson, J. (2018). Students are not inferential-misfits: Naturalising logic in the science classroom. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 51(8), 852–865.

Ferguson, J., & Prain, V. (2020). Revisiting Peirce's account of scientific creativity to inform classroom practice. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 52(5), 524–534.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. Harvard Educational Review, 85(2), 149–171.

Ford, M. J. (2015). Educational implications of choosing "practice" to describe science in the next generation science standards. Science Education, 99, 1041–1048.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977. Vintage.

Fourez, G. (1988). Ideologies and science teaching. Bulletin of Science Technology & Society, 8, 269-277.

Franco, L. G., & Munford, D. (2021). The hourglass approach: Analysing science classroom discursive interactions through an intercontextual lens. Research in Science Education, 51, 13–33.

Friedrich, P. (1989). Language, ideology, and political economy. American Anthropologist, 91(2), 295-312.

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). St. Martins.

Gee, J. P. (2014). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method. Routledge.

Gee, J. P. , & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. Review of Research in Education, 23, 119-169.

Gilbert, A., & Yerrick, R. (2001). Same school, separate worlds: A sociocultural study of identity, resistance, and negotiation in a rural, lower track science classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 574–598.

Gilbert, J. K., Boulter, C. J., & Elmer, R. (2000). Positioning models in science education and in design and technology education. In Developing models in science education (pp. 3–17). Springer.

Godec, S. (2018). Sciencey girls: Discourse supporting working-class girls to identity with science. Education Sciences, 8(19), 1–19. González-Howard, M., & McNeill, K. L. (2016). Learning in a community of practice: Factors impacting English-learning students' engagement in scientific argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53, 527–553.

González-Howard, M., & McNeill, K. L. (2019). Teachers' framing of argumentation goals: Working together to develop individual versus communal understanding. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 821–844.

González-Howard, M., McNeill, K. L., Marco-Bujosa, L. M., & Proctor, C. P. (2017). "Does it answer the question or is it French fries?": An exploration of language supports for scientific argumentation. International Journal of Science Education, 39, 528–547.

Green, J. L., Baker, W. D., Chian, M., Vanderhoof, C., Hooper, L., Kelly, G. J., Skukauskaite, A., & Kalainoff, M. (2020). Studying the over-time construction of knowledge in education settings: A microethnographic-discourse analysis approach. Review of Research in Education, 44, 161–194.

Green, J. L., & Bloome, D. (1997). Ethnography and ethnographers of and in education: A situated perspective. In J. Flood, S. B.

Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), Research on teaching and literacy through the communicative and visual arts (pp. 181–202). Macmillan.

Green, J. L., & Kelly, G. J. (2019). How we look at discourse: Definitions of sociolinguistic units. In G. J. Kelly & J. L. Green (Eds.), Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education (pp. 264–270). Routledge.

Grimes, P., McDonald, S., & van Kampen, P. (2019). "We're getting somewhere": Development and implementation of a framework for the analysis of productive science discourse. Science Education, 103, 5–36.

Grob, R., Holmeier, M., & Labudde, P. (2017). Formative assessment to support students' competences in inquiry-based science education. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 11(2), 6.

Gullberg, A., Andersson, K., Danielsson, A., Scantlebury, K., & Hussénius, A. (2018). Pre-service teachers' views of the child – Reproducing or challenging gender stereotypes in science in preschool. Research in Science Education, 48, 691–715.

- 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). Blackwell Publishing.
- Hakuta, K., Santos, M., & Fang, Z. (2013). Challenges and opportunities for language learning in the context of the CCSS and the NGSS. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56(6), 451–454.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. Linguistics and Education, 5(2), 93-116.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. (1993). Writing science: Literacy and discursive power. Falmer Press.
- Haraway, D. (2003). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief, 2003, 21–46.
- Harding, S. (Ed.). (2011). The postcolonial science and technology studies reader. Duke University Press.
- Harman, R., Buxton, C., Cardozo-Gaibisso, L., Jiang, L., & Bui, K. (2020). Culturally sustaining systemic functional linguistics praxis in science classrooms. Language and Education, 1–17.
- Hasni, A., Bousadra, F., Belletete, V., Benabdallah, A., Nicole, M.-C., & Dumais, N. (2016). Trends in research on project-based science and technology teaching and learning at K 12 levels: A systematic review. Studies in Science Education, 52(2), 199–231.
- Henderson, J. B., McNeill, K. L., González-Howard, M., Close, K., & Evans, M. (2018). Key challenges and future directions for educational research on scientific argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 5–18.
- 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.
- Hodson, D. (2003). Time for action: Science education for an alternative future. International Journal of Science Education, 25, 645–670.
- Höttecke, D., & Allchin, D. (2020). Reconceptualizing nature-of-science education in the age of social media. Science Education, 104, 641–666.
- Hsu, P.-S., Van Dyke, M., Smith, T. J., & Looi, C.-K. (2018). Argue like a scientist with technology: The effect of within-gender versus cross-gender team argumentation on science knowledge and argumentation skills among middle-level students. Educational Technology Research and Development, 66(3), 733–766.
- Hufnagel, E. (2015). Preservice elementary teachers' emotional connections and disconnections to climate change in a science course. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52, 1296–1324.
- Hufnagel, E. (2019). Emotional discourse as constructed in an environmental science course. In G. J. Kelly & J. L. Green (Eds.), Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education (pp. 155–180). Routledge.
- Isohätälä, J. , Näykki, P. , Järvelä, S. , & Baker, M. J. (2018). Striking a balance: Socio-emotional processes during argumentation in collaborative learning interaction. Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 16, 1–19.
- Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1999). The discourse reader (Vol. 2). Routledge.
- Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2014). Determinism and underdetermination in Genetics: Implications for students' engagement in argumentation and epistemic practices. Science & Education, 23(2), 465–484.
- Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Brocos, P. (2018). Shifts in epistemic statuses in argumentation and in conceptual change. In T. Amin & O. Levrini (Eds.), Converging perspectives on conceptual change: Mapping an emerging paradigm in the learning sciences (pp. 171–179). Routledge.
- Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Brocos, P. (2021). Emotional tension as a frame for argumentation and decision-making: Vegetarian vs. omnivorous diets. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 662141
- Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Puig, B. (2021). Educating critical citizens to face post-truth: The time is now. In B. Puig & M. P.
- Jiménez-Aleixandre (Eds.), Critical thinking in biology and environmental education: Facing challenges in a post-truth world. Springer. Kang, E. J., Donovan, C., & McCarthy, M. J. (2018). Exploring elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and confidence
- in implementing the NGSS science and engineering practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(1), 9–29. 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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kelly, G. J. (2008). Learning science: Discursive practices. In Encyclopedia of language and education (pp. 1071–1082). Springer. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-0-387-30424–3 82
- 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). Routledge.
- Kelly, G. J. (2014). Discourse practices in science learning and teaching. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 321–336). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kelly, G. J. (2016). Methodological considerations for the study of epistemic cognition in practice. In J. A. Greene, W. A. Sandoval, & I. Braten (Eds.), Handbook of epistemic cognition (pp. 393–408). Routledge.
- Kelly, G. J. (2021). Theory, methods, and expressive potential of discourse studies in science education. Research in Science Education, 51(1), 225–233.
- 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., & Cunningham, C. (2019). Epistemic tools in engineering design for K 12 education. Science Education, 103(4), 1080–1111.
- Kelly, G. J., & Green, J. (2019a). Framing issues of theory and methods for the study of science and engineering education. In G. J. Kelly & J. Green (Eds.), Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education (pp. 1–28). Routledge.
- Kelly, G. J., & Green, J. (Eds.). (2019b). Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education.
- Kelly, G. J., & Green, J. (Eds.). (2019b). Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education. Routledge.
- Kelly, G. J., & Licona, P. (2018). Epistemic practices and science education. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.), History, philosophy and science teaching (pp. 139–165). Springer.
- King, D., Ritchie, S., Sandhu, M., & Henderson, S. (2015). Emotionally intense science activities. International Journal of Science Education, 37, 1886–1914.
- Knain, E. (2001). Ideologies in school science textbooks. International Journal of Science Education, 23, 319–329.
- Knain, E., Fredlund, T., & Furberg, A (2021). Exploring student reasoning and representation construction in school science through the lenses of social semiotics and interaction analysis. Research in Science Education, 51, 93–111.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (2009). Epistemic cultures: How the sciences make knowledge. Harvard University Press.

Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Ogborn, J., & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001). Multimodal teaching and learnins: The rhetorics of the science classroom. Continuum.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2009). Narrative reproductions: Ideologies of storytelling, authoritative words, and generic regimentation in the village of Tewa1. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 19(1), 40–56.

Kuhn, D. (2019). Critical thinking as discourse. Human Development, 62, 146–164.

Land, S. M., Zimmerman, H. T., Millet, C., & Choi, G. W. (2020). Supporting observing-on-the-move with proximity-based technology: Designing for children's scientific observations outdoors. Visitor Studies, 23(2), 182–204.

Langman, J. (2014). Translanguaging, identity, and learning: Science teachers as engaged language planners. Language Policy, 13(2), 183–200.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts. Princeton 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: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 38(5), 499–501.

Lee, O. (2005). Science education with English language learners: Synthesis and research agenda. Review of Educational Research, 75(4), 491–530.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning and values. Ablex.

Lemke, J. L. (1998). Multiplying meaning: Visual and verbal semiotics in scientific text. In J. Martins & R. Veel (Eds.), Reading science. Routledge.

Lemke, J. L., Kelly, G., & Roth, W. M. (2006). Toward a phenomenology of interviews. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 83–106.

Lemmi, C., Brown, B. A., Wild, A., Zummo, L., & Sedlacek, Q. (2019). Language ideologies in science education. Science Education, 103, 854–874.

Lenoir, T. (1998). Inscription practices and materialities of communication. Inscribing Science: Scientific Texts and the Materiality of Communication, 1–19.

Licona, P. R. (2019). Translanguaging about socioscientific issues in middle school science. In G. J. Kelly & J. L. Green (Eds.), Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education (pp. 73–100). Routledge.

Licona, P. R., & Kelly, G. J. (2020). Translanguaging in a middle school science classroom: Constructing scientific arguments in English and Spanish. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15, 485–510.

Lin, Y.-R., & Hung, J.-F. (2016). The analysis and reconciliation of students' rebuttals in argumentation activities. International Journal of Science Education, 38, 130–155. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1134848

Linder, C. (2013). Disciplinary discourse, representation, and appresentation in the teaching and learning of science. European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 1(2), 43–49.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States. Routledge.

Luzón, M. J. (2013). Public communication of science in blogs: Recontextualizing scientific discourse for a diversified audience. Written Communication, 30(4), 428–457.

Martin, J., Xu, L., & Seah, L. H. (2020). Discourse analysis and multimodal meaning making in a science classroom: Metamethodological insights from three theoretical perspectives. Research in Science Education, 1–21.

Maulucci, M. S. R. (2008). Intersections between immigration, language, identity, and emotions: A science teacher candidate's journey. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3(1), 17–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-007-9074-9

Mavuru, L., & Ramnarain, U. (2020). Learners' socio-cultural backgrounds and science teaching and learning: A case study of township schools in South Africa. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15, 1067–1095.

McDonald, C., & McIntyre, M. (2001). Reinstating the marginalized body in nursing science: Epistemological privilege and the lived life. Nursing Philosophy, 2(3), 234–239.

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). Springer.

McNeill, K. L. , & Berland, L. (2017). What is (or should be) scientific evidence use in k-12 classrooms? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54, 672–689.

McNeill, K. L., & Pimentel, D. S. (2010). Scientific discourse in three urban classrooms: The role of the teacher in engaging high school students in argumentation. Science Education, 94, 203–229.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Harvard University Press.

Miller, E., Lauffer, H. B., & Messina, P. (2014). NGSS for English language learners. Science and Children, 51(5), 55.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research interviewing: Context and narrative. Harvard University Press.

Moje, E. B., Collazo, T., Carrillo, R., & Marx, R. W. (2001). "Maestro, what is 'quality'?": Language, literacy, and discourse in project-based science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 469–498.

Monteira, S. F., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2016). The practice of using evidence in kindergarten: The role of purposeful observation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53, 1232–1258.

Monteira, S. F., Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Siry, C. (2022). Scaffolding children's production of representations along the three years of ECE: A longitudinal study. Research in Science Education, 52, 127–158. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09931-z

Moore, T. J. , Tank, K. M. , Glancy, A. W. , & Kersten, J. A. (2015). NGSS and the landscape of engineering in K-12 state science standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52, 296–318.

Mortimer, E. F., & Scott, P. H. (2003). Meaning making in secondary science classrooms. Open University Press.

National Research Council . (2013). Monitoring progress toward successful K-12 STEM education: A nation advancing? National Academies Press.

NGSS Lead States. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.

O'Hallaron, C. L. (2014). Supporting fifth-grade ELLs' argumentative writing development. Written Communication, 31(3), 304–331. Olander, C. (2010). Towards an interlanguage of biological evolution: Exploring students talk and writing as an arena for sense-making. https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/21558

Olander, C., & Ingerman, Å. (2011). Towards an inter-language of talking science: Exploring students' argumentation in relation to authentic language. Journal of Biological Education, 45(3), 158–164.

- Olander, C., Wickman, P.-O., Tytler, R., & Ingerman, Å. (2018). Representations as mediation between purposes as junior secondary science students learn about the human body. International Journal of Science Education, 40(2), 204–226.
- Olitsky, S. (2007). Facilitating identity formation, group membership, and learning in science classrooms: What can be learned from out-of-field teaching in an urban school? Science Education, 91, 201–221.
- Oliveira, A. W., Sadler, T. D., & Suslak, D. F. (2007). The linguistic construction of expert identity in professor Student discussions of science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2(1), 119–150.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] . (2016). PISA 2015 results (volume I): Excellence and equity in education. OECD Publishing.
- Ortiz-Revilla, J., Adúriz-Bravo, A., & Greca, I. M. (2020). A framework for epistemological discussion on integrated STEM education. Science & Education, 29, 857–880.
- Osborne, J. F. (2014). Teaching scientific practices: Meeting the challenge of change. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(2), 177–196.
- Osborne, J. F., Henderson, J. B., MacPherson, A., Szu, E., Wild, A., & Yao, S. Y. (2016). The development and validation of a learning progression for argumentation in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53, 821–846.
- Östman, L., & Wickman, P.-O. (2014). A pragmatic approach on epistemology, teaching and learning. Science Education, 98, 375–382.
- Page-Reeves, J., Marin, A., Moffett, M., DeerlnWater, K., & Medin, D. (2019). Wayfinding as a concept for understanding success among Native Americans in STEM: "Learning how to map through life". Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14, 177–197.
- Park, H., Kim, Y., & Jeong, S. (2019). The effect of a science festival for special education students on communicating science. Asia-Pacific Science Education, 5(1), 1–21.
- Park, W., Wu, J. Y., & Erduran, S. (2020). The nature of STEM disciplines in the science education standards documents from the USA, Korea and Taiwan. Science & Education, 29, 899–927.
- Parkinson, J., & Crouch, A. (2011). Education, language, and identity amongst students at a South African university. Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 10(2), 83–98.
- Patterson, A. D. (2019). Equity in groupwork: The social process of creating justice in a science classroom. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14, 361–381.
- Pluta, W. J., Chinn, C. A., & Duncan, R. G. (2011). Learners' epistemic criteria for good scientific models. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 486–511. http://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20415
- Polo, C., Plantin, C., Lund, K., & Niccolai, G. (2017). Group emotions in collective reasoning: A Model. Argumentation, 31(2), 301–329.
- Poza, L. E. (2016). The language of ciencia: Translanguaging and learning in a bilingual science classroom. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1–19.
- Prain, W., & Tytler, R. (2012). Learning through constructing representations in science: A framework of representational construction affordances. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 2751–2773.
- Probyn, M. (2015). Pedagogical translanguaging: Bridging discourses in South African science classrooms. Language and Education, 29(3), 218–234.
- Rapanta, C., & Felton, M. (2019). Mixed methods research in inquiry-based instruction: An integrative review. International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 42(3), 288–304.
- Reveles, J. M., Cordova, R., & Kelly, G. J. (2004). Science literacy and academic identity formulation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 1111–1144.
- Reynante, B. M., Selbach-Allen, M. E., & Pimentel, D. R. (2020). Exploring the promises and perils of integrated STEM through disciplinary practices and epistemologies. Science & Education, 29, 785–803.
- Rincke, K. (2011). It's rather like learning a language: Development of talk and conceptual understanding in mechanics lessons. International Journal of Science Education. 33, 229–258.
- Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), An introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in education (pp. 1–18). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rosa, J. D. (2010). Looking like a language, sounding like a race: Making Latina/o panethnicity and managing American anxieties. University of Chicago Press.
- Rosebery, A. S., Warren, B., & Conant, F. R. (1992). Appropriating scientific discourse: Findings from language minority classrooms. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 2(1), 61–94.
- Roth, W.-M. (2014). Science language wanted alive: Through the dialectical/dialogical lens of vygotsky and the bakhtin circle. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51, 1049–1083.
- Roth, W.-M., & Lucas, K. B. (1997). From "truth" to "invented reality": A discourse analysis of high school physics students' talk about scientific knowledge. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34, 145–179.
- Rouse, J. (2002). How scientific practices matter: Reclaiming philosophical naturalism. University of Chicago Press.
- Rudolph, J. L. , & Horibe, S. (2016). What do we mean by science education for civic engagement? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53, 805–820.
- Rudolph, J. L., & Stewart, J. (1998), Evolution and the nature of science: On the historical discord and its implications for education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35, 1069–1089.
- 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.
- Salloum, S., & Bou Jaoude, S. (2020). Language in teaching and learning science in diverse Lebanese multilingual classrooms: Interactions and perspectives. International Journal of Science Education, 42, 2331–2363.
- Schnittka, J., & Schnittka, C. (2016). "Can I drop it this time?" Gender and collaborative group dynamics in an engineering design-based afterschool program. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research (J-PEER), 6(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1120
- Schoultz, J., Säljo, R., & Wyndhamn, J. (2001). Heavenly talk: Discourse, artifacts, and children's understanding of elementary astronomy. Human Development, 44, 103–118.

- Seargeant, P. (2008). Language, ideology and "English within a globalized context". World Englishes, 27(2), 217–232.
- Sezen-Barrie, A., Stapleton, M. K., & Marbach-Ad, G. (2020). Science teachers' sensemaking of the use of epistemic tools to scaffold students' knowledge (re) construction in classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 1058–1092.
- Siry, C., & Gorges, A. (2020). Young students' diverse resources for meaning making in science: Learning from multilingual contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 42, 2364–2386.
- Skukauskaitė, A., & Girdzijauskienė, R. (2021). Video analysis of contextual layers in teaching-learning interactions. Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 29, 100499.
- Solli, A., Hillman, T., & Mäkitalo, Å. (2019). Navigating the complexity of socio-scientific controversies How students make multiple voices present in discourse. Research in Science Education, 49, 1595–1623.
- Stoddart, M. C. (2007). Ideology, hegemony, discourse: A critical review of theories of knowledge and power. Social Thought & Research. 191–225.
- 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, 664–687.
- Tang, K. S., Tan, A. L., & Mortimer, E. F. (2021). The multi-timescale, multi-modal and multi-perspectival aspects of classroom discourse analysis in science education. Research in Science Education, 51, 1–11.
- Treen, K. M. D. I., Williams, H. T., & O'Neill, S. J. (2020). Online misinformation about climate change. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 11(5), e665.
- Ünsal, Z., Jakobson, B., Molander, B.-O., & Wickman, P.-O. (2018a). Language use in a multi-lingual class: A study of the relation between bilingual students' languages and their meaning-making in science. Research in Science Education, 48, 1027–1048.
- Ünsal, Z., Jakobson, B., Wickman, P. O., & Molander, B. O. (2018b). Gesticulating science: Emergent bilingual students' use of gestures. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 121–144.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). News, discourse, and ideology. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), The handbook of journalism studies (pp. 191–204). Routledge.
- van Eijck, M., & Roth, W.-M. (2011). Cultural diversity in science education through novelization: Against the epicization of science and cultural centralization. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 824–847.
- Varelas, M. (2017). Dialectical relationships and how they shape (in)equitable science learning spaces and places. In L. Bryan & K. Tobin (Eds.), 13 questions: Reframing education's conversation: Science. Peter Lang.
- Varelas, M., Kane, J. M., Tucker-Raymond, E., & Pappas, C. C. (2012). Science learning in urban elementary school classrooms: Liberatory education and issues of access, participation and achievement. In Second international handbook of science education (pp. 91–103). Springer. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7 8
- Varelas, M., & Pappas, C. C. (2006). Intertextuality in read-alouds of integrated science-literacy units in urban primary classrooms: Opportunities for the development of thought and language. Cognition and Instruction, 24(2), 211–259.
- Vedder-Weiss, D. (2017). Serendipitous science engagement: A family self-ethnography. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54, 350–378.
- Visintainer, T. (2019). "I think at first glance people would not expect me to be interested in science": Exploring the racialized science experiences of high school students of color. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 393–422.
- 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: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 38(5), 529–552.
- Warren, B., & Rosebery, A. S. (1992). Science Education As A Sense-Making Practice: Implications for assessment. In E. Statzner (Eds.), Proceedings of the Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on Middle and High School Issues. US Department of Education.
- Warren, B., Vossoughi, S., Rosebery, A., Bang, M., & Taylor, E. (2020). Multiple ways of knowing: Re-imagining disciplinary learning. In N. S. Nasir, C. D. Lee, R. Pea, & M. McKinney de Royston (Eds.), Handbook of the cultural foundations of learning (pp. 277–294). Routledge.
- Watson, T. J. (1995). Rhetoric, discourse and argument in organizational sense making: A reflexive tale. Organization Studies, 16(5), 805–821.
- Wickman, P.-O. (2013). Aesthetic experience in science education: Learning and meaning-making as situated talk and action. Routledge.
- Wickman, P.-O. (2017). Back to the drawing board-examining the philosophical foundations of educational research on aesthetics and emotions. In A. Bellocchi, K. Otrel-Cass, & C. Quigley (Eds.), Beyond cognition in science education: Considering the role of emotions, well-being, and aesthetics (pp. 9–37). Springer.
- Wickman, P. -O., & Östman, L. (2002). Learning as discourse change: A sociocultural mechanism. Science Education, 86, 601–623. Wieselmann, J. R., Keratithamkul, K., Dare, E. A., Ring-Whalen, E. A., & Roehrig, G. H. (2021). Discourse analysis in integrated STEM activities: Methods for examining power and positioning in small group interactions. Research in Science Education, 51(1), 113–133.
- Wilmes, S. E., & Siry, C. (2021). Multimodal interaction analysis: A powerful tool for examining plurilingual students' engagement in science practices. Research in Science Education, 51(1), 1–21.
- Woolard, K. A. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. Pragmatics, 2(3), 235–249.
- Wu, S., Silveus, A., Vasquez, S., Biffi, D., Silva, C., & Weinburgh (2019). Supporting ELLs' use of hybrid language and argumentation during science instruction. Journal of Research in Science Instruction, 30, 24–43.
- Xu, Q., Song, Y., Yu, N., & Chen, S. (2020). Are you passing along something true or false? Dissemination of social media messages about genetically modified organisms. Public Understanding of Science, 1–17.
- Yerrick, R. K., & Gilbert, A. (2011). Constraining the discourse community: How science discourse perpetuates marginalization of underrepresented students. Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 6(1), 67–91.
- Yun, S. M., & Kim, H. B. (2015). Changes in students' participation and small group norms in scientific argumentation. Research in Science Education, 45, 465–484.

Synergies Between Learning Technologies and Learning Sciences

- Agarwal, P., & Sengupta-Irving, T. (2019). Integrating power to advance the study of connective and productive disciplinary engagement in mathematics and science. Cognition and Instruction, 37(3), 349–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2019.1624544 Albó, L., & Hernández-Leo, D. (2018). Identifying design principles for learning design tools: The case of edCrumble. In V. Pammer-Schindler, M. Pérez-Sanagustín, H. Drachsler, R. Elferink, & M. Scheffel (Eds.), Lifelong technology-enhanced learning. EC-TEL 2018 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 11082). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98572-5_31
- Anderson, J. L., & Barnett, M. (2013). Learning physics with digital game simulations in middle school science. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 22(6), 914–926. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-013-9438-8
- Applebaum, B. (2017). Comforting discomfort as complicity: White fragility and the pursuit of invulnerability. Hypatia, 32(4), 862–875. 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. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211433290
- Aristeidou, M., & Herodotou, C. (2020). Online citizen science: A systematic review of effects on learning and scientific literacy. Citizen Science: Theory and Practice, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.224
- Bai, S., Hew, K. F., & Huang, B. (2020). Does gamification improve student learning outcome? Evidence from a meta-analysis and synthesis of qualitative data in educational contexts. Educational Research Review, 30, 100322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100322
- Bang, M. (2020). Learning on the move toward just, sustainable, and culturally thriving futures. Cognition and Instruction, 38(3), 434–444. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2020.1777999
- Bang, M., & Vossoughi, S. (2016). Participatory design research and educational justice: Studying learning and relations within social change making. Cognition and Instruction, 34(3), 173–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2016.1181879
- Bennett, S., Dawson, P., Bearman, M., Molloy, E., & Boud, D. (2017). How technology shapes assessment design: Findings from a study of university teachers. British Journal of Educational Technology, 48(2), 672–682. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12439
- Berland, L. K., McNeill, K. L., Pelletier, P., & Krajcik, J. (2017). Engaging in argument from evidence. In Helping students make sense of the world using next generation science and engineering practices (pp. 229–257). NSTA Press.
- Berland, L. K., & Reiser, B. J. (2011). Classroom communities' adaptations of the practice of scientific argumentation. Science Education, 95(2), 191–216. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20420
- Bertsch, S., Pesta, B. J., Wiscott, R., & McDaniel, M. A. (2007). The generation effect: A meta-analytic review. Memory & Cognition, 35(2), 201–210. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193441
- Bichler, S., Gerard, L., Bradford, A., & Linn, M. C. (2021). Designing a remote professional development course to support teacher customization in science. Computers in Human Behavior, 123, 106814. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106814 Billings, K., Gerard, L., & Linn, M. C. (2021). Improving teacher noticing of students' science ideas. In E. de Vries, J. Ahn, & Y. Hod (Eds.), Proceedings of 15th International Conference of the Learning Sciences ICLS 2021. International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Biswas, G., Segedy, J. R., & Bunchongchit, K. (2016). From design to implementation to practice a learning by teaching system: Betty's Brain. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 26(1), 350–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-015-0057-9 Bjork, R. A., & Linn, M. C. (2006). The science of learning and the learning of science: Introducing desirable difficulties. American Psychological Society Observer, 19(3).
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5
- Boda, P. A., Bathia, S., & Linn, M. C. (2021). Longitudinal impact of interactive science activities: Developing, implementing, and validating a graphing integration inventory. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(2), 225–248. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21653
- Boda, P. A., & Brown, B. (2020). Designing for relationality in virtual reality: Context-specific learning as a primer for content relevancy. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 29(5), 691–702. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09849-1
- Bondaryk, L., Hsi, S., & Van Doren, S. (2021). Probeware for the modern era: IoT dataflow system design for secondary classrooms. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 1. https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2021.3061040
- Booth, J. L., Lange, K. E., Koedinger, K. R., & Newton, K. J. (2013). Using example problems to improve student learning in algebra: Differentiating between correct and incorrect examples. Learning and Instruction, 25, 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2012.11.002
- Borunda, A. (2021, June 17). Los Angeles confronts its shady divide. National Geographic. www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/article/los-angeles-confronts-its-shady-divide-feature
- Bradford, A., Bichler, S., & Linn, M. C. (2021). Designing a workshop to support teacher customization of curricula. International Conference of the Learning Sciences.
- Bradford, A., Gerard, L., Lim-Breitbart, J., Miller, J., & Linn, M. C. (2022). Computational thinking in middle school science. In C. Chinn, E. Tan, C. Chan, & Y. Kali (Eds.), Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of the Learning Sciences—ICLS 2022 (pp. 839–846). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.) (1999). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. National Academy Press.
- Bridwell, L. S. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 197–222.
- Buffum, P. S., Frankosky, M., Boyer, K. E., Wiebe, E. N., Mott, B. W., & Lester, J. C. (2016). Collaboration and gender equity in game-based learning for middle school computer science. Computing in Science & Engineering, 18(2), 18–28. https://doi.org/10.1109/MCSE.2016.37
- Calabrese-Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2019). Designing for rightful presence in STEM: The role of making present practices. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 28(4–5), 616–658. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2019.1591411

- Cannady, M. A., Greenwald, E., & Harris, K. N. (2014). Problematizing the STEM pipeline metaphor: Is the STEM pipeline metaphor serving our students and the STEM workforce? Science Education, 98(3), 443–460. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21108
- Chen, C.-H., Shih, C.-C., & Law, V. (2020). The effects of competition in digital game-based learning (DGBL): A meta-analysis. Educational Technology Research and Development, 68(4), 1855–1873. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09794-1
- Chen, C.-H., & Yang, Y.-C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. Educational Research Review, 26, 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.11.001
- Chen, J. K., Bradford, A., & Linn, M. (2020). Examining the impact of student choice in online science investigations. In M. Gresalfi & I. S. Horn (Eds.), The interdisciplinarity of the learning sciences (14th International Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS) 2020, Vol. 3, pp. 1705–1708). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Chen, J., Wang, M., Kirschner, P. A., & Tsai, C.-C. (2018). The role of collaboration, computer use, learning environments, and supporting strategies in CSCL: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 88(6), 799–843. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318791584
- Chi, M. T. H., Adams, J., Bogusch, E. B., Bruchok, C., Kang, S., Lancaster, M., Levy, R., Li, N., McEldoon, K., Stump, G. S., Wylie, R., Xu, D., & Yaghmourian, D. L. (2018). Translating the ICAP theory of cognitive engagement into practice. Cognitive Science, 42(6), 1777–1832. https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12626
- Chin, D. B., Blair, K. P., Wolf, R. C., Conlin, L. D., Cutumisu, M., Pfaffman, J., & Schwartz, D. L. (2019). Educating and measuring choice: A test of the transfer of design thinking in problem solving and learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 28(3), 337–380.
- Chiu, J. L., & Linn, M. C. (2012). The role of self-monitoring in learning chemistry with dynamic visualizations. In Metacognition in science education (pp. 133–163). Springer.
- Clark, D. B., Tanner-Smith, E. E., & Killingsworth, S. S. (2016). Digital games, design, and learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 86(1), 79–122. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582065
- Coburn, C. E., & Penuel, W. R. (2016). Research practice partnerships in education: Outcomes, dynamics, and open questions. Educational Researcher, 45(1), 48–54. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16631750
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. Educational Researcher, 19(2), 2–11. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X019002002
- Cohen, E. G. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. Review of Educational Research, 64(1), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064001001
- Coomey, M., & Stephenson, J. (2018). Online learning: It is all about dialogue, involvement, support and control According to the research. In Teaching & learning online (pp. 37–52). Routledge.
- Crawford, I., & Neary, J. P. (2008). Testing for a reference consumer in international comparisons of living standards. American Economic Review, 98(4), 1731.
- Cummings, J. J., & Bailenson, J. N. (2016). How immersive Is enough? A meta-analysis of the effect of immersive technology on user presence. Media Psychology, 19(2), 272–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2015.1015740
- Davis, E. A., & Krajcik, J. S. (2005). Designing educative curriculum materials to promote teacher learning. Educational Researcher, 34(3), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x034003003
- Davis, E. A., Palincsar, A. S., Smith, P. S., Arias, A. M., & Kademian, S. M. (2017). Educative curriculum materials: Uptake, impact, and implications for research and Design. Educational Researcher, 46(6), 293–304. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17727502
- Debarger, A. H., & Casserly, C. (2021). Twenty years of Open Educational Resources: Building robust networks for innovation. https://hewlett.org/twenty-years-of-open-educational-resources-building-robust-networks-for-innovation/
- Debarger, A. H., Penuel, W. R., Moorthy, S., Beauvineau, Y., Kennedy, C. A., & Boscardin, C. K. I. M. (2017). Investigating purposeful science curriculum adaptation as a strategy to improve teaching and learning. Science Education, 101(1), 66–98. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21249
- de Freitas, S. (2018). Are games effective learning tools? A review of educational games. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 21(2), 74–84. www.jstor.org/stable/26388380
- de Jong, T. (2019). Moving towards engaged learning in STEM domains; there is no simple answer, but clearly a road ahead. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 35(2), 153–167.
- de Jong, T., Gillet, D., Rodríguez-Triana, M. J., Hovardas, T., Dikke, D., Doran, R., Dziabenko, O., Koslowsky, J., Korventausta, M., Law, E., Pedaste, M., Tasiopoulou, E., Vidal, G., & Zacharia, Z. C. (2021). Understanding teacher design practices for digital inquiry based science learning: The case of Go-Lab. Educational Technology Research and Development, 69(2), 417–444. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09904-z
- de Jong, T., Linn, M. C., & Zacharia, Z. C. (2013). Physical and virtual laboratories in science and engineering education. Science, 340(6130), 305–308. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1230579
- de Royston, M. M., Lee, C., Nasir, N. S., & Pea, R. (2020). Rethinking schools, rethinking learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 102(3), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721720970693
- Design-Based Research Collective (2003). Design-based research: An emerging paradigm for educational inquiry. Educational Researcher, 32(1), 5–8. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032001005
- Dewey, J. (1904/2003). The relation of theory to practice in education. In L. A. Hickman (Series Ed.), John Dewey: The middle works, 1899–1904: Vol. 3, 1903–1906 (pp. 249–272). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dickler, R., Gobert, J., & Sao Pedro, M. (2021). Using innovative methods to explore the potential of an alerting dashboard for science inquiry. Journal of Learning Analytics, 8(2), 105–122. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2021.7153
- Dimitriadis, Y., Martínez-Maldonado, R., & Wiley, K. (2021). Human-centered design principles for actionable learning analytics. In T. Tsiatsos, S. Demetriadis, A. Mikropoulos, & V. Dagdilelis (Eds.), Research on E-learning and ICT in education. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64363-8_15
- diSessa, A. A. (2018). A friendly introduction to "Knowledge in Pieces": Modeling types of knowledge and their roles in learning BT. In G. Kaiser, H. Forgasz, M. Graven, A. Kuzniak, E. Simmt, & B. Xu (Eds.), Invited lectures from the 13th international congress on mathematical education (pp. 65–84). Springer International Publishing.
- Donnelly, D. F., Linn, M. C., & Ludvigsen, S. (2014). Impacts and characteristics of computer-based science inquiry learning environments for precollege students. Review of Educational Research, 84(4). https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314546954
 Donnelly, D. F., Namdar, B., Vitale, J. M., Lai, K., & Linn, M. C. (2016). Enhancing student explanations of evolution: Comparing elaborating and competing theory prompts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(9), 1341–1363.

- Donnelly, D., Vitale, J., & Linn, M. (2015). Automated guidance for thermodynamics essays: Critiquing versus revisiting. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 24(6), 861–874. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-015-9569-1
- Donnelly-Hermosillo, D. F., Gerard, L. F., & Linn, M. C. (2020). Impact of graph technologies in K-12 science and mathematics education. Computers & Education, 146, 103748. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103748
- Double, K. S., McGrane, J. A., & Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2020). The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis of control group studies. Educational Psychology Review, 32(2), 481–509. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09510-3
- Edelson, D. C., Reiser, B. J., McNeill, K. L., Mohan, A., Novak, M., Mohan, L., Affolter, R., McGill, T. A. W., Buck Bracey, Z. E., Deutch, N., Kowalski, S. M., Novak, D., Lo, A. S., Landel, C., Krumm, A., Penuel, W. R., Van Horne, K., González-Howard, M., & Suárez, E. (2021). Developing research-based instructional materials to support large-scale transformation of science teaching and learning: The approach of the Open-SciEd middle school program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(7), 780–804. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2021.1877457
- Emara, M., Hutchins, N., Grover, S., Snyder, C., & Biswas, G. (2021). Examining student regulation of collaborative, computational, problem-solving processes in open-ended learning environments. Journal of Learning Analytics, 8(1 SE-), 49–74. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2021.7230
- Emejulu, A., & McGregor, C. (2019). Towards a radical digital citizenship in digital education. Critical Studies in Education, 60(1), 131–147. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2016.1234494
- Farrell, C. C., Penuel, W. R., Allen, A., Anderson, E. R., Bohannon, A. X., Coburn, C. E., & Brown, S. L. (2022). Learning at the boundaries of research and practice: A framework for understanding research–practice partnerships. Educational Researcher, 51(3), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211069073
- Fischer, C., Pardos, Z. A., Baker, R. S., Williams, J. J., Smyth, P., Yu, R., Slater, S., Baker, R., & Warschauer, M. (2020). Mining big data in education: Affordances and challenges. Review of Research in Education, 44(1), 130–160. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X20903304
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600
- Flower, L., Hayes, J. R., Carey, L., Schriver, K., & Stratman, J. (1986). Detection, diagnosis, and the strategies of revision. College Composition and Communication, 37(1), 16–55.
- Forbes, C. T., & Davis, E. A. (2010). Curriculum design for inquiry: Preservice elementary teachers' mobilization and adaptation of science curriculum materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(7), 820–839. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20379 Freedman, S. W., Hull, G. A., Higgs, J. M., & Booten, K. P. (2016). Teaching writing in a digital and global age: Toward access,
- learning, and development for all. In Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 1389–1450). American Educational Research Association.
- Furtak, E. M., Bakeman, R., & Buell, J. Y. (2018). Developing knowledge-in-action with a learning progression: Sequential analysis of teachers' questions and responses to student ideas. Teaching and Teacher Education, 76, 267–282.
- Furtak, E. M., Seidel, T., Iverson, H., & Briggs, D. C. (2012). Experimental and quasi-experimental studies of inquiry-based science teaching: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 82(3), 300–329. http://rer.sagepub.com/content/82/3/300.abstract Gardner, J. R. (2021, October 11). Seventy-two hours under the heat dome. The New Yorker.
- www.newyorker.com/magazine/2021/10/18/seventy-two-hours-under-the-heat-dome
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20248
- Gerard, L., Bichler, S., Bradford, A., & Linn, M. C., Steimel, K., & Riordan, B. (2022). Designing an adaptive dialogue for promoting science understanding. In J. Oshima, T. Mochizuki, & Y. Hayashi (Eds.), General Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the International Society of the Learning Sciences. International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Gerard, L., Bradford, A., & Linn, M. C. (2022). Supporting teachers to customize curriculum for self-directed learning. Journal of Science Education & Technology, 31, 660–679.
- Gerard, L., Bradford, A., Wiley, K., Debarger, A., & Linn, M. C. (2022). Cultivating teacher efficacy for social justice in science. Science Scope, 45(5), 35–43.
- Gerard, L., Wiley, K., Debarger, A. H., Bichler, S., Bradford, A., & Linn, M. C. (2022). Self-directed science learning during COVID-19 and beyond. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 31(2), 258–271.
- Gerard, L., Kidron, A., & Linn, M. C. (2019). Guiding collaborative revision of science explanations. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 14(3), 291–324. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-019-09298-y
- Gerard, L., & Linn, M. C. (2016). Using automated scores of student essays to support teacher guidance in classroom inquiry. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(1), 111–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-016-9455-6
- Gerard, L., & Linn, M. C. (2022). Computer-based guidance to support students' revision of their science explanations. Computers & Education, 176, 104351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104351
- Gerard, L., Linn, M. C., & Madhok, J. J. (2016). Examining the impacts of annotation and automated guidance on essay revision and science learning. In C-K. Looi, J. Polman, U. Cress, & P. Reimann (Eds.), International conference of the learning sciences (Vol. 1, pp. 394–401). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Gerard, L., Matuk, C., McElhaney, K., & Linn, M. C. (2015). Automated, adaptive guidance for K-12 education. Educational Research Review, 15, 41–58. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.04.001
- Gerard, L., Ryoo, K., McElhaney, K., Liu, L., Rafferty, A., & Linn, M. C. (2015). Automated guidance for student inquiry. Journal of Educational Psychology, 108(1), 60–81. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000052
- Gerard, L. , Spitulnik, M. , & Linn, M. C. (2010). Teacher use of evidence to customize inquiry science instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(9), 1037–1063. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20367
- Gerard, L., Varma, K., Corliss, S. B., & Linn, M. C. (2011). Professional development for technology-enhanced inquiry science. Review of Educational Research, 81(3), 408–448. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311415121
- Gerard, L., Wiley, K., Bradford, A., Chen, J. K., Breitbart, J., & Linn, M. C. (2020). Impact of a teacher action planner capturing student ideas on customization decisions. Proceedings of the 14th International Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS) 2020, 4, pp. 2077–2084, Nashville, TN.

- Gess-Newsome, J., Taylor, J. A., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Wilson, C. D., & Stuhlsatz, M. A. M. (2019). Teacher pedagogical content knowledge, practice, and student achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 41(7), 944–963. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1265158
- Girod, M. , Rau, C. , & Schepige, A. (2003). Appreciating the beauty of science ideas: Teaching for aesthetic understanding. Science Education, 87(4), 574-587. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.1054
- Gobert, J. D., Pedro, M. S., Raziuddin, J., & Baker, R. S. (2013). From log files to assessment metrics: Measuring students' science inquiry skills using educational data mining. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2013.837391 Gomoll, A., Clarke, S., & Dennis, K. (2021). Zooming in: Exploring the construction of professional vision in teachers' reflection with visualizations of classroom discourse. In E. de Vries, Y. Hod, & J. Ahn (Eds.), Proceedings of the 15th International Conference of the Learning Sciences ICLS 2021 (pp. 621–624). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- González, P. A., Minkler, M., Garcia, A. P., Gordon, M., Garzón, C., Palaniappan, M., Prakash, S., & Beveridge, B. (2011). Community-based participatory research and policy advocacy to reduce diesel exposure in West Oakland, California. American Journal of Public Health, 101(Suppl 1), S166–S175. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2010.196204
- Grover, S., & Pea, R. (2018). Computational thinking: A competency whose time has come. In S. Sentence, E. Barendsen, & C. Schulte (Eds.), Computer science education: Perspectives on teaching and learning in school (pp. 19–37). Bloomsbury Academic. Guan, T., Wang, L., Jin, J., & Song, X. (2018). Knowledge contribution behavior in online Q&A communities: An empirical
- investigation. Computers in Human Behavior, 81, 137–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.023
- Gutiérrez, K. D. , & Jurow, A. S. (2016). Social design experiments: Toward equity by design. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 25(4), 565-598. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2016.1204548
- Halatchliyski, I., Kimmerle, J., & Cress, U. (2011). Divergent and convergent knowledge processes on Wikipedia. In H. Spada, G. Stahl, N. Miyake, & N. Law (Eds.), Connecting computer-supported collaborative learning to policy and practice: CSCL2011 conference proceedings (Vol. II, pp. 566–570). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Harris, J. C., & Linder, C. (2018). The racialized experiences of students of color in higher education and student affairs graduate preparation programs. Journal of College Student Development, 59(2), 141–158. http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0014
- Harrison, E., Gerard, E., & Linn, M. C. (2018). Encouraging revision of scientific ideas with critique in an online genetics unit. In J. Kay & R. Luckin (Eds.), Rethinking learning in the digital age: Making the learning sciences count, 13th international conference of the learning of the learning sciences (ICLS) 2018 (Vol. 2, pp. 816–823). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Hegarty, M., Friedman, A., Boone, A. P., & Barrett, T. J. (2016). Where are you? The effect of uncertainty and its visual representation on location judgments in GPS-like displays. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 22(4), 381–392. https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000103
- Hernández-Leo, D., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Pardo, A., Muñoz-Cristóbal, J. A., & Rodríguez-Triana, M. J. (2019). Analytics for learning design: A layered framework and tools. British Journal of Educational Technology, 50(1), 139–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12645
- Hoffman, C., Cooper, C. B., Kennedy, E. B., Farooque, M., & Cavalier, D. (2017). Scistarter 2.0: A digital platform to foster and study sustained engagement in citizen science. In L. Ceccaroni & J. Piera (Eds.), Analyzing the role of citizen science in modern research (pp. 50–61). IGI Global.
- Honey, M. A., & Hilton, M. L. (2011). Learning science through computer games. National Academies Press.
- Hsu, Y.-S., & Lin, S.-S. (2017). Prompting students to make socioscientific decisions: Embedding metacognitive guidance in an elearning environment. International Journal of Science Education, 39(7), 964–979. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1312036 lrgens, G.A., Dabholkar, S., Bain, C., Woods, P., Hall, K., Swanson, H., Horn, M., & Wilensky, U. (2020). Modeling and measuring high school students' computational thinking practices in science. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 29(1), 137–161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09811-1
- Israel-Fishelson, R., & Hershkovitz, A. (2022). Studying interrelations of computational thinking and creativity: A scoping review (2011–2020). Computers & Education, 176, 104353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104353
- Janis, I. L. (1992). Groupthink: The desperate drive for consensus at any cost. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), Classics of organization theory. Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Järvelä, S., Malmberg, J., Sobocinski, M., & Kirschner, P. A. (2021). Metacognition in collaborative learning. In U. Cress, C. Rosé, A. F. Wise, & J. Oshima (Eds.), International handbook of computer-supported collaborative learning (pp. 281–294). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65291-3 15
- Jasanoff, S. (2014). A mirror for science. Public Understanding of Science, 23(1), 21–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662513505509 Jebeile, J. (2018). Explaining with simulations: Why visual representations matter. Perspectives on Science, 26(2), 213–238. https://doi.org/10.1162/posc_a_00273
- Kafai, Y., Fields, D., & Searle, K. (2014). Electronic textiles as disruptive designs: Supporting and challenging maker activities in schools. Harvard Educational Review, 84(4), 532–556. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.4.46m7372370214783
- Kafai, Y., Proctor, C., & Lui, D. (2019). From theory bias to theory dialogue: Embracing cognitive, situated and critical framings of computational thinking for K 12 CS education. In Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research (pp. 101–109). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3291279.3339400
- Kajamaa, A., Kumpulainen, K., & Olkinuora, H.-R. (2020). Teacher interventions in students' collaborative work in a technology-rich educational makerspace. British Journal of Educational Technology, 51(2), 371–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12837
- Kapur, M. (2016). Examining productive failure, productive success, unproductive failure, and unproductive success in learning. Educational Psychologist, 51(2), 289–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1155457
- Kelly, S. U., Sung, C., & Farnham, S. (2002). Designing for improved social responsibility, user participation and content in on-line communities. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 391–398). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/503376.503446
- Klahr, D., Triona, L. M., & Williams, C. (2006). Hands on what? The relative effectiveness of physical versus virtual materials in an engineering design project by middle school children. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44(1), 183–203. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20152
- Koedinger, K. R., & Aleven, V. (2007). Exploring the assistance dilemma in experiments with cognitive tutors. Educational Psychology Review, 19(3), 239–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-007-9049-0
- Koedinger, K. R., Corbett, A. T., & Perfetti, C. (2012). The knowledge-learning-instruction framework: Bridging the science-practice chasm to enhance robust student learning. Cognitive Science, 36(5), 757–798. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-6709.2012.01245.x

- 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(tm) into practice. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12(4), 495–547.
- Krajcik, J. S., & Mun, K. (2014). Promises and challenges of using learning technologies to promote student learning of science. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), The handbook of research on science education (pp. 337–360). Routledge.
- Kullenberg, C., & Kasperowski, D. (2016). What is citizen science? A scientometric meta-analysis. PLoS ONE, 11(1), e0147152. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0147152
- Lai, K., Cabrera, J., Vitale, J. M., Madhok, J., Tinker, R., & Linn, M. C. (2016). Measuring graph comprehension, critique, and construction in science. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 25(4), 665–681. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-016-9621-9 Laurillard, D., Kennedy, E., Charlton, P., Wild, J., & Dimakopoulos, D. (2018). Using technology to develop teachers as designers of TEL: Evaluating the learning designer. British Journal of Educational Technology, 49(6), 1044–1058. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12697
- Leary, H., Severance, S., Penuel, W. R., Quigley, D., Sumner, T., & Devaul, H. (2016). Designing a deeply digital science curriculum: Supporting teacher learning and implementation with organizing technologies. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(1), 61–77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-016-9452-9
- Lee, C. D., White, G., & Dong, D. (Eds.). (2021). Executive summary. Educating for civic reasoning and discourse. Committee on civic reasoning and discourse. National Academy of Education.
- Lee, H.-S., Gweon, G.-H., Lord, T., Paessel, N., Pallant, A., & Pryputniewicz, S. (2021). Machine learning-enabled automated feedback: Supporting students' revision of scientific arguments based on data drawn from simulation. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30(2), 168–192. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09889-7
- Lee, H.-S., Linn, M. C., Varma, K., & Liu, O. L. (2010). How do technology-enhanced inquiry science units impact classroom learning? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(1), 71–90. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20304
- Lee, H.-S., Liu, O. L., & Linn, M. C. (2012). Validating measurement of knowledge integration in science using multiple-choice and explanation items. Applied Measurement in Education, 24(2), 115–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2011.554604
- Lee, O., & Campbell, T. (2020). What science and STEM teachers can learn from COVID-19: Harnessing data science and computer science through the convergence of multiple STEM subjects. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(8), 932–944. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560x.2020.1814980
- Lewis, C., & Perry, R. (2017). Lesson study to scale up research-based knowledge: A randomized, controlled trial of fractions learning. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 48(3), 261–299. https://doi.org/10.5951/jresematheduc.48.3.0261
- Li, H., Xiong, Y., Hunter, C. V., Guo, X., & Tywoniw, R. (2020). Does peer assessment promote student learning? A meta-analysis. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45(2), 193–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1620679
- Lin, Q., Yin, Y., Tang, X., Hadad, R., & Zhai, X. (2020). Assessing learning in technology-rich maker activities: A systematic review of empirical research. Computers & Education, 157, 103944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103944
- Lindgren, R., Tscholl, M., Wang, S., & Johnson, E. (2016). Enhancing learning and engagement through embodied interaction within a mixed reality simulation. Computers & Education, 95, 174–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.001
- Linn, M. C. (1998). The impact of technology on science instruction: Historical trends and current opportunities. In K. G. Tobin & B. J. Fraser (Eds.), International handbook of science education (Vol. 1, pp. 265–294).
- Kluwer. Linn, M. C. (2006). WISE teachers: Using technology and inquiry for science instruction. In E. A. Ashburn & R. E. Floden (Eds.), Meaningful learning using technology: What educators need to know (pp. 45–69). Teachers College Press.
- Linn, M. C., & Eylon, B.-S. (2011). Science learning and instruction: Taking advantage of technology to promote knowledge integration. Routledge.
- Linn, M. C., Gerard, L., Matuk, C., & McElhaney, K. W. (2016). Science education: From separation to integration. Review of Research in Education, 40(1), 529–587. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16680788
- Linn, M. C., Gerard, L., Ryoo, K., McElhaney, K., Liu, L. O., & Rafferty, A. N. (2014). Computer-guided inquiry to improve science learning. Science, 344(6180), 155–156. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1245980
- Linn, M. C., & Hsi, S. (2000). Computers, teachers, peers: Science learning partners. Erlbaum.
- Linn, M. C., Lewis, C., Tsuchida, I., & Songer, N. B. (2000). Beyond fourth-grade science: Why do U.S. and Japanese students diverge? Educational Researcher, 29(3), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029003004
- Littenberg-Tobias, J., Beheshti, E., & Staudt, C. (2016). To customize or not to customize? Exploring science teacher customization in an online lesson portal. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(3), 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21300
- Litts, B. K., Kafai, Y. B., Lui, D. A., Walker, J. T., & Widman, S. A. (2017). Stitching codeable circuits: High school students' learning about circuitry and coding with electronic textiles. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 26(5), 494–507. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-017-9694-0
- Liu, C.-C., Wen, C.-T., Chang, H.-Y., Chang, M.-H., Lai, P.-H., Fan Chiang, S.-H., Yang, C.-W., & Hwang, F.-K. (2022). Augmenting the effect of virtual labs with "teacher demonstration" and "student critique" instructional designs to scaffold the development of scientific literacy. Instructional Science, 50, 303–333. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-021-09571-4
- Liu, O. L., Lee, H.-S., Hofstetter, C., & Linn, M. C. (2008). Assessing knowledge integration in science: Construct, measures, and evidence. Educational Assessment, 13(1), 33–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627190801968224
- Liu, O. L., Rios, J. A., Heilman, M., Gerard, L., & Linn, M. C. (2016). Validation of automated scoring of science assessments. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(2), 215–233. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21299
- Liu, O. L. , Ryoo, K. , Linn, M. C. , Sato, E. , & Svihla, V. (2015). Measuring knowledge integration learning of energy topics: A two-year longitudinal study. International Journal of Science Education, 37(7), 1044–1066. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1016470
- Luna, M. J., & Sherin, M. G. (2017). Using a video club design to promote teacher attention to students' ideas in science. Teaching and Teacher Education, 66, 282–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.019
- Luo, H. , Li, G. , Feng, Q. , Yang, Y. , & Zuo, M. (2021). Virtual reality in K-12 and higher education: A systematic review of the literature from 2000 to 2019. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, n/a*(n/a). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12538 Magnusson, P. R. , Wästlund, E. , & Netz, J. (2016). Exploring users' appropriateness as a proxy for experts when screening new product/service ideas. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 33(1), 4–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12251

- Matuk, C., & Linn, M. C. (2015). Examining the real and perceived impacts of a public idea repository on literacy and science inquiry. In O. Lindwall, P. Hakkinen, T. Koschman, P. Tchounikine, & S. Ludvigsen (Eds.), Exploring the material conditions of learning: The computer supported collaborative learning (CSCL) conference 2015 (Vol. 1). The International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Matuk, C., & Linn, M. C. (2018). Why and how do middle school students exchange ideas during science inquiry? International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 13(3), 263–299. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-018-9282-1
- Matuk, C., McElhaney, K., Chen, J., Lim-Breitbart, J., Kirkpatrick, D., & Linn, M. (2016). Iteratively refining a science explanation tool through classroom implementation and stakeholder partnerships. International Journal of Designs for Learning, 7(2). www.learntechlib.org/p/209686/
- Matuk, C., Tissenbaum, M., & Schneider, B. (2019b). Real-time orchestrational technologies in computer-supported collaborative learning: An introduction to the special issue. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 14(3), 251–260. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-019-09310-5
- Matuk, C., Zhang, J., & Linn, M. C. (2017). How middle school students construct and critique graphs to explain cancer treatment. In B. K. Smith, M. Borge, E. Mercier, & K.-Y. Lim (Eds.), Making a difference: Prioritizing equity and access in CSCL, 12th international conference on computer supported collaborative learning (CSCL) 2017 (Vol. 1, pp. 375–382). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Matuk, C., Zhang, J., Uk, I., & Linn, M. C. (2019a). Qualitative graphing in an authentic inquiry context: How construction and critique help middle school students to reason about cancer. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(7), 905–936. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21533
- McBride, E. A., Vitale, J., & Linn, M. (2018). Learning design through science vs. science through design. In J. Kay & R. Luckin (Eds.), Rethinking learning in the digital age: Making the learning sciences count, 13th international conference of the learning of the learning sciences (ICLS) 2018 (Vol. 1, pp. 17–24). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- McElhaney, K. W., Baker, A., Kasad, Z., Roschelle, J., & Chillmon, C. (2021). A field-driven, equity-centered research agenda for OpenSciEd [White paper]. Digital Promise.
- McElhaney, K. W., Chang, H.-Y., Chiu, J. L., & Linn, M. C. (2015). Evidence for effective uses of dynamic visualisations in science curriculum materials. Studies in Science Education, 51(1), 49–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2014.984506
- Miller, E. C., Severance, S., & Krajcik, J. (2021). Motivating teaching, sustaining change in practice: Design principles for teacher learning in project-based learning contexts. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(7), 757–779. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1864099
- Misiejuk, K., & Wasson, B. (2021). Backward evaluation in peer assessment: A scoping review. Computers & Education, 175, 104319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104319
- Mokros, J. R., & 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660240408
- Moore, E. B., Chamberlain, J. M., Parson, R., & Perkins, K. K. (2014). PhET interactive simulations: Transformative tools for teaching chemistry. Journal of Chemical Education, 91(8), 1191–1197. https://doi.org/10.1021/ed4005084
- Morales-Doyle, D. (2017). Justice-centered science pedagogy: A catalyst for academic achievement and social transformation. Science Education, 101(6), 1034–1060. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21305
- Morales-Doyle, D., Childress Price, T., & Chappell, M. J. (2019). Chemicals are contaminants too: Teaching appreciation and critique of science in the era of Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Science Education, 103(6), 1347–1366. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21546
- Morales-Doyle, D., & Gutstein, E. (2019). Racial capitalism and STEM education in Chicago Public Schools. Race Ethnicity and Education, 22(4), 525–544. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2019.1592840
- Nasir, N. S., Rosebery, A. S., Warren, B., & Lee, C. D. (2014). Learning as a cultural process: Achieving equity through diversity. In The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (2nd ed., pp. 686–706). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139519526.041
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine . (2018). Learning through citizen science: Enhancing opportunities by design. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/25183
- National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K-8. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11625
- NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.
- Niaz, M., & Maza, A. (2011). Nature of science in general chemistry textbooks. In Nature of science in general chemistry textbooks (pp. 1–37). Springer.
- Norris, C. , & Soloway, E. (2017). The Collabrify research platform: A research tool for studying synchronous collaboration in the classroom. iConference 2017 Proceedings. https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/items/101835
- Nzinga, K., Rapp, D. N., Leatherwood, C., Easterday, M., Rogers, L. O., Gallagher, N., & Medin, D. L. (2018). Should social scientists be distanced from or engaged with the people they study? Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115(45), 11435–11441. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721167115
- Ogan, A., Walker, E., Baker, R., Rodrigo, M. M. T., Soriano, J. C., & Castro, M. J. (2015). Towards understanding how to assess belp-seeking behavior across cultures. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 25(2), 229–248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-014-0034-8
- Osborne, J. F., Henderson, J. B., MacPherson, A., Szu, E., Wild, A., & Yao, S.-Y. (2016). The development and validation of a learning progression for argumentation in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(6), 821–846. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21316
- Owens, D. C. , & Sadler, T. D. (2020). Socio-scientific issues as contexts for the development of STEM literacy. In Handbook of research on STEM education. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429021381-20
- Paulus, P. B., Coursey, L. E., & Kenworthy, J. B. (2019). Divergent and convergent collaborative creativity. In I. Lebuda & V. P. Glăveanu (Eds.), The Palgrave handbook of social creativity research (pp. 245–262). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95498-1 16
- Pea, R. , & Linn, M. C. (2020). Personal perspectives on the emergence of the learning sciences: 1970s-2005. Frontiers in Education. www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/feduc.2020.00130
- Penuel, W. R. (2017). Research practice partnerships as a strategy for promoting equitable science teaching and learning through leveraging everyday science. Science Education, 101(4), 520–525. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21285

- 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(4), 996–1025. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211410864
- Penuel, W. R., Reiser, B. J., McGill, T. A. W., Novak, M., Van Horne, K., & Orwig, A. (2022). Connecting student interests and questions with science learning goals through project-based storylines. Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research, 4(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-021-00040-z
- Perin, D., & Lauterbach, M. (2018). Assessing text-based writing of low-skilled college students. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 28(1), 56–78.
- Pew Research Center. (2020). Most parents of K-12 students learning online worry about them falling behind.
- www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2020/10/29/most-parents-of-k-12-students-learning-online-worry-about-them-falling-behind/ Pew Research Center . (2021). The internet and the pandemic. www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/09/01/the-internet-and-the-pandemic/
- Philip, T. M., & Azevedo, F. S. (2017). Everyday science learning and equity: Mapping the contested terrain. Science Education, 101(4), 526–532. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21286
- Philip, T. M., & Gupta, A. (2020). Emerging perspectives on the co-construction of power and learning in the learning sciences, mathematics education, and science education. Review of Research in Education, 44(1), 195–217. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X20903309
- Pinkard, N., Martin, C. K., & Erete, S. (2020). Equitable approaches: Opportunities for computational thinking with emphasis on creative production and connections to community. Interactive Learning Environments, 28(3), 347–361. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1636070
- Plutzer, E., McCaffrey, M., Hannah, A. L., Rosenau, J., Berbeco, M., & Reid, A. H. (2016). Climate confusion among U.S. teachers. Science, 351(6274), 664–665. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab3907
- Polman, J. L., & Hope, J. M. G. (2014). Science news stories as boundary objects affecting engagement with science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(3), 315–341. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21144
- Puntambekar, S., Gnesdilow, D., Dornfeld Tissenbaum, C., Narayanan, N. H., & Rebello, N. S. (2021). Supporting middle school students' science talk: A comparison of physical and virtual labs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(3), 392–419. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21664
- Quintana, C., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Krajcik, J., Fretz, E., Duncan, R. G., 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. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327809jls1303 4
- Rafferty, A. N., Gerard, L. F., McElhaney, K., & Linn, M. C. (2013, July 13). Automating guidance for students chemistry drawings. In E. Walker & C.-K. Looi (Eds.), Proceedings of the Workshops at the 16th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education (Vol. 8, pp. 612–619). AIED.
- Raviv, A., Cohen, S., & Aflalo, E. (2019). How should students learn in the school science laboratory? The benefits of cooperative learning. Research in Science Education, 49(2), 331–345. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9618-2
- Raza, A., Penuel, W., Allen, A., Sumner, T., & Jacobs, J. (2021). "Making it culturally relevant": A visual learning analytics system supporting teachers to reflect on classroom equity. In Proceedings of 15th International Conference of the Learning Sciences ICLS 2021. International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Remillard, J. T. (2005). Examining key concepts in research on teachers' use of mathematics curricula. Review of Educational Research, 75(2), 211–246. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075002211
- Richardson, J. C., Maeda, Y., Lv, J., & Caskurlu, S. (2017). Social presence in relation to students' satisfaction and learning in the online environment: A meta-analysis. Computers in Human Behavior, 71, 402–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.02.001
- Richland, L. E., Linn, M. C., & Bjork, R. A. (2007). Cognition and instruction: Bridging laboratory and classroom settings. Handbook of Applied Cognition, 555–584. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470713181.ch21
- Riedl, C. , Blohm, I. , Leimeister, J. M. , & Krcmar, H. (2013). The effect of rating scales on decision quality and user attitudes in online innovation communities. International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 17(3), 7–36. https://doi.org/10.2753/JEC1086-4415170301
- Riordan, B., Cahill, A., Chen, J. K., Wiley, K., Bradford, A., Gerard, L., & Linn, M. C. (2020). Identifying NGSS-aligned ideas in student science explanations. Paper presented at the Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, New York.
- Rios, T., Elliott, M., & Mandernach, B. J. (2018). Efficient instructional strategies for maximizing online student satisfaction. Journal of Educators Online, 15(3), n3.
- Roblin, N. P., Schunn, C., & McKenney, S. (2018). What are critical features of science curriculum materials that impact student and teacher outcomes? Science Education, 102(2), 260–282. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21328
- Rodríguez-Triana, M. J., Prieto, L. P., Ley, T., de Jong, T., & Gillet, D. (2020). Social practices in teacher knowledge creation and innovation adoption: A large-scale study in an online instructional design community for inquiry learning. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 15(4), 445–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-020-09331-5
- Roseman, J. E., Herrmann-Abell, C. F., & Koppal, M. (2017). Designing for the next generation science standards: Educative curriculum materials and measures of teacher knowledge. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(1), 111–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2016.1277598
- Roth, K. J., Wilson, C. D., Taylor, J. A., Stuhlsatz, M. A. M., & Hvidsten, C. (2018). Comparing the effects of analysis-of-practice and content-based professional development on teacher and student outcomes in science. American Educational Research Journal, 56(4), 1217–1253. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218814759
- Rubel, L. H., Lim, V. Y., Hall-Wieckert, M., & Sullivan, M. (2016). Teaching mathematics for spatial justice: An investigation of the lottery. Cognition and Instruction, 34(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2015.1118691
- 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.
- Rutten, N., van Joolingen, W. R., & van der Veen, J. T. (2012). The learning effects of computer simulations in science education. Computers & Education, 58(1), 136–153. www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131511001758
- Ryoo, K., & Linn, M. C. (2014). Designing guidance for interpreting dynamic visualizations: Generating versus reading explanations. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(2), 147–174. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21128
- Ryoo, K., & Linn, M. C. (2015). Designing and validating assessments of complex thinking in science. Theory Into Practice, 54(3), 238–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2015.1044374

- Ryoo, K., & Linn, M. C. (2016). Designing automated guidance for concept diagrams in inquiry instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(7), 1003–1035. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21321
- Sato, E., & Linn, M. C. (2014). Designing critique to improve conceptual understanding. In J. L. Polman, E. A. Keewwyza, D. K. O'Neill, I. Tabak, W. R. Penuel, A. S. Jurow, K. O'Connor, T. Lee, & L. D'Amico (Eds.), Learning and becoming in practice: The international conference of the learning sciences (ICLS) 2014, volume 1 (Vol. 1, pp. 385–393). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (2014). Knowledge building and knowledge creation: Theory, pedagogy, and technology. In L. Sawyer (Ed.), Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 397–417). Cambridge University Press.
- Schad, M., & Jones, W. M. (2020). The maker movement and education: A systematic review of the literature. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 52(1), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2019.1688739
- Schneider, B., & Pea, R. (2014). Toward collaboration sensing. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 9(4), 371–395. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-014-9202-y
- Severance, S., Penuel, W. R., Sumner, T., & Leary, H. (2016). Organizing for teacher agency in curricular co-design. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 25(4), 531–564. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2016.1207541
- Sharples, M., Aristeidou, M., Herodotou, C., McLeod, K., & Scanlon, E. (2019). Inquiry learning at scale: Pedagogy-informed design of a platform for citizen inquiry. In Proceedings of the Sixth (2019) ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale. Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3330430.3333642
- Shen, J., Lei, J., Chang, H. Y., & Namdar, B. (2014). Technology-enhanced, modeling-based instruction (TMBI) in science education. In Handbook of research on educational communications and technology (pp. 529–540). Springer.
- Shute, V. J., & Rahimi, S. (2017). Review of computer-based assessment for learning in elementary and secondary education. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 33(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12172
- Spencer, H., & Taylor, M. (2021). Social statics. Routledge.
- Tansomboon, C., Gerard, L. F., Vitale, J. M., & Linn, M. C. (2017). Designing automated guidance to promote productive revision of science explanations. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 27(4), 729–757. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-017-0145-0
- Tate, E. D. (2009). Asthma in the community: Designing instruction to help students explore scientific dilemmas that impact their lives (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database (Umi No. 3383554).
- Tate, E. D., Ibourk, A., McElhaney, K. W., & Feng, M. (2020). Middle school students' mechanistic explanation about trait expression in rice plants during a technology-enhanced science inquiry investigation. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 29(5), 677–690. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09846-4
- Tekkumru-Kisa, M., Stein, M. K., & Doyle, W. (2020). Theory and research on tasks revisited: Task as a context for students' thinking in the era of ambitious reforms in mathematics and science. Educational Researcher, 49(8), 606–617. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20932480
- Tissenbaum, M., & Slotta, J. (2019). Supporting classroom orchestration with real-time feedback: A role for teacher dashboards and real-time agents. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 14(3), 325–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-019-09306-1
- Trouille, L., Lintott, C. J., & Fortson, L. F. (2019). Citizen science frontiers: Efficiency, engagement, and serendipitous discovery with human Machine systems. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(6), 1902
- Vakil, S. (2018). Ethics, identity, and political vision: Toward a justice-centered approach to equity in computer science education. Harvard Educational Review, 88(1), 26–52. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-88.1.26
- Vakil, S., McKinney de Royston, M., Suad Nasir, N., & Kirshner, B. (2016). Rethinking race and power in design-based research: Reflections from the field. Cognition and Instruction, 34(3), 194–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2016.1169817
- van Leeuwen, A., Rummel, N., & van Gog, T. (2019). What information should CSCL teacher dashboards provide to help teachers interpret CSCL situations? International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 14(3), 261–289. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-019-09299-x
- Visintainer, T. (2020). "I think at first glance people would not expect me to be interested in science": Exploring the racialized science experiences of high school students of color. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(3), 393–422. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21597
- Vitale, J. M., Applebaum, L., & Linn, M. C. (2019). Coordinating between graphs and science concepts: Density and buoyancy. Cognition and Instruction, 37(1), 38–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2018.1539736
- Vitale, J. M., Lai, K., & Linn, M. C. (2015). Taking advantage of automated assessment of student-constructed graphs in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(10), 1426–1450. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21241
- Vitale, J. M., McBride, E., & Linn, M. C. (2016). Distinguishing complex ideas about climate change: Knowledge integration vs. specific guidance. International Journal of Science Education, 38(9), 1548–1569. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1198969 Wang, J., Werner-Avidon, M., Newton, L., Randol, S., Smith, B., & Walker, G. (2013). Ingenuity in action: Connecting tinkering to engineering design processes. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research (J-PEER), 3(1), Article 2.
- https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1077
- Warren, B., Vossoughi, S., Rosebery, A. S., Bang, M., & Taylor, E. V. (2020). Multiple ways of knowing*: Re-Imagining disciplinary learning. In Handbook of the cultural foundations of learning (pp. 277–294). Routledge.
- Weinberger, A., Stegmann, K., & Fischer, F. (2007). Knowledge convergence in collaborative learning: Concepts and assessment. Learning and Instruction, 17(4), 416–426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2007.03.007
- Weintrop, D., & Wilensky, U. (2019). Transitioning from introductory block-based and text-based environments to professional programming languages in high school computer science classrooms. Computers & Education, 142, 103646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103646
- Wiley, K., Gerard, L., Bradford, A., & Linn, M. C. (in press). Teaching with technology: Empowering teachers and promoting equity in science. In: A. M. O'Donnell, J. Reeve, & N. Barnes (Eds.): Oxford Handbook of Educational Psychology, Oxford University Press. Williams, M., DeBarger, A. H., Montgomery, B. L., Zhou, X., & Tate, E. (2012). Exploring middle school students' conceptions of the relationship between genetic inheritance and cell division. Science Education, 96(1), 78–103. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20465 Wilson, J., & Czik, A. (2016). Automated essay evaluation software in English Language Arts classrooms: Effects on teacher feedback, student motivation, and writing quality. Computers & Education, 100, 94–109.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.05.004

- Wing, J. M. (2006). Computational thinking. Communications of the ACM, 49(3), 33–35. https://doi.org/10.1145/1118178.1118215 Wu, J., & Uttal, D. (2020). Beyond the leaky pipeline: Developmental pathways that lead college students to join or return to STEM majors. Journal of Research in STEM Education, 6(2 SE-Articles), 64–90. https://doi.org/10.51355/jstem.2020.80
- Wu, M.-Y. M., Magnone, K., Tasker, R., & Yezierski, E. J. (2021). Remote chemistry teacher professional development delivery: Enduring lessons for programmatic redesign. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(8), 2518–2526. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.1c00181
- Xu, Z., Ritzhaupt, A. D., Tian, F., & Umapathy, K. (2019). Block-based versus text-based programming environments on novice student learning outcomes: A meta-analysis study. Computer Science Education, 29(2–3), 177–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2019.1565233
- Ye, L., Recker, M., Walker, A., Leary, H., & Yuan, M. (2015). Expanding approaches for understanding impact: Integrating technology, curriculum, and open educational resources in science education. Educational Technology Research and Development, 63(3), 355–380. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9377-6
- Zacharia, Z. C., Manoli, C., Xenofontos, N., de Jong, T., Pedaste, M., van Riesen, S. A. N., Kamp, E. T., Mäeots, M., Siiman, L., & Tsourlidaki, E. (2015). Identifying potential types of guidance for supporting student inquiry when using virtual and remote labs in science: A literature review. Educational Technology Research and Development, 63(2), 257–302. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9370-0
- Zhai, X., Yin, Y., Pellegrino, J. W., Haudek, K. C., & Shi, L. (2020). Applying machine learning in science assessment: A systematic review. Studies in Science Education, 56(1), 111–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2020.1735757
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20443
- Zheng, L., Zhang, X., & Cui, P. (2020). The role of technology-facilitated peer assessment and supporting strategies: A meta-analysis. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45(3), 372–386. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1644603
 Zhu, M., Liu, O. L., & Lee, H.-S. (2020). The effect of automated feedback on revision behavior and learning gains in formative assessment of scientific argument writing. Computers & Education, 143, 103668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103668
 Zohar, R., Bagno, E., Eylon, B., & Abrahamson, D. (2018). Motor skills, creativity, and cognition in learning physics concepts. Functional Neurology, Rehabilitation, and Ergonomics, 7(3), 67–76.
- Zucker, A., Tinker, R., Staudt, C., Mansfield, A., & Metcalf, S. (2008). Learning science in Grades 3–8 using probeware and computers: Findings from the TEEMSS II project. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 17(1), 42–48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-007-9086-y

Science Education During the Early Childhood Years

- Adams, E. J., & Parlakian, R. (2016). Sharing the wonder: Science with infants and toddlers. Young Children, 71(1), 94–96. Adbo, K., & Carulla, C. V. (2020). Learning about science in preschool: Play-based activities to support children's understanding of chemistry concepts. International Journal of Early Childhood, 52, 17–35.
- Åkerblom, A., Součková, D., & Pramling, N. (2019). Preschool children's conceptions of water, molecule, and chemistry before and after participating in a playfully dramatized early childhood education activity. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(4), 879–895. 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 Education and Technology, 20(5), 537–549.
- Akerson, V. L., Weiland, I., & Fouad, K. E. (2015). Young children's ideas about life science concepts. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 99–124). Springer.
- Akman, B., & Ozgul, S. G. (2015). Role of play in teaching science in the early years. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 237–258). Springer.
- Alber-Morgan, S. R., Sawyer, M. R., & Miller, H. L. (2015). Teaching science to young children with special needs. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 299–324). Springer.
- Alexander, J. M., Johnson, K. E., & Kelley, K. (2012). Longitudinal analysis of the relations between opportunities to learn about science and the development of interests related to science. Science Education, 96(5), 763–786.
- Andersson, K., & Gullberg, A. (2014). What is science in preschool and what do teachers have to know to empower children? Cultural Studies of Science Education, 9(2), 275–296.
- Apanasionok, M. M., Hastings, R. P., Grindle, C. F., Watkins, R. C., & Paris, A. (2019). Teaching science skills and knowledge to students with developmental disabilities: A systematic review. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(7), 847–880.
- Areljung, S., Ottander, C., & Due, K. (2017). "Drawing the leaves anyway": Teachers embracing children's different ways of knowing in preschool science practice. Research in Science Education, 47, 1173–1192.
- Bagiati, A., & Evangelou, D. (2015). Engineering curriculum in the preschool classroom: The teacher's experience. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 23(1), 112–128.
- Baruch, Y. K., Spektor-Levy, O., & Mashal, N. (2016). Pre-schoolers' verbal and behavioral responses as indicators of attitudes and scientific curiosity. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 14(1), 125–148.
- Bird, D., Culley, L., & Lakhanpaul, M. (2013). Why collaborate with children in health research: An analysis of the risks and benefits of collaboration with children. Archives of Disease in Childhood Education and Practice, 98, 42–48.
- Breit-Smith, A., Busch, J. D., Dinnesen, M. S., & Guo, Y. (2017). Interactive book reading with expository science texts in preschool special education classrooms. Grantee Submission, 49(3), 185–193.
- Brenneman, K. (2011). Assessment for preschool science learning and learning environments. Early Childhood Research & Practice, 13(1), 1–9.
- Bulunuz, M. (2013). Teaching science through play in kindergarten: Does integrated play and science instruction build understanding? European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 21(2), 226–249.
- Bustamante, A. S., Greenfield, D. B., & Nayfeld, I. (2018). Early childhood science and engineering: Engaging platforms for fostering domain-general learning Skills. Education Sciences, 8(144), 1–13.

- Bustamante, A. S., White, L. J., & Greenfield, D. B. (2017). Approaches to learning and school readiness in Head Start: Applications to preschool science. Learning and Individual Differences, 56, 112–118.
- Bustamante, A. S., White, L. J., & Greenfield, D. B. (2018). Approaches to learning and science education in Head Start: Examining bidirectionality. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 44, 34–42.
- Byrne, J., Rietdijk, W., & Cheek, S. (2016). Enquiry-based science in the infant classroom: 'Letting go'. International Journal of Early Years Education, 24(2), 206–223.
- Caiman, C., & Lundegård, I. (2018). Young children's imagination in science education and education for sustainability. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13, 687–705.
- Chang, N. (2012). The role of drawing in young children's construction of science concepts. Early Childhood Education Journal, 40, 187–193.
- Chen, Y. C., Hand, B., & Norton-Meier, L. (2017). Teacher roles of questioning in early elementary science classrooms: A framework promoting student cognitive complexities in argumentation. Research in Science Education, 47(2), 373–405.
- Clements, D. H., Vinh, M., Lim, C.-I., & Sarama, J. (2020). STEM for inclusive excellence and equity. Early Education and Development, 32(1), 1–24.
- Cowie, B., & Otrel-Cass, K. (2011). Exploring the value of "horizontal" learning in early years science classrooms. Early Years, 31(3), 285–295.
- Curran, F. C., & Kitchin, J. (2019). Early elementary science instruction: Does more time on science or science topics/skills predict science achievement in the early grades? AERA Open, 5(3), 1–18.
- Cutter-Mackenzie, A., & Edwards, S. (2013). Toward a model for early childhood environmental education: Foregrounding, developing, and connecting knowledge through play-based learning. The Journal of Environmental Education, 44(3), 195–213.
- Czerniak, C., Paprzycki, P., Hapgood, S., & Kaderavek, J. (2019). Longitudinal impact of early childhood science instruction on middle grades literacy and mathematics. Advances in Global Education and Research, 3, 279.
- Dalvi, T., Wendell, K. B., & Johnson, J. (2016). Community-based engineering: An approach to integrate and unify STEM. Experiences from a 2nd grade urban classroom. Young Children, 71(5).
- 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(15), 2069–2094.
- de Freitas, E., & Palmer, A. (2016). How scientific concepts come to matter in early childhood curriculum: Rethinking the concept of force. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(4), 1201–1222.
- Dejonckheere, P. J. N., de Keere, K., Vervaet, S., & De Wit, D. (2016). Exploring the classroom: Teaching science in early childhood. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 8(4), 537–558.
- Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations . (2019). Belonging, being, becoming: The early years learning framework for Australia. www.dese.gov.au/national-quality-framework-early-childhood-education-and-care/resources/belonging-being-becoming-early-years-learning-framework-australia
- Doğan, Y., & Simsar, A. (2018). Preschool teachers' views on science education, the methods they use, science activities, and the problems they face. International Journal of Progressive Education, 14(5), 57–76.
- Eckhoff, A. (2017). Partners in inquiry: A collaborative life science investigation with preservice teachers and Kindergarten students. Early Childhood Education Journal, 45, 219–227.
- Emmons, N., Smith, H., & Kelemen, D. (2016). Changing minds with the story of adaptation: Strategies for teaching young children about natural selection. Early Education and Development, 27(8), 1205–1221.
- $Ero-Tolliver, I.\ , Lucas, D.\ , \& Schauble, L.\ (2013). Young children's thinking about decomposition: Early modeling entrees to complex ideas in science. Research in Science Education, 43, 2137-2152.$
- European Commission . (2015). Science education for responsible citizenship. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/publication/a1d14fa0-8dbe-11e5-b8b7-01aa75ed71a1
- Fleer, M. (2013). Affective imagination in science education: Determining the emotional nature of scientific and technological learning of young children. Research in Science Education, 43(5), 2085–2106.
- Fleer, M. (2018). Conceptual playworlds: The role of imagination in play and learning. Early Years, 41(4), 353–364.
- Fleer, M. (2019). Scientific playworlds: A model of teaching science in play-based settings. Research in Science Education, 49(5), 1257–1278.
- Fleer, M. (2020). A tapestry of playworlds: A study into the reach of Lindqvist's legacy in testing times. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 27(1), 36–49.
- Fleer, M., Adams, M., & Gunstone, R. (2019). Transformative pedagogy: Dinka playgroups as spaces for cultural knowledge productions of Western science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(4), 1045–1069.
- Fleer, M., & March, S. (2015). Conceptualizing science learning as a collective social practice: Changing the social pedagogical compass for a child with visual impairment. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 10, 803–831.
- Frejd, J. (2019a). When children do science: Collaborative interactions in preschoolers' discussions about animal diversity. Research in Science Education, 1–22.
- Frejd, J. (2019b). Children's encounters with natural selection during an interactive read aloud. Research in Science Education, 1–14. Fridberg, M., Jonsson, A., Redfors, A., & Thulin, S. (2019). Teaching chemistry and physics in preschool: A matter of establishing intersubjectivity. International Journal of Science Education, 41(17), 2542–2556.
- Fridberg, M., Thulin, S., & Redfors, A. (2017). Preschool children's collaborative science learning scaffolded by tablets. Research in Science Education, 48(5), 1007–1026.
- Garner, P. W., Gabitova, N., Gupta, A., & Wood, T. (2018). Innovations in science education: Infusing social emotional principles into early STEM learning. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13, 889–903.
- Gerde, H. K., Pierce, S. J., Lee, K., & Van Egeren, L. A. (2018). Early childhood educators' self-efficacy in science, math, and literacy instruction and science practice in the classroom. Early Education and Development, 29(1), 70–90.
- Gonzalez, J., Pollard-Durodola, S., Simmons, D., Taylor, A., Davis, M., Kim, M., & Simmons, L. (2010). Developing low income preschoolers' social studies and science vocabulary knowledge through content focused shared book reading. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 4(1), 25–52.
- Gopnik, A. (2012). Scientific thinking in young children: Theoretical advances, empirical research, and policy implications. Science, 337(6102), 1623–1627.

- Goulart, M. I. M., & Roth, W. M. (2010). Engaging young children in collective curriculum design. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5(3), 533–562.
- Green, C. J. (2015). Toward young children as active researchers: A critical review of the methodologies and methods in early childhood environmental education. The Journal of Environmental Education, 46(4), 207–229.
- Greenfield, D. B., Jirout, J., Dominguez, X., Greenberg, A., Maier, M., & Fuccillo, J. (2009). Science in the preschool classroom: A programmatic research agenda to improve science readiness. Early Education and Development, 20(2), 238–264.
- Gropen, J., Clark-Chiarelli, N., Hoisington, C., & Ehrlich, S. B. (2011). The importance of executive function in early science education. Child Development Perspectives, 5(4), 298–304.
- Gropen, J., Kook, J. F., Hoisington, C., & Clark-Chiarelli, N. (2017). Foundations of science literacy: Efficacy of a preschool professional development program in science on classroom instruction, teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, and children's observations and predictions. Early Education and Development, 28(5), 607–631.
- Gross, L., Fitts, S., Quadrini, V., & Ramirez, B. M. (2018). Gravity is a pull! Exploring forces and motion with English learners. Science Activities: Classroom Projects and Curriculum Ideas, 55(1–2), 1–19.
- Günther-Hanssen, A. (2020). Barn, naturvetenskap och könande processer i förskolan [Doctoral dissertation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis].
- Guo, Y., Wang, S., Hall, A. H., Breit-Smith, A., & Busch, J. (2016). The effects of science instruction on young children's vocabulary learning: A research synthesis. Early Childhood Education Journal, 44(4), 359–367.
- Gustavsson, L., Jonsson, A., Ljung-Djärf, A., & Thulin, S. (2016). Ways of dealing with science learning: A study based on Swedish early childhood education practice. International Journal of Science Education, 38(11), 1867–1881.
- Gustavsson, L., & Pramling, N. (2013). The educational nature of different ways teachers communicate with children about natural phenomena. International Journal of Early Years Education, 22(1), 59–72.
- Hamlin, M., & Wisneski, D. B. (2012). Supporting the scientific thinking and inquiry of toddlers and preschoolers through play. Young Children, 67(3), 82–88.
- Hammer, A. S. E., & He, M. (2016). Preschool teachers' approaches to science: A comparison of a Chinese and a Norwegian kindergarten. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 24(3), 450–464.
- Hansson, L., Leden, L., & Thulin, S. (2020). Book talks as an approach to nature of science teaching in early childhood education. International Journal of Science Education, 42(12), 2095–2111.
- Harris, P. L., & Koenig, M. A. (2006). Trust in testimony: How children learn about science and religion. Child Development, 77(3), 505–524.
- Haus, J. M. (2018). Performative intra-action of a paper plane and a child: Exploring scientific concepts as agentic playmates. Research in Science Education, 50, 1305–1320.
- Hedefalk, M., Almqvist, J., & Östman, L. (2014). Education for sustainable development in early childhood education: A review of the research literature. Environmental Education Research, 21(7), 975–990.
- Henrichs, L. F., & Leseman, P. P. (2014). Early science instruction and academic language development can go hand in hand. The promising effects of a low-intensity teacher-focused intervention. International Journal of Science Education, 36(17), 2978–2995.
- Hobson, S. M., Trundle, K. C., & Saçkes, M. (2010). Using a planetarium software program to promote conceptual change with young children. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 19(2), 165–176.
- Hong, S. Y., & Diamond, K. E. (2012). Two approaches to teaching young children science concepts, vocabulary, and scientific problem-solving skills. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 27(2), 295–305.
- Hu, J., Gordon, C., Yang, N., & Ren, Y. (2020). "Once upon a star": A science education program based on personification storytelling in promoting preschool children's understanding of astronomy concepts. Early Education and Development, 32(1), 7–25. lannacci, L. (2016). A case study of asset-oriented approaches to cultural and linguistic diversity in early childhood education. In R. Heydon & L. lannacci (Eds.), Early childhood curricula and the de-pathologizing of childhood (pp. 130–153). University of Toronto Press
- Impedovo, M. A., Delserieys-Pedregosa, A., Jégou, C., & Ravanis, K. (2017). Shadow formation at preschool from a socio-materiality perspective. Research in Science Education, 47, 579–601.
- Inan, H. Z., & Inan, T. (2015). 3 H s Education: Examining hands-on, heads-on and hearts-on early childhood science education. International Journal of Science Education, 37(12), 1974–1991.
- Inan, H. Z., Trundle, K. C., & Kantor, R. (2010). Understanding natural sciences education in a Reggio Emilia-inspired preschool in America. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(10), 1186–1208.
- Isik-Ercan, Z. (2020). "You have 25 kids playing around!": Learning to implement inquiry-based science learning in an urban second-grade classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 42(3), 329–349.
- Jirout, J., & Zimmerman, C. (2015). Development of science process skills in the early childhood years. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 143–166). Springer.
- Jørgensen, N. J., & Martiny-Bruun, A. (2019). Painting trees in the wind: Socio-material ambiguity and sustainability politics in early childhood education with refugee children in Denmark. Environmental Education Research, 26(9–10), 1406–1419.
- Kaderavek, J. N., North, T., Rotshtein, R., Dao, H., Liber, N., Milewski, G., & Czerniak, C. M. (2015). SCIIENCE: The creation and pilot implementation of an NGSS-based instrument to evaluate early childhood science teaching. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 45, 27–36.
- Kallery, M. (2011). Astronomical concepts and events awareness for young children. International Journal of Science Education, 33(3), 341–369.
- Kambouri, M. (2016). Investigating early years teachers' understanding and response to children's preconceptions. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 24(6), 907–927.
- Kemple, K. M., Oh, J. H., & Porter, D. (2015). Playing at school: An inquiry approach to using an experiential play lab in an early childhood teacher education course. Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 36(3), 250–265.
- Kermani, H., & Aldemir, J. (2015). Preparing children for success: Integrating science, math, and technology in early childhood classroom. Early Child Development and Care, 185(9), 1504–1527.
- Kim, K. H., VanTassel-Baska, J., Bracken, B. A., Feng, A., Stambaugh, T., & Bland, L. (2012). Project clarion: Three years of science instruction in Title I schools among K-third grade students. Research in Science Education, 42(5), 813–829.

- Kim, M., & Roth, W. M. (2018). Dialogical argumentation in elementary science classrooms. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(4), 1061–1085.
- Kinzie, M. B., Whittaker, J., Williford, A., DeCoster, J., McGuire, P., Lee, Y., & Kilday, C. (2014). My Teaching Partner-Math/Science pre-kindergarten curricula and teacher supports: Associations with children's mathematics and science learning. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 29(4), 586–599.
- Kirch, S. A., & Siry, C. A. (2012). "Maybe the Algae was from the Filter": Maybe and similar modifiers as mediational tools and indicators of uncertainty and possibility in children's science talk. Research in Science Education, 42(2), 261–280.
- Klaar, S., & Öhman, J. (2012). Action with friction: A transactional approach to toddlers' physical meaning making of natural phenomena and processes in preschool. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 20(3), 439–454.
- Klemm, J., & Neuhaus, B. J. (2017). The role of involvement and emotional well-being for preschool children's scientific observation competency in biology. International Journal of Science Education, 39(7), 863–876.
- Kloos, H., Maltbie, C., Brown, R., & Carr, V. (2018). Listening in: Spontaneous teacher talk on playscapes. Creative Education, 9(3), 426–441.
- Larimore, R. A. (2020). Preschool science education: A vision for the future. Early Childhood Education Journal, 48(6), 703–714. Lee, Y., & Kinzie, M. B. (2011). Teacher question and student response with regard to cognition and language use. Instructional Science, 40(6), 857–874.
- Lee, Y., Kinzie, M. B., & Whittaker, J. V. (2012). Impact of online support for teachers' open-ended questioning in PreK science activities. Teaching and Teacher Education, 28(4), 568–577.
- Lin, X., Yang, W., Wu, L., Zhu, L., Wu, D., & Li, H. (2020). Using an inquiry-based science and engineering program to promote science knowledge, problem-solving skills and approaches to learning in preschool children. Early Education and Development, 1–19.
- Lloyd, E., Edmonds, C., Downs, C., Crutchley, R., Paffard, F. (2017). Talking everyday science to very young children; a study involving parents and practitioners within an early childhood centre. Early Child Development and Care, 187(2), 244–260.
- Mantzicopoulos, P., & Patrick, H. (2010). "The seesaw is a machine that goes up and down": Young children's narrative responses to science-related informational text. Early Education and Development, 21(3), 412–444.
- Mantzicopoulos, P., & Patrick, H. (2011). Reading picture books and learning science: Engaging young children with informational text. Theory Into Practice, 50(4), 269–276.
- Mantzicopoulos, P., Patrick, H., & Samarapungavan, A. (2013). Science literacy in school and home contexts: Kindergarteners' science achievement and motivation. Cognition and Instruction, 31(1), 62–119.
- Martínez-Álvarez, P. (2019). What counts as science? Expansive learning actions for teaching and learning science with bilingual children. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(4), 799–837.
- Meindertsma, H. B., van Dijk, M. W., Steenbeek, H. W., & van Geert, P. L. (2014). Assessment of preschooler's scientific reasoning in adult Child interactions: What is the optimal context? Research in Science Education, 44(2), 215–237.
- Menning, S. F. (2019). Why nurturing curiosity is an ethical endeavour: Exploring practitioners' reflections on the importance of curiosity. International Journal of Early Years Education, 27(1), 34–51.
- Merritt, E. G., Chiu, J., Peters-Burton, E., & Bell, R. (2017). Teachers' integration of scientific and engineering practices in primary classrooms. Research in Science Education, 48(6), 1321–1337.
- Milner, A. R., Sondergeld, T. A., Demir, A., Johnson, C. C., & Czerniak, C. M. (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.
- Monteira, S. F., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2016). The practice of using evidence in kindergarten: The role of purposeful observation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(8), 1232–1258.
- Monteira, S. F., Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. & Siry, C. (2020). Scaffolding children's production of representations along the three years of ECE: A longitudinal study. Research in Science Education, 52, 127–158.
- Morgan, P. L., Farkas, G., Hillemeier, M. M., & Maczuga, S. (2016). Science achievement gaps begin very early, persist, and are largely explained by modifiable factors. Educational Researcher, 45(1), 18–35.
- National Science Teachers Association . (2014). NSTA position statement: Early childhood science education. NSTA.
- Nayfeld, I., Brenneman, K., & Gelman, R. (2011). Science in the classroom: Finding a balance between autonomous exploration and teacher-led instruction in preschool settings. Early Education & Development, 22(6), 970–988.
- NGSS Lead States. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.
- Pantoya, M. L., Aguirre-Munoz, Z., & Hunt, E. M. (2015). Developing an engineering identity in early childhood. American Journal of Engineering Education, 6(2), 61–68.
- Paprzycki, P., Tuttle, N., Czerniak, C. M., Molitor, S., Kadervaek, J., & Mendenhall, R. (2017). The impact of a Framework-aligned science professional development program on literacy and mathematics achievement of K-3 students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(9), 1174–1196.
- Parsons, A. W., & Bryant, C. L. (2016). Deepening kindergarteners' science vocabulary: A design study. The Journal of Educational Research, 109(4), 375–390.
- Patrick, H., & Mantzicopoulos, P. (2015). Young children's motivation for learning science. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 7–34). Springer.
- Pattison, S. A., & Dierking, L. D. (2019). Early childhood science interest development: Variation in interest patterns and parent Child interactions among low-income families. Science Education, Science Education, 103, 362–388.
- Pendergast, E. , Lieberman-Betz, R. G. , & Vail, C. O. (2017). Attitudes and beliefs of prekindergarten teachers toward teaching science to young children. Early Childhood Education Journal, 45(1), 43-52.
- Plummer, J. D., & Small, K. J. (2018). Using a planetarium fieldtrip to engage young children in three-dimensional learning through representations, patterns, and lunar phenomena. International Journal of Science Education, 8(3), 193–212.
- Plummer, J. P. (2019). The effect of depth on the useful field of view [Doctoral dissertation, Wichita State University].
- Ravanis, K. (2017). Early childhood science education: State of the art and new perspectives. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 16(3), 284–288.
- Ravanis, K., Christidou, V., & Hatzinikita, V. (2013a). Enhancing conceptual change in preschool children's representations of light: A sociocognitive approach. Research in Science Education, 43(6), 2257–2276.

- Ravanis, K., Papandreou, M., Kampeza, M., & Vellopoulou, A. (2013b). Teaching activities for the construction of a precursor model in 5- to 6-year-old children's thinking: The case of thermal expansion and contraction of metals. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 21(4), 514–526.
- Rigney, J. C., & Callanan, M. A. (2011). Patterns in parent Child conversations about animals at a marine science center. Cognitive Development, 26(2), 155–171.
- Saçkes, M. (2012). How often do early childhood teachers teach science concepts? Determinants of the frequency of science teaching in kindergarten. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 22(2), 169–184.
- Saçkes, M. (2013). Children's competencies in process skills in kindergarten and their impact on academic achievement in third grade. Early Education & Development, 24(5), 704–720.
- Saçkes, M. (2014). Parents who want their PreK children to have science learning experiences are outliers. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 29(2), 132–143.
- Saçkes, M. (2015a). Kindergartners' mental models of the day and night cycle: Implications for instructional practices in early childhood classrooms. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 997–1007.
- Saçkes, M. (2015b). Young children's ideas about earth and space science concepts. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 35–66). Springer.
- Saçkes, M., Flevares, L. M., & Trundle, K. C. (2010a). Four-to six-year-old children's conceptions of the mechanism of rainfall. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 25(4), 536–546.
- Saçkes, M., Smith, M. M., & Trundle, K. C. (2016). US and Turkish preschoolers' observational knowledge of astronomy. International Journal of Science Education, 38(1), 116–129.
- Saçkes, M., Trundle, K. C., & Bell, R. L. (2013). Science learning experiences in kindergarten and children's growth in science performance in elementary grades. Education and Science, 38(167), 114–127.
- Saçkes, M., Trundle, K. C., Bell, R. L., & O'Connell, A. A. (2010b). The influence of early science experience in kindergarten on children's immediate and later science achievement: Evidence from the early childhood longitudinal study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(2), 217–235.
- Saçkes, M., Trundle, K. C., Bell, R. L., & O'Connell, A. A. (2011). The influence of early science experience in kindergarten on children's immediate and later science achievement: Evidence from the early childhood longitudinal study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(2), 217–235.
- Saçkes, M., Trundle, K. C., & Shaheen, M. (2019). Profiling parental orientation to early childhood curriculum. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 27(5), 662–674.
- Saçkes, M., Trundle, K. C., & Shaheen, M. (2020). The effect of balanced learning curriculum on young children's learning of science. Early Childhood Education Journal, 16(2), 357–369.
- Samarapungavan, A., Bryan, L., & Wills, J. (2017). Second graders' emerging particle models of matter in the context of learning through model-based inquiry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(8), 988–1023.
- Samarapungavan, A., Patrick, H., & Mantzicopoulos, P. (2011). What kindergarten students learn in inquiry-based science classrooms. Cognition and Instruction, 29(4), 416–470.
- Samarapungavan, A., Tippins, D., & Bryon, L. (2015). A modeling-based inquiry framework for early childhood science learning. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 259–278). Springer.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Ringstaff, C. (2011). Reversing the downward spiral of science instruction in K-2 classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22(6), 513–533.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Ringstaff, C. (2014). Inspiring instructional change in elementary school science: The relationship between enhanced self-efficacy and teacher practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(6), 729–751.
- Sapsaglam, O., & Bozdogan, A. E. (2017). The effect of active-participant experiments upon the skills of nursery class students to recognize measuring instruments. Journal of Education in Science, Environment and Health (JESEH), 3(1),100–109.
- Sikder, S. (2015). Social situation development: Parents perspectives on infant-toddlers' concept formation in science. Early Child Development and Care, 185(10), 1685–1677.
- Sikder, S., & Fleer, M. (2015). *Small Science*: Infant and toddlers experiencing science in everyday family life. Research in Science Education, 45, 445–464.
- Sikder, S., & Fleer, M. (2018). The relations between ideal and real forms of small science: Conscious collaboration among parents and infants Toddlers (Cultural Studies of Science Education). Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(4), 865–888.
- Sims, M. (2017). Neoliberalism and early childhood. Cogent Education, 4(1), 1–10.
- Siry, C. A. (2012). Towards multidimensional approaches to early childhood science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 9(2), 297–304.
- Siry, C. A., & Brendel, M. (2016). The inseparable role of emotions in the teaching and learning of primary school science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(3), 803–815.
- Siry, C. A., & Gorges, A. (2019). Young students' diverse resources for meaning making in science: Learning from multilingual contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 42(14), 2364–2386.
- Siry, C. A., & Kremer, I. (2011). Children explain the rainbow: Using young children's ideas to guide science curricula. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 20(5), 643–655.
- Siry, C. A., & Lang, D. E. (2010). Creating participatory discourse for teaching and research in early childhood science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21(2), 149–160.
- Siry, C. A., & Max, C. (2013). The collective construction of a science unit: Framing curricula as emergent from kindergarteners' wonderings. Science Education, 97(6), 878–902.
- Siry, C. A., Ziegler, G., & Max, C. (2012). "Doing science" through discourse-in-interaction: Young children's science investigations at the early childhood level. Science Education, 96(2), 311–326.
- Slee, R. (2018). Inclusion and education: Defining the scope of inclusive education. Paper commissioned for the 2020 global education monitoring report, inclusion and education. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265773
- Smith, K. V., Loughran, J., Berry, A., & Dimitrakopoulos, C. (2012). Developing scientific literacy in a primary school. International Journal of Science Education, 34(1), 127–152.
- Smolkin, L. B., & Donovan, C. A. (2015). Science and literacy: Considering the role of texts in early childhood science education. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 211–236). Springer.

- Sounoglou, M., & Michalopoulou, A. (2016). Early childhood education curricula: Human rights and citizenship in early childhood education. Journal of Education and Learning, 6(2), 53–68.
- Spektor-Levy, O., Baruch, Y. K., & Mevarech, Z. (2013). Science and scientific curiosity in pre-school The teacher's point of view. International Journal of Science Education, 35(13), 2226–2253.
- Sullivan, A., & Bers, M. U. (2016). Robotics in the early childhood classroom: Learning outcomes from an 8-week robotics curriculum in pre-kindergarten through second grade. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 26(1), 3–20.
- Sundberg, B., Areljung, S., Due, K., Ekström, K., Ottander, C., & Tellgren, B. (2016). Understanding preschool emergent science in a cultural historical context through activity theory. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 24(4), 567–580.
- Sundberg, B., Areljung, S., Due, K., Ekström, K., Ottander, C., & Tellgren, B. (2018). Opportunities for and obstacles to science in preschools: Views from a community perspective. International Journal of Science Education, 40(17), 2061–2077.
- Tank, K. M., Rynearson, A. M., & Moore, T. J. (2018). Examining student and teacher talk within engineering design in Kindergarten. European Journal of STEM Education, 3(3), 10.
- Tao, Y. (2016). Young Chinese children's justifications of plants as living things. Early Education and Development, 27(8), 1159–1174. Tao, Y., Oliver, M., & Venville, G. (2012). Long-term outcomes of early childhood science education: Insights from a cross-national comparative case study on conceptual understanding of science. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 10(6), 1269–1302
- Tenenbaum, H. R., & Callanan, M. A. (2008). Parents' science talk to their children in Mexican-descent families residing in the USA. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32(1), 1–12.
- Teo, T. W. (2017). Editorial on focus issue: Play in early childhood science education. Pedagogies: An International Journal, 12(4), 321–324.
- Teo, T. W., Yan, Y. K., & Ong, W. M. (2017). An investigation of Singapore preschool children's emerging concepts of floating and sinking. Pedagogies: An International Journal, 12(4), 325–339.
- Terrazas-Arellanes, F. E., Gallard, M. A. J., Strycker, L. A., & Walden, E. D. (2018). Impact of interactive online units on learning science among students with learning disabilities and English learners. International Journal of Science Education, 40(5), 498–518. Tippett, C. D., & Milford, T. M. (2017). Findings from a pre-kindergarten classroom: Making the case for STEM in early childhood education. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 15(1), 67–86.
- Tippins, D. J., Neuharth-Pritchett, S., & Mitchell, D. (2015). Connecting young children with the natural world: Past, present and future landscapes. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 279–298). Springer.
- Trundle, K. C. (2015). The inclusion of science in early childhood classrooms. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 1–6). Springer.
- Trundle, K. C., & Hagevik, R. (in review). School garden-based learning research (1990–2019): A systematic review. International Journal of Science Education.
- Trundle, K. C., & Hobson, S. M. (2011). Reaching for the moon: Using technology to teach young children space science concepts. Science and Children, 49(4), 51–55.
- Trundle, K. C., & Saçkes, M. (2012). Science and early education. In R. Pianta (Ed.), Handbook of early childhood education (pp. 240–258). The Guilford Press.
- Trundle, K. C., & Saçkes, M. (Eds.). (2015). Research in early childhood science education. Springer.
- Trundle, K. C., & Smith, M. M. (2017). A hearts-on, hands-on, minds-on model for preschool science learning. Young Children, 72(1), 80–86.
- Tuttle, N., Mentzer, G. A., Strickler, L., Bloomquist, D., Hapgood, S., Molitor, S., & Czerniak, C. M. (2017). Exploring how families do science together: Adult-child interactions at community science events. School Science and Mathematics, 117(5), 175–182.
- Ucar, S. (2015). The use of technology in teaching science to young children. In K. C. Trundle & M. Saçkes (Eds.), Research in early childhood science education (pp. 167–184). Springer.
- UNESCO . (2019). Education: Early childhood: Quality. www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/strengthening-education-systems/early-childhood/quality/
- van der Graaf, J., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2015). Scientific reasoning abilities in kindergarten: Dynamic assessment of the control of variables strategy. Instructional Science, 43(3), 381–400.
- Vartiainen, J., & Kumpulainen, K. (2020). Playing with science: Manifestation of scientific play in early science inquiry. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 28(4), 490–503.
- Wan, Z. H., Jiang, Y., & Zhan, Y. (2020). STEM education in early childhood: A Review of empirical studies. Early Education and Development, 1–23.
- Weinburgh, M., Silva, C., Smith, K. H., Groulx, J., & Nettles, J. (2014). The intersection of inquiry-based science and language: Preparing teachers for ELL classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(5), 519–541.
- Wight, R. A., Kloos, H., Maltbie, C. V., & Carr, V. W. (2015). Can playscapes promote early childhood inquiry towards environmentally responsible behaviors? An exploratory study. Environmental Education Research, 22(4), 518–537.
- Wilmes, S. E., & Siry, C. (2018). Interaction rituals and inquiry-based science instruction: Analysis of student participation in small-group investigations in a multilingual classroom. Science Education, 102(5), 1107–1128.
- Wilson, R. E., & Bradbury, L. U. (2016). The pedagogical potential of drawing and writing in a primary science multimodal unit. International Journal of Science Education, 38(17), 2621–2641.
- Wright, T. S., & Gotwals, A. W. (2017). Supporting kindergartners' science talk in the context of an integrated science and disciplinary literacy curriculum. The Elementary School Journal, 117(3), 513–537.
- Zacharia, Z. C., Loizou, E., & Papaevripidou, M. (2012). Is physicality an important aspect of learning through science experimentation among kindergarten students? Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 27(3), 447–457.
- Zangori, L., & Pinnow, R. J. (2020). Positioning participating in the NGSS era: What counts as success? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 623–648.
- Zhang, M., Parker, J., Koehler, M. J., & Eberhardt, J. (2015). Understanding in-service science teachers' needs for professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26(5), 471–496.
- Zhang, M., Passalacqua, S., Lundeberg, M., Koehler, M. J., Eberhardt, J., Parker, J., Urban-Lurain, M., Zhang, T., & Paik, S. (2010). "Science talks" in Kindergarten classrooms: Improving classroom practice through collaborative action research. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21(2), 161–179.

Zucker, T. A., Williams, J. M., Bell, E. R., Assel, M. A., Landry, S. H., Monsegue-Bailey, P., Crawford, A., & Bhavsar, V. (2016). Validation of a brief, screening measure of low-income pre-kindergarteners' science and engineering knowledge. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 36, 345–357.

Zwiep, S. G., & Straits, W. J. (2013). Inquiry science: The gateway to English language proficiency. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24(8), 1315–1331.

Elementary Science Teaching

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2014). The evolving landscape related to assessment of nature of science. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education volume II (pp. 621–650). Routledge.

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, 665–701.

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.

Akerson, V. L., Abd-El-Khalick, F. S., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). The 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.

Akerson, V. L., Avsar Erumit, B., & Elcan Kaynak, N. (2019). Teaching nature of science through children's literature: An early childhood preservice teacher study. International Journal of Science Education, 41, 393–416.

Akerson, V. L., Burgess, A., Gerber, A., Guo, M., Khan, T. A., & Newman, S. (2018). Disentangling the meaning of STEM: Implications for science education and science teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19, 1–8.

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, 133–157.

Akerson, V. L., Carter, I. S., Pogsanon, K., & Nargund-Joshi, V. (2019). Teaching and learning nature of science in elementary classrooms: Research-based strategies for practical implementation. Science & Education, 28, 391–411.

Akerson, V. L., Elcan Kaynak, N., & Avsar Erumit, B. (2019). Development of third grader's identities as — persons who understand nature of science through a gravity unit. International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 5(2), 450–456.

Akerson, V. L., Pongsanon, K., Park Rogers, M., Carter, I., & Galindo, E. (2017). Exploring the use of lesson study to develop elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching nature of science. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 15, 293–312.

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(1), 3–12.

Australian Curriculum . (2022). Australian curriculum, assessment and reporting authority [ACARA]. ACARA.

Avery, L. M., & Meyer, D. Z. (2012). Teaching science as science is practiced: Opportunities and limits for enhancing preservice elementary teachers' self-efficacy for science and science teaching. School Science and Mathematics, 112(7), 395–409.

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.

Avsar Erumit, B., Fouad, K. E., & Akerson, V. L. (2019). How do learner-directed scientific investigations influence students' questioning and their nature of science conceptions? International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology (IJEMST), 7(1), 20–31. doi:10.18404/ijemst.509246

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.

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. Horizon Research, Inc.(NJ1).

Bartels, S. L., Rupe, K., & Lederman, J. S. (2019). Shaping preservice teachers' understandings of STEM: A collaborative math and science methods approach. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30, 666–680.

Batdi, V., Talan, T., & Semerci, C. (2019). Meta-analytic and meta-thematic analysis of STEM education. International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology, 7, 382–399.

Bergman, D. J., & Morphew, J. (2015). Effects of a science content course on elementary preservice teachers' self-efficacy of teaching science. Journal of College Science Teaching, 44(3), 73–81.

Blank, R. F. (2013). Science instructional time is declining in elementary schools: What are the implications for student achievement and closing the gap? Science Education, 97, 830–847.

BOEN . (2015). Bulletin Officiel de l'Éducation Nationale. Socle commun de connaissances, de compétences et de culture (NOR MENE1506516D) [In French].

Bowers, S. W., & Ernst, J. V. (2018). Assessing elementary in-service teachers' STEM-Centric lesson plans. Journal of STEM Education, 9, 5–12.

BRAZIL . (2018). Ministério da Educação e Cultura PlanoNacional da Educão. MEC.

Brunner, J. (2019). Teachers' use of educative features in guides for nature of science read-alouds. Science & Education, 28, 413–437.

Brunner, J., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2020). Improving nature of science instruction in elementary classes with modified science tradebooks and educative curriculum materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 154–183.

Buck, G. A., Akerson, V. L., Quigley, C. F., & Weiland, I. S. (2014). Exploring the potential of using explicit reflective instruction through contextualized and decontextualized approaches to teach first-grade African American girls the practices of science. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 18(6), 1–21.

Capobianco, B., Radloff, J., & Lehma, J. D. (2020). Elementary science teachers' sense-making with learning to implement engineering design and its impact on students' science achievement. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32, 39–61.

Capps, D. K., & Crawford, B. A. (2013). Inquiry-based instruction and teaching about nature of science: Are they happening? Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24(3), 497–526.

- 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(3), 291–318.
- Capps, D. K., Shemwell, J. T., & Young, A. M. (2016). Over reported and misunderstood? A study of teachers' reported enactment and knowledge of inquiry-based science teaching. International Journal of Science Education, 38(6), 934–959.
- Changpetch, S., & Seechaliao, T. (2020). The propose of an instructional model based on STEM education approach for enhancing the information and communication technology skills for elementary students. International Education Studies, 13, 69–75.
- Chen, Y. C., Hand, B., & Norton-Meier, L. (2017). Teacher roles of questioning in early elementary science classrooms: A framework promoting student cognitive complexities in argumentation. Research in Science Education, 47(2), 373–405.
- Dalvi, T., Wendell, K. (2017). Using student video cases to assess pre-service elementary teachers' engineering teaching responsiveness. Research in Scencei Education, 47, 1101–1125.
- Davis, E. A., Petish, D., & Smithey, J. (2006). Challenges new science teachers face. Review of Educational Research, 76(4), 607–651.
- DeJarnette, N. K. (2018). Early childhood STEAM: Reflections from a year of STEAM initiatives implemented in a high needs primary school. Education, 139, 95–110.
- Dell'Erba, M. (2019). Policy considerations for STEAM education. Education Commission of the States, 1–10.
- Deniz, H., & Adibelli, E. (2015). Exploring how second grade elementary teachers translate their nature of science views into classroom practice after a graduate level nature of science course. Research in Science Education, 45, 865–888.
- Department for Education . (2013). The national curriculum in England: key stages 1 and 2 framework document.

www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-primary-curriculum

- Department of Basic Education . (2011). Curriculum and assessment policy statement: Grades P-12 sciences. Government Printer.
- Diamond, B. S. , Maerten-Rivera, J. , Rohrer, R. E. , & Lee, O. (2013). Elementary teachers' science content knowledge:
- Relationships among multiple measures. Florida Journal of Educational Research, 51(5), 635-638.
- Diamond, B. S., Maerten-Rivera, J., Rohrer, R. E., & Lee, O. (2014). Effectiveness of a curricular and professional development intervention at improving elementary teachers' science content knowledge and student achievement outcomes: Year 1 results. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(5), 635–658.
- Donna, J. D., & Hick, S. R. (2017). Developing elementary preservice teacher subject matter knowledge through the use of educative science curriculum materials. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(1), 92–110.
- Duschl, R. A. (1990). Restructuring science education. Teachers College Press.
- Ebru, K., Erduran, S., Aksoz, B., & Akgun, S. (2019). Reconceptualised family resemblance approach to nature of science in preservice science teacher education. International Journal of Science Education, 41(1), 21–61.
- Elcan Kaynak, N., Akerson, V. L., & Cevik, E. (2020). Third graders' identities as —persons who understand nature of sciencell through an electricity unit. International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology (IJEMST), 8(1), 44–52.
- Engel, M., Jacob, R., Claessens, A., & Erickson, A. (2021). Kindergarten in a large urban district. Educational Researcher, 50(6). https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211041586.
- Estapa, A. T., & Tank, K. M. (2017). Supporting integrated STEM in the elementary classroom: A professional development approach centered on an engineering design challenge. International Journal of STEM Education, 4, 1–16.
- Federal Ministry of Education . (1999). UBE universal basic education for Nigeria. Proceedings of the Education Mini Summit. Abuja, Monday 29 November 1999. Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited.
- Ferguson, S., & Sutphin, L. (2019). Preservice STEM teachers' views of teaching before and after their first lesson. International Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13, 1–8.
- Finnish National Board of Education (FNBE) . (2015). The national core curriculum for upper secondary education. National Board of Education.
- Firat, E. A. (2020). Science, technology, engineering and mathematics integration: Science teachers' perceptions and beliefs. Science Education International, 31, 104–116.
- Flores, I. M. (2015). Developing preservice teachers' self-efficacy through field-based science teaching practice with elementary students. Research in Higher Education Journal, 27.
- Forbes, C. T., & Zint, M. (2010). Elementary teachers' beliefs about, perceived competencies for, and reported use of scientific inquiry to promote student learning about and for the environment. The Journal of Environmental Education, 42(1), 30–42.
- Franks, B. A., McGlamery, S. L., & VanWyngaarden, K. (2016). Effects of teaching in a science summer camp on the science self-efficacy of preservice teachers. Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 82(3), 63–73.
- Gillies, R. M., & Nichols, K. (2015). How to support primary teachers' implementation of inquiry: Teachers' reflections on teaching cooperative inquiry-based science. Research in Science Education, 45(2), 171–191.
- Griffiths, A. J., Nash, A. M., Maupin, Z., & Mathur, S. N. (2020). Her voice: Engaging and preparing girls with disabilities for science, technology, engineering, and math careers. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 12, 293–301, 419–439.
- Gunning, A. M., & Mensah, F. M. (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.
- Hacıeminoğlu, E., Ertepınar, H., Yılmaz-Tüzün, O., &Çakır, H. (2015). Students and school characteristics related to elementary school students' views of the nature of science. Education 3–13, 43(6), 700–721.
- Harris, C. J., & Rooks, D. L. (2010). Managing inquiry-based science: Challenges in enacting complex science instruction in elementary and middle school classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21(2), 227–240.
- Havice, B. , Havice, P. , Waugaman, C. , & Walker, K. (2018). Evaluating the effectiveness of integrative STEM education: Teacher and administrator professional development. Journal of Technology Education, 29, 73–90.
- Havu-Nuutinen, S., Kervinen, A., Uitto, A., Laine, A., Koliseva, A., Pyykkö, L., & Impiö, P. (2019). Pre-service and in-service teachers' experiences of inquiry-based primary science teaching: A collaborative team teaching model. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 18(4), 583–594.
- Hechter, R. P. (2011). Changes in preservice elementary teachers' personal science teaching efficacy and science teaching outcome expectancies: The influence of context. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22(2), 187–202.
- Igbokwe, C. O. (2015). Recent curriculum reforms at the basic education level in Nigeria aimed at catching them young to create change. American Journal of Educational Research, 3(1), 31–37.

- Jarrett, O. S. (1999). Science interest and confidence among preservice elementary teachers. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 11(1), 49–59.
- Kaya, S. (2012). An examination of elementary and early childhood pre-service teachers' nature of science views. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46, 581–595.
- Kelly, D. L., Centurino, V., Martin, M. O., & Mullis, I. V. S. (Eds.). (2020). TIMSS 2019 encyclopedia: Education policy and curriculum in mathematics and science. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College. https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2019/encyclopedia/
- Kim, C., Kim, D., Yuan, J., Hill, R. G., Doshi, P., & Thai, C. N. (2015). Robotics to promote elementary education pre-service teachers' STEM engagement, learning, and teaching. Computers & Education, 91, 14–31.
- Kinskey, M. (2020). Elementary preservice teachers' use of speaking, listening, and writing skills to understand the importance of nature of science instruction. Journal of College Science Teaching, 49(5), 60–67.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 20(1), 77–97.
- Leden, L., Hansson, L., & Ideland, M. (2020). The mangle of school science practice: Teachers' negotiations of two nature of science activities at different levels of contextualization. Science Education, 104, 5–26.
- Lederman, N. G. (1992). Students' and teachers' conceptions about the nature of science: A review of the research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 331–359.
- Lee, O., Llosa, L., Jiang, F., Haas, A., O'Connor, C., & Van Booven, C. D. (2016). Elementary teachers' science knowledge and instructional practices: Impact of an intervention focused on english language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(4), 579–597.
- Lie, R., Selcen Guzey, S., & Moore, T. J. (2019). Implementing engineering in diverse upper elementary and middle school science classrooms: Student learning and attitudes. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 28(2), 104–117.
- López-Bonilla, G. (2015). Curricular reforms in Mexico: Challenges for developing disciplinary literacy in upper secondary education. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 58(7), 541–545. http://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.396
- Lozon, C., & Grennon Brooks, J. (2019). The potential of purposeful play: Using the lens and language of cross-cutting concepts to enhance the science and engineering practices of play. International Journal of the Whole Child, 4(2), 88–94.
- Luft, J. A., & Hewson, P. W. (2014). Research on teacher professional development in science. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abel (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 889–910). Routledge.
- Lumpe, A. T., Haney, J. J., & Czerniak, C. M. (2000). Assessing teachers' beliefs about their science teaching context. Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 37(3), 275–292. Madden, L., Beyers, J., & O Brien, S. (2016). The importance of STEM education in the elementary grades: Learning from preservice and novice teachers' perspectives. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 20, 1–18.
- Maerten-Rivera, J. L., Huggins-Manley, A. C., Adamson, K., Lee, O., & Llosa, L. (2015). Development and validation of a measure of elementary teachers' science content knowledge in two multiyear teacher professional development intervention projects. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(3), 371–396.
- Malone, K. M., Tiarani, V., Irving. K. E., Kajfez, R., Lin, H., Giasi, T., & Edmiston, B. W. (2018). Engineering design challenges in early childhood education: Effects on student cognition and interest. European Journal of STEM Education, 3(3), 11. https://doi.org/10.20897/ejsteme/3871
- Maretta, Y. (2016). Preparing prospective teachers in integrating science and local wisdom through practicing open inquiry. Journal of Turkish Science Education, 13(2), 3–14.
- McCall, M. (2017). Elementary pre-service science teaching efficacy and attitude toward science: Can a college science course make a difference? The Electronic Journal for Research in Science & Mathematics Education, 21(6).
- McDonnough, J. T., & Matkins, J. J. (2010). The role of field experience in elementary preservice teachers' self-efficacy and ability to connect research to practice. School Science and Mathematics, 110(1), 13–23.
- McFadden, J. R., & Roehrig, G. H. (2017). Exploring teacher design endeavors while creating an elementary-focused STEM-integrated curriculum. International Journal of STEM Education, 4, 1–22.
- McFadden, J. R., & Roehrig, G. H. (2019). Engineering design in the elementary classroom: Supporting student discourse during an engineering design challenge. International Journal of Engineering and Design Education, 29, 231–262.
- Menon, D., & Sadler, T. D. (2016). Preservice elementary teachers' science self-efficacy beliefs and science content knowledge. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(6), 649–673.
- Menon, D., & Sadler, T. D. (2018). Sources of science teaching self-efficacy for preservice elementary teachers in science content courses. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 16(5), 835–855.
- Mensah, F. M. (2011). A case for culturally relevant teaching in science education and lessons learned for teacher education. The Journal of Negro Education, 296–309.
- 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 of Science Education, 6(3), 525–547.
- Milford, T. M., Jagger, S., Yore, L. D., & Anderson, J. O. (2010). National influences on science education reform in Canada. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 10(4), 370–381.
- MINEDUC . (2012). Bases Curriculares 1 a 6 básico. Santiago: Ministerio de Educación.
- Ministry of Education . (2007). The New Zealand curriculum. Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China . (2003). National curriculum standards (trial version). People's Education Press (in Chinese).
- Ministry of National Education (MNE). (2018). Ortaöğretim Biyoloji Dersi (9–12. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı. MEB Basımevi.
- Murphy, T. P., & Mancini-Samuelson, G. J. (2012). Graduating STEM competent and confident teachers: The creation of a STEM certificate for elementary education majors. Journal of College Science Teaching, 42(2), 18–23.
- National Academy of Engineering . (2020). Building capacity for teaching engineering in K-12 education (260 pp). National Academies Press.
- Norris, C. M., Morris, J. E., & Lummis, G. W. (2018). Preservice teachers' self-efficacy to teach primary science based on "science learner" typology. International Journal of Science Education, 40(18), 2292–2308.

- Nowicki, B. L., Sullivan-Watts, B., Shim, M. K., Young, B., & Pockalny, R. (2013). Factors influencing science content accuracy in elementary inquiry science lessons. Research in Science Education, 43(3), 1135–1154.
- Ontario . (2007). The Ontario curriculum, grades 11-12 science. Ontario, Ministry of Education.

www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/science.html

- Pedaste, M., Mäeots, M., Siiman, L.A., De Jong, T., Van Riesen, S.A., Kamp, E.T., Manoli, C.C., Zacharia, Z.C., &
- Tsourlidaki, E. (2015). Phases of inquiry-based learning: Definitions and the inquiry cycle. Educational Research Review, 14, 47–61.
- Perkins Coppola, M. (2019). Preparing elementary school teachers to teach engineering: Impact on self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. School Science and Mathematics, 119, 161–170.
- Phillips, M., Vowell, J. E., Hee Lee, Y., & Plankis, B. J. (2015). How do elementary science textbooks present the nature of science? The Educational Forum, 79(2), 148–162.
- Rich, P. J., Jones, B. L., Belikov, O., Yoshikawa, E., & Perkins, M. (2017). Computing and engineering in elementary school: The effect of year-long training on elementary teacher self-efficacy and beliefs about teaching computing and engineering. International Journal of Computer Science Education in Schools, 1, 1–20. ISSN 2513–8359.
- Riegle-Crumb, C., Morton, K., Moore, C., Chimonidou, A., Labrake, C., & Kopp, S. (2015). Do inquiring minds have positive attitudes? The science education of preservice elementary teachers. Science Education, 99(5), 819–836.
- Roberts, D. A. (2008). Scientific literacy/science literacy. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 729–780). Routledge.
- Sánchez Cumplido, C., & Viejo Montesinos, J. L. (2012). Investigando antes de la Universidad: La investigación en los niveles educativos preuniversitarios. Encuentros Multidisciplinares, 42, 1–10.
- Seage, S. J., & Türegün, M. (2020). The effects of blended learning on STEM achievement of elementary school students. International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 6(1), 133–140.
- Secretariat of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Lander in the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK) . (2017). The education system in the Federal Republic of Germany 2014/2015. A description of the responsibilities, structures and developments in education policy for the exchange of information in Europe (T. Eckhardt, Ed.). KMK.
- SEMS . (2017). Planes de estudio de referencia del marco curricular comuń de la educación media superior. Subsecretaría de Educación Media Superior. Dirección General de Bachillerato. Secretaría de Educación Pública. www.dgb.sep.gob.mx/informacion-academica/pdf/DOC_BASE_22_08_2017.pdf
- Sikma, L., & Osborne, M. (2014). Conflicts in developing an elementary STEM magnet school. Theory Into Practice, 53, 4–10. Swedish National Agency for Education . (2011). Syllabuses for physics, chemistry and biology in upper secondary school. Skolverket: Fritzes, www.skolverket.se
- Tatar, N. (2012). Inquiry-based science laboratories: An analysis of preservice teachers' beliefs about learning science through inquiry and their performances. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 11(3), 248.
- Tobias, S. (1990). They're not dumb, they're different: Stalking the secbd tier. Research Corporation.
- Tomlinson, S. (1997). Edward Lee Thorndike and John Dewey on the science of education. Oxford Review of Education, 23(3), 365–383.
- Utley, J., Ivey, T., Hammock, R., & High, K. (2019). Enhancing engineering education in the elementary school. School Science and Mathematics, 119, 203–212.
- Valente, B., Maurićio, P., & Faria, C. (2018). Understanding the process and conditions that improve preser-vice teachers' conceptions of nature of science in real contexts. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(7), 620–643.
- Vallera, F. L., & Bodzin, A. M. (2020). Integrating STEM with *AgLIT* (Agricultural literacy through innovative technology): The efficacy of a project-based curriculum for upper-primary students. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 18.
- van Aalderen-Smeets, S. I., & Walma van der Molen, J. (2013). Measuring primary teachers' attitudes toward teaching science: Development of the dimensions of attitude toward science (DAS) instrument. International Journal of Science Education, 35(4), 577–600.
- van Aalderen-Smeets, S. I., & Walma van der Molen, J. H. (2015). Improving primary teachers' attitudes toward science by attitude-focused professional development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(5), 710–734.
- van Aalderen-Smeets, S. I., Walma van der Molen, J. H., & Asma, L. J. (2012). Primary teachers' attitudes toward science: A new theoretical framework. Science Education, 96(1), 158–182.
- Van Ingen, S., Davis, J., & Arndt, K. (2018). The synergy between integrated STEM lessons and culturally responsive teaching in elementary classrooms. Research in the Schools, 25, 1–19.
- Van Uum, M. S., Verhoeff, R. P., & Peeters, M. (2016). Inquiry-based science education: Towards a pedagogical framework for primary school teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 38(3), 450–469.
- Volk, K. (2019). The demise of traditional technology and engineering education teacher preparation programs and a new direction for the profession. Journal of Technology Education, 31(1), 2–18.
- Von Zastrow, C., & Kelley, B. (2019). Accelerating gains in K-12 engineering education: Policy brief. Education Commission of the States. 20 pp.
- Walls, L. (2012). Third grade African American students' views of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (1), 1–37.
- Watkins, J., McCormick, M., Wendell, K. B., Spencer, K., Milto, E., Portsmore, M., & Hammer, D. (2018). Data-based conjectures for supporting responsive teaching in engineering design for elementary teachers. Science Education, 102, 548–570.
- Wendell, K. B., Swenson, J. E. S., & Dalvi, T. S. (2019). Epistemological framing and novice elementary teachers' approaches to learning and teaching engineering design. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 956–982.
- Wieselmann, J. R., Dare, E. A., Ring-Whalen, E. A., & Roehrig, G. H. (2019). "I just do what the boys tell me": Exploring small group student interactions in an integrated STEM unit. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 112–144.
- Wright, C. G., Wendell, K. B., & Paugh, P. P. (2018). "Just put it together to make no commotion:" Re-imagining urban elementary students' participation in engineering design practices. International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology (IJEMST), 6(3), 285–301. http://doi.org/10.18404/ijemst.428192
- Yalcin, S. A., & Yalcin, S. (2011). Analyzing elementary teachers' views on the nature of science according to their academic levels. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 942–946.

- Yang, Y., Liu, X., & Gardella Jr, J. A. (2018). Effects of professional development on teacher pedagogical content knowledge, inquiry teaching practices, and student understanding of interdisciplinary science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(4), 263–282.
- Ying, L. Y., & Hamzaid, N. A. (2019). Parents' perspectives on engineering education using hands on, headson and hearts on (3HS) approach. Malaysian Online Journal of Education Sciences, 7(4), 1–15.
- Yoon, H. G., Joung, Y. J., & Kim, M. (2012). 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.
- Zakharov, W., Strobel, J., & Diefes-Dux, H. A. (2020). Teacher level factors and student achievement in a cyber-enabled engineering education professional development program. International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 6(1), 48–60. Zapata, M. (2013). Substantiating the need to apply a sociocultural lens to the preparation of teachers in an effort to achieve science reform. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 8, 777–801.

Interdisciplinary Approaches and Integrated STEM in Science Teaching

- Abbiss, J., & Quinlivan, K. (2011). Shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning in the integration of the New Zealand Curriculum in teacher education: A meta-ethnography. www.tlri.org.nz/sites/default/files/projects/9264%20Meta%20ethnography.pdf Abell, S. K., & Lederman, N. G. (Eds.). (2007). Handbook of research on science education. Routledge.
- Acar, D., Tertemiz, N., & Tasdemir, A. (2018). The effects of STEM training on the academic achievement on 4th graders science and mathematics and their views on STEM training teachers. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 10, 505–513. http://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2018438141
- Aldahmash, A. H., Naem, M. A., & Aljallal, M. A. (2019). Saudi Arabian science and mathematics teachers' attitudes toward integrating STEM in teaching before and after participating in a professional development program. Cogent Education, 6(1). http://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1580852
- An, Z., Wan, W., Wang, N., & Fu, Q. (2020). The enlightenment of Chinese innovation education STEM. Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Social Science, Economics, and Education Research (SSEER 2020), 455, 85–87.
- Anderson, J., & Tully, D. (2020). Designing and evaluating an integrated STEM professional development program for secondary and primary school teachers in Australia. In J. Anderson & Y. Li (Eds.), Integrated approaches to STEM education (Advances in STEM Education). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52229-2 22
- Antoniou, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2013). A dynamic integrated approach to teacher professional development: Impact and sustainability of the effects on improving teacher behavior and student outcomes. Teaching and Teacher Education, 29, 1–12.
- Asghar, A., Ellington, R., Rice, E., Johnson, F., & Prime, G. M. (2012). Supporting STEM education in secondary science contexts. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 6(2), 4.
- Asunda, P., & Mativo, J. (2017). Integrated STEM: A new primer for teaching technology education. Technology and Engineering Teacher, 76(5), 14–19.
- Australian Government . (2021). Integrated STEM learning. www.dese.gov.au/australian-curriculum/national-stem-education-resources-toolkit/i-want-know-about-stem-education/what-works-best-when-teaching-stem/integrated-stem-learning
- Autieri, S. M., Amirshokoohi, A., & Kazempour, M. (2016). The science-technology-society framework for achieving scientific literacy: An overview of the existing literature. European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 4(1), 75–89.
- Badmus, O. T., & Omosewo, E. O. (2020). Evolution of STEM, STEAM and STREAM education in Africa: The implication of the knowledge gap. International Journal on Research in STEM Education, 2(2), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.31098/ijrse.v2i2.227
- 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(3), 375–395.
- Banilower, E. R., Smith, S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. J., Campbell, K. H., & Weis, A. H. (2013). Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education. Horizon Research, Inc.
- Bartscher, K., Gould, B., & Nutter, S. (1995). Increasing student motivation through project-based learning (Master's Research Project). Saint Xavier and IRI Skylight.
- Bascope, M., Reiss, K., Morales, M., Robles, C., Reyes, P., Duque, M. I., & Andrade, J. C. (2020). Latin American STEM policy: A review of recent initiatives on STEM education in four Latin American countries. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 443–458). Routledge.
- 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). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Basham, J. D., Marino, M. T., Hunt, C. L., & Han, K. (2020). Considering STEM for learners with disabilities and other diverse needs. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 128–137). Routledge.
- Becker, K., & Park, K. (2011). Effects of integrative approaches among science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) subjects on students' learning: A preliminary meta-analysis. Journal of STEM Education, 12(5–6), 23–37.
- Beier, M. E., Kim, M. H., Saterbak, A., Leautaud, V., Bishnoi, S., & Gilberto, J. M. (2018). The effect of authentic project-based learning on attitudes and career aspirations in STEM. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 3–23.
- Bell, D. , Morrison-Love, D. , Wooff, D. , & McLain, M. (2018). STEM education in the twenty-first century: Learning at work An exploration of design and technology teacher perceptions and practices. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 28(3), 721-737.
- Bell, J., & Bell, T. (2018). Integrating computational thinking within a music education context. Informatics in Education, 17(2), 151–166.
- Belland, B. R., Ertmer, P. A., & Simons, K. D. (2006). Perceptions of the value of problem-based learning among students with special needs and their teachers. The Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning, 1(2), 1–18.
- Bers, M. U. (2018). Coding and computational thinking in early childhood: The impact of ScratchJr in Europe. European Journal of STEM Education, 3(3), 8. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1190774.pdf

- Bevo, W., Pei-Ling, L., & Chun-Yen, C. (2020). Evidence of STEM enactment effectiveness in asian student learning outcomes. International Journal of STEM Education, 7(1) http://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00236-1
- Brears, L., Macintyre, W. R., & O'Sullivan, G. (2011). Preparing teachers for the 21st century using PBL as an integrating strategy in science and technology. Design and Technology Education, 16, 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.
- Brush, T., & Saye, J. (2008). The effects of multimedia-supported problem-based inquiry on student engagement, empathy, and assumptions about history. The Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning, 2(1), 21–56.
- Buck Institute . (2009). Does PBL work? www.bie.org/research/study/does pbl work
- Burris, C. C., & Welner, K. G. (2005). Closing the achievement gap by detracking. Phi Delta Kappan, 86, 594-598.
- Burrows, A., & Slater, T. (2015). A proposed integrated STEM framework for contemporary teacher preparation. Teacher Education and Practice, 28(2/3), 318–330.
- $\label{lem:canada's Innovation and Skills Plan. (2017). https://community.oecd.org/servlet/JiveServlet/previewBody/131551-102-1-230266/Canada-Innovation-and-Skills-Plan-2017.pdf$
- Capraro, R. M., Capraro, M. M., & Morgan, J. R. (Eds.). (2013). STEM project-based learning: An integrated science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) approach. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Carr, G., Loucks, D. P., & Bloschl, G. (2018). Gaining insight into interdisciplinary research and education programmes: A framework for evaluation. Research Policy, 47(1), 35–48.
- Carter, V., Beachner, M., & Daugherty, M. K. (2015). Family and consumer sciences and STEM integration. Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences, 107(1), 55–58.
- Chamberlin, S. A., & Pereira, N. (2017). Differentiating engineering activities for use in a mathematics setting. In D. Dailey & A. Cotabish (Eds.), Engineering instruction for high-ability learners in K-8 classrooms (pp. 45–55). Prufrock Press.
- Chan, H. Y., Choi, H., Hailu, M. F., Whitford, M., & DeRouen, S. D. (2020). Participation in structured STEM-focused out-of-school time programs in secondary school: Linkage to postsecondary STEM aspiration and major. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 1250–1280.
- Chanlin, L. (2008). Technology integration applied to project-based learning in science. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 45, 55–65.
- China STEM Education 2029 Innovation Action Plan . (2019). https://edtechchina.medium.com/chinas-stem-education-in-action-observations-initiatives-and-reflections-
- $a20d6cd43a0c\#: \sim : text = 2029\%20Action\%20Plan\&text = This\%20plan\%20aims\%20to\%20allow, and\%20the\%20ability\%20to\%20innovate$
- Cho, J., & Hugh, J. (2017). New education policies and practices in South Korea. https://bangkok.unesco.org/content/new-education-policies-and-practices-south-korea
- Clark, S. K., Lott, K., Larese-Casanova, M., Taggart, A. M., & Judd, E. (2020). Leveraging integrated science and disciplinary literacy instruction to teach first graders to write like scientists and to explore their perceptions of scientists. Research in Science Education, 1–23.
- Colucci-Gray, L., Trowsdale, J., Cooke, C. F., Davies, R., Burnard, P., & Gray, D. S. (2017). Reviewing the potential and challenges of developing STEAM education through creative pedagogies for 21st learning: How can school curricula be broadened towards a more responsive, dynamic, and inclusive form of education? www.bera.ac.uk/promoting-educational-research/projects/reviewing-the-potential-and-challenges-of-developing-steam-education
- Counsell, S., Peat, F., Vaughan, R., & Johnson, T. (2015). Inventing mystery machines: Collaborating to improve teacher STEM preparation. Science and Children, 52(7), 64.
- Craig, T. T., & Marshall, J. (2019). Effect of project-based learning on high school students' state-mandated, standardized math and science performance. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 1461–1488.
- Crotty, E. A., Guzey, S. S., Roehrig, G. H., Glancy, A. W., Ring-Whalen, E. A., & Moore, T. J. (2017). Approaches to integrating engineering in STEM units and student achievement gains. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research (J-PEER), 7(2), 1.
- Crouch, D. (2015). How to use project-based learning in your middle school science classroom. STEM Jobs. http://edu.stemjobs.com/how-to-implement-project-based-learning-in-your-middle-school-science-classroom/
- Cunningham, C. M., & Carlsen, W. S. (2014). Teaching engineering practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(2), 197–210.
- Cutucache, C., Boham, T., Luhr, J., Sommers, A., Stevenson, N., Sointu, E., Mäkitalo-Siegl, K., Kärkkäinen, S., Valtonen, T., Grandgenett, N., & Tapprich, W. (2018). NE STEM 4U afterschool intervention leads to gains in STEM content knowledge for middle school youth. Cogent Education, 5(1), 1–12.
- Czerniak, C. M. (2007). Interdisciplinary science teaching. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Czerniak, C. M., Beltyukova, S., Struble, J., Haney, J. J., & Lumpe, A. T. (2005). 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). NSTA Press.
- Czerniak, C. M., & Johnson, C. Ć. (2014). Interdisciplinary science teaching. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education volume II (pp. 395–411). Routledge.
- Dani, D. E., Hartman, S. L., & Helfrich, S. R. (2017). Learning to teach science: Elementary teacher candidates facilitate informal STEM events. The New Educator, 1–18.
- Dare, E. A., Ring-Whalen, E. A., & Roehrig, G. H. (2019). Creating a continuum of STEM models: Exploring how K-12 science teachers conceptualize STEM education. International Journal of Science Education, 41(12), 1701–1720.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. Davies, R., & Trowsdale, J. (2017). The value of instability: Lessons from reviewing how and why creativity and the arts might interact with STEM education. European Journal of Curriculum Studies, 4(1), 584–600. http://clok.uclan.ac.uk/21342/

- DeColito, I. (2016). STEM education in Canada: A knowledge synthesis. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education*, 16(2), 114–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/14926156.2016.1166297
- Delahunty, T., Prendergast, M., & Ní Ríordáin, M. (2021, April). Teachers' perspectives on achieving an integrated curricular model of Primary STEM education in Ireland: Authentic or utopian ideology? In Frontiers in education (Vol. 6, p. 123). Frontiers. www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.666608/full?utm source=S-
- TWT&utm medium=SNET&utm campaign=ECO FEDUC XXXXXXXX auto-dlvrit
- DiFrancesca, D., Lee, C., & McIntyre, E. (2014). Where is the "E" in STEM for young children? Engineering design education in an elementary teacher education program. Issues in Teacher Education, 23(1), 49–64.
- Dong, Y., Wang, J., Yang, Y., & Kurup, P. M. (2020). Understanding intrinsic challenges to STEM instructional practices for Chinese teachers based on their beliefs and knowledge base. International Journal of STEM Education, 7(1), 1–12.
- Drake, S. M., & Reid, J. L. (2020, July). 21st century competencies in light of the history of integrated curriculum. In Frontiers in education (Vol. 5, p. 122). Frontiers.
- Eckman, E. W., Williams, M. A., & Silver-Thorn, M. B. (2016). An integrated model for STEM teacher preparation: The value of teaching cooperative educational experience. Journal of STEM Teacher Education, 51(1), 71–82.
- Ekiz-Kiran, B., & Aydin-Gunbatar, S. (2021). Analysis of engineering elements of k-12 science standards in seven countries engaged in STEM education reform. Science & Education, 1–34. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-021-00227-w
- El-Deghaidy, H., Mansour, N., Alzaghibi, M., & Alhammad, K. (2017). Context of STEM integration in schools: Views form in-service science teachers. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science, & Technology Education, 13(6), 2459–2484.
- Ellis, D., & Williams, P. J. (2020). STEM policy in Australia. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 428–442). Routledge.
- Enderson, M. C., Reed, P. A., & Grant, M. R. (2020). Secondary STEM teacher education. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 349–360). Routledge.
- English, L. D. (2016). STEM education K-12: Perspectives on integration. International Journal of STEM Education, 3(3). http://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-016-0036-1
- English, L. D. (2017). Advancing elementary and middle school STEM education. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 15(1), 5–24.
- Fan, S. C., & Yu, K. C. (2017). How an integrative STEM curriculum can benefit students in engineering design practices. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 27(1), 107–129.
- Fulp, S. L. (2000). National survey of science and mathematics education: Status of elementary school science teaching. Horizon Research.
- Furman, M., Gray, D., Podestá, M. E., & Colucci-Gray, L. (2016, April). Fostering creative pedagogies in science teaching: Experiences from Argentine and Scottish teachers. Science Education Research: Engaging Learners for a Sustainable Future: Electronic Proceedings of the ESERA 2015 Conference. Science Education Research: Engaging Learners for a Sustainable Future. University of Helsinki, Helsinki, 8(138), 1131–1143. www.udesa.edu.ar/sites/default/files/archivo27.esera .pdf
- Gao, X., Li, P., Shen, J. (2020). Reviewing assessment of student learning in interdisciplinary STEM education. International Journal of STEM Education, 7(24). https://doi.org/10/1186/s40594-020-00225-4
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915–945.
- Garner, R. (2015). Finland schools: Subjects scrapped and replaced with "topics" as country reforms its education system. www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/finland-schools-subjects-are-out-and-topics-are-country-reforms-its-education-system-10123911.html
- 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.
- German, S. (2019). Three-dimensional classroom assessment tasks. Science Scope, 42(7), 28–33.
- Gijbels, D., Dochy, F., Bossched, P., & Segers, M. (2005). Effects of problem-based learning: A meta-analysis from the angle of assessment. Review of Educational Research, 75(1), 27–61.
- Gnagey, J., & Lavertu, S. (2016). The impact of inclusive STEM high schools on student achievement. AERA Open, 2(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416650870
- Graham, S., Kiuhara, S. A., & MacKay, M. (2020). The effects of writing on learning in science, social studies, and mathematics: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 90(2), 179–226.
- Guo, Y., Wang, S., Hall, A. H., Breit-Smith, A., & Busch, J. (2016). The effects of science instruction on young children's vocabulary learning: A research synthesis. Early Childhood Education Journal, 44(4), 359–367.
- Guzey, S. S. , & Aranda, M. (2017). Student participation in engineering practices and discourse: An exploratory case study. Journal of Engineering Education, 106, 585–606.
- Guzey, S. S., Harwell, M., Moreno, M., Peralta, Y., & Moore, T. J. (2017). The impact of design-based STEM integration curricula on student achievement in engineering, science, and mathematics. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 26, 207–222.
- Guzey, S. S., Moore, T. J., Harwell, M., & Moreno, M. (2016). STEM integration in middle school life science: Student learning and attitudes. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 25(4), 550–560.
- Guzey, S. S., Ring-Whalen, E. A., Harwell, M., & Peralta, Y. (2019). Life STEM: A case study of life science learning through engineering design. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17(1), 23–42.
- Haapaniemi, J., Venäläinen, S., Malin, A., & Palojoki, P. (2020). Teacher autonomy and collaboration as part of integrative teaching Reflections on the curriculum approach in Finland. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1–17.
- Haesen, S., & Van de Put, E. (2018). STEAM education in Europe: A comparative analysis report. EuroSTEAM. www.eurosteamproject.eu/res/Comparative analysis report vlatest.pdf
- Hamad, S., Tairab, H., Wardat, Y., Rabbani, L., AlArabi, K., Yousif, M., Abu-Al-Aish, A., & Stoica, G. (2022). Understanding science teachers' implementations of integrated STEM: Teacher perceptions and practice. Sustainability, 14(6), 3594. http://doi.org/10.3390/su14063594
- Han, S. Y., Capraro, R. M., & Capraro, M. M. (2014). How science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) project-based learning (PBL) affects high, middle, and low achievers differently: The impact of student factors on achievement. International Journal

- of Science and Mathematics Education, 13(5). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-014-9526-0
- Hapgood, S., Czerniak, C., Brenneman, K., Clements, D. H., Duschl, R. D., Fleer, M., Greenfield, D., Hadani, H., Romance, N., Sarama, J., Schwartz, C., & VanMeeteren, B. (2020). The importance of early childhood STEM education. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 87–100). Routledge.
- Harris, C. J., Penuel, W. R., D'Angelo, C. M., DeBarger, A. H., Gallagher, L. P., Kennedy, C. A., Cheng, B. H., & Krajcik, J. S. (2015). Impact of project-based curriculum materials on student learning in science: Results of a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(10), 1362–1385.
- Heba, E. D. (2015). Science education in Egypt based on integrating ecological needs and STEAM education. www.researchgate.net/profile/Heba-El-
- Deghaidy/publication/281592230_Science_Education_in_Egypt_Based_on_Integrating_Ecological_Needs_and_STEAM_Education/links/56e0089008aee77a15fe8616/Science-Education-in-Egypt-Based-on-Integrating-Ecological-Needs-and-STEAM-Education.pdf Hoeg, D. G., & Bencze, J. L. (2017). Values underpinning STEM education in the USA: An analysis of the next generation science standards. Science Education, 101(2), 278–301.
- Horizon Research . (2013). 2012 National survey of science and mathematics education: Highlights report. Horizon Research.
- Hubber, P., Widjaja, W., & Aranda, G. (2022). Assessment of an interdisciplinary project in science and mathematics: Opportunities and challenges. Teaching Science: The Journal of the Australian Science Teachers Association, 68(1).
- Jaipal-Jamani, K., & Angeli, C. (2017). Effect of robotics on elementary preservice teachers; self-efficacy, science learning, and computational thinking. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 26(2), 175–192.
- Johnson, C. C. (2012). Implementation of STEM education policy: Challenges, progress, and lessons learned. School Science and Mathematics, 112(1), 45–55.
- Johnson, C. C. (2013). Conceptualizing integrated STEM education. School Science and Mathematics, 113(8), 367–368.
- Johnson, C. C., Bolshakova, V. L. J., & Waldron, T. (2014). When good intentions and reality meet: Large-Scale reform of science teaching in urban schools with predominantly Hispanic ELL students. Urban Education, 49, 1–38.
- Johnson, C. C., & Fargo, J. D. (2014). A study of the impact of Transformative Professional Development (TPD) on Hispanic student performance on state-mandated assessments of science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25, 845–859.
- Johnson, C. C. , Peters-Burton, E. E. , & Moore, T. J. (Eds.). (2015). STEM Road Map: A framework for integrated STEM education. Routledge.
- Johnson, C. C., Peters-Burton, E. E., & Moore, T. J. (Eds.). (2021). STEM Road Map 2.0: A framework for integrated STEM education in the innovation age (pp. 1–364). Routledge.
- Johnson, C. C., & Sondergeld, T. A. (2020). Outcomes of an integrated STEM high school: Enabling access and achievement for all students. Urban Education, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085920914368
- Johnson, C. C., Sondergeld, T. A., & Walton, J. B. (2017). A statewide implementation of the critical features of professional development: Impact on teacher outcomes. School Science and Mathematics, 117(7–8), 341–349.
- Johnson, C. C., Walton, J. B., & Breiner, J. M. (2020). STEM policy in the United States and Canada. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 400–415). Routledge.
- Johnson, S. (2015). Education and international competitiveness. Journal of Initial Teacher Inquiry, 1.
- https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10092/11441/Johnson%20Education%20and%20international%20competitiveness.pdf; sequence=4
- Kang, N. H. (2020). What can integrated STEAM education achieve? A South Korean case. In J. Anderson & Y. Li (Eds.), Integrated approaches to STEM education (Advances in STEM Education). Springer. https://doi-org.prox.lib.ncsu.edu/10.1007/978-3-030-52229-2 13
- Kapoor, H., & Shah, S. (2021). Re-imagining K-12 education with a STEM pedagogy in India.
- https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/in/Documents/strategy/in-strategy-STEM-integration-in-K-12-noexp.pdf
- Kazu, I. Y., & Kurtoglu Yalcin, C. (2021). The effect of STEM education on academic performance: A meta-analysis study. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET, 20(4), 101–116.
- Kennedy, T. J., & Odell, M. R. L. (2014). Engaging students in STEM education. Science Education International, 25(3), 246–258.
- Krajcik, J., & Czerniak, C. M. (2018). Teaching science in elementary and middle school. Routledge.
- Krauss, J., & Boss, S. (2013). Thinking through project-based learning: Guiding deeper inquiry. Corwin Press.
- Kuen-Yi, L., Ying-Tien, W., Yi-Ting, H., & John, W. P. (2021). Effects of infusing the engineering design process into STEM project-based learning to develop preservice technology teachers' engineering design thinking. International Journal of STEM Education, 8(1). http://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00258-9
- Kumar, D., & Berlin, D. (1998). A study of STS themes in state science curriculum frameworks in the United States. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 7(2), 191–197.
- Lavonen, J. (2020). Curriculum and teacher education reforms in Finland that support the development of competences for the twenty-first century. In Audacious education purposes (pp. 65–80). Springer.
- 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. M., & Abell, S. K. (2014), Handbook of research on science education, volume II, Routledge,
- Lederman, N. M., & 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, I., & Grover, S. (2020). Computational thinking from a disciplinary perspective: Integrating computational thinking in K-12 science, technology, engineering, & mathematics education. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 29, 1–8.
- Lee, O., & Luykx, A. (2006). Science education and student diversity: Synthesis and research agenda. Cambridge University Press. Li, J., Yao, J., Luo, T., & So, W. W. M. (2020). STEM policy in Asia. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 416–427). Routledge.
- Li, Y., Wang, K., Yu, X., & Froyd, J. E. (2020). Research and trends in STEM education: A systematic review of journal publications. International Journal of STEM Education, 7(1). http://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00207-6
- Loucks-Horsley, S. , Love, N. , Stiles, K. E. , Mundry, S. , & Hewson, P. W. (2007). Designing professional development for teachers of mathematics and science. Corwin Press.

- Luft, J. A., Diamond, J. M., Zhang, C., & White, D. Y. (2020). Research on K-12 STEM professional development programs. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 361–374). Routledge.
- Luft, J. A., & Hewson, P. W. (2014). Research on teacher professional development programs in science. In S. K. Abell & N. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education, volume II (pp. 889–909). Routledge.
- Lynch, S. J., Peters Burton, E., Behrend, T., House, A., Ford, M., Spillane, N., Matray, S., Han, E., & Means, B. (2018). Understanding inclusive STEM high schools as opportunity structures for underrepresented students. Critical Components, 55, 712–748.
- Margot, K. C., & Kettler, T. (2019). Teachers' perception of STEM integration and education: A systematic literature review. International Journal of STEM Education, 6(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10/1186/s40594-018-0151-2
- Martin-Paez, T., Aguilera, D., Perales-Palcios, F. J., & Vilchez-Gonzalez, J. M. (2019). What are we talking about when we talk about STEM education? A review of the literature. Science Education, 103, 799–822.
- 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. McClure, E. R., Guernsey, L., Clements, D. H., Bales, S. N., Nichols, J., Kendall-Taylor, N., & Levine, M. H. (2017). STEM starts early: Grounding science, technology, engineering, and math education in early childhood. Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop.
- McComas, W. F., & Burgin, S. R. (2020). A critique of "STEM" education. Science & Education, 29(4), 805–829.
- McGehee, J. J. (2001). Developing interdisciplinary units: A strategy based on problem solving. School Science and Mathematics, 101(7), 380–389.
- Means, B., Confrey, J., House, A., & Bhanot, R. (2008). STEM high schools: Specialized science technology engineering and mathematics secondary schools in the U.S. report prepared for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. SRI International. http://ctl.sri.com/publications/displayPublicationResults.jsp
- Means, B., Wang, H., Wei, X., Lynch, S., Peters, V., Young, V., & Allen, C. (2017). Expanding STEM opportunities through inclusive STEM-focused high schools. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 101, 681–715.
- Means, B., Wang, H., Young, V., Lynch, S., & Peters, V. (2016). STEM-focused high schools as a strategy for enhancing readiness for postsecondary STEM programs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(5), 709–736.
- Mejias, S., Thompson, N., Sedas, R. M., Rosin, M., Soep, E., Peppler, K., Roche, J., Wong, J., Hurley, M., Bell, P., & Bevan, B. (2020). The trouble with STEAM and why we use it anyway. Science Education, 105, 209–231.
- Mergendoller, J. R., Maxwell, N. L., & Bellisimo, Y. (2006). The effectiveness of problem-based instruction: A comparative study of instructional methods and student characteristics. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning, 1(2). http://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1026
- Meyrick, K. M. (2011). How STEM education improves student learning. Meridian K-12 school. Computer Technologies Journal, 14(1), 1–6.
- Modi, T. (2011). Living in the innovation age: Five principles for prospering in this new era (pp. 1–159). TekNirvana.
- Moore, T. J., Bryan, L. B., Johnson, C. J., & Roehrig, G. H. (2021). Integrated STEM education. In C. C. Johnson, E. E. Peters-Burton, & T. J. Moore (Eds.), STEM Road Map 2.0: A framework for integrated STEM education in the innovation age (pp. 25–42). Routledge.
- Moore, T. J., Guzey, S. S., & Brown, A. (2014). Greenhouse design to increase habitable land: An engineering unit. Science Scope, 37(7), 51–57.
- Moore, T. J., & Hughes, J. E. (2018). Chapter 12: Teaching and learning with technology in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. In M. D. Roblyer & J. E. Hughes (Eds.), Integrating educational technology into teaching (8th ed., pp. 386–427). Pearson.
- Moore, T. J., Johnston, A. C., & Glancy, A. W. (2020). STEM integration: A synthesis of conceptual frameworks and definitions. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 3–16). Routledge.
- Moran, J. (2001). Interdisciplinarity. Routledge.
- Morris, J., Slater, E., Boston, J., Fitzgerald, M. T., & Lummis, G. (2021). Teachers in conversation with industry scientists: Implications for STEM education. International Journal of Innovation in Science and Mathematics Education, 29(1).
- https://openjournals.library.sydney.edu.au/index.php/CAL/article/view/14652
- Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2001). Effective teaching: Evidence and practice. Sage.
- Murphy, T. P., & Mancini-Samuelson, G. J. (2012). Graduating STEM competent and confident teachers: The creation of a STEM certificate for elementary education majors. Journal of College Science Teaching, 42(2), 18–23.
- Myers, A. (2015). The STEM shift: A guide for school leaders. Corwin.
- Nadelson, L. S., & Seifert, A. L. (2017). Integrated STEM defined: Contexts, challenges, and the future. The Journal of Educational Research, 110(3), 221–223.
- Nathan, M. J., Srisurichan, R., Walkington, C., Wolfgram, M., Williams, C., & Alibali, M. W. (2013). Building cohesion across representations: A mechanism for STEM integration. Journal of Engineering Education, 102(1), 77–116.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine . (2018). Learning through citizen science: Enhancing opportunities by design. https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/25183/learning-through-citizen-science-enhancing-opportunities-by-design Ministry of Education of China (MOE) . (2016). The 13th five-year plan for educational informatization.
- http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A16/s3342/201606/t20160622 269367.html. [in Chinese]
- Ministry of Education of China (MOE). (2017). Recommend new engineering research and practice projects.
- http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A08/s7056/201707/t20170703_308464.html. [in Chinese]
- National Research Council, (2011), A framework for K-12 science education, National Academy Press,
- National Research Council . (2014). STEM integration in K-12 education: Status, prospects, and an agenda for research. National Academies Press.
- National Science and Technology Council Committee on STEM Education . (2018). Charting a course for success: America's strategy for STEM education. National Science and Technology Council. www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/STEM-Education-Strategic-Plan-2018.pdf

- Navy, S. L., & Kaya, F. (2020). PBL as a pedagogical approach for integrated STEM: Evidence from prospective teachers. School Science and Mathematics, 120, 285–296.
- Ndijuye, L. G., & Tandika, P. B. (2020). STEM starts early: Views and beliefs of early childhood education stakeholders in Tanzania. Journal of Childhood, Education & Society, 1(1), 29–42. www.j-ces.com/index.php/jces/article/view/28
- Nesmith, S. M., & Cooper, S. (2020). Elementary STEM learning. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 101–114). Routledge.
- Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.
- O'Brien, S. (2010). Characterization of a unique undergraduate multidisciplinary STEM K-5 teacher preparation program. Journal of Technology Education 21(2). http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v21n2/obrien.html
- Osborne, P. (2015). Problematizing disciplinarity, transdisciplinary problematics. Theory, Culture, & Society, 32(5–6), 3–35.
- Parker, W., Mosberg, S., Bransford, J., Vye, N., Wilderson, J., & Abbott, R. (2011). Rethinking advanced high school coursework: Tackling the depth/breadth tension in the AP U.S. Government and Politics course. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43(4), 533–559.
- Pearson, G. (2017). Exploring agricultural and biotechnical engineering through hands-on integrated STEM. Journal of Educational Research, 110(3), 224–226.
- Penuel, W. R., & DeBarger, A. H. (2016). A research-practice partnership to improve formative classroom assessment in science. In A. J. Daly & K. S. Finnigan (Eds.), Thinking and acting systemically: Improving school districts under pressure.
- https://ebooks.aera.net/catalog/book/thinking-and-acting-systemically-improving-school-districts-under-pressure
- Penuel, W. R. , Fishman, B. , Yamaguchi, R. , & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. American Educational Research Journal, 44(4), 921-958.
- Penuel, W. R., & Means, B. (2000). Designing a performance assessment to measure students' communication skills in multi-mediasupported, project-based learning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Peters-Burton, E. E., House, A., Peters, V., Remold, J., & Goldsmith, L. (2020). STEM-focused school models. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 389–399). Routledge.
- Peters-Burton, E. E., Lynch, S. J., Behrend, T. S., & Means, B. B. (2014). Inclusive STEM high school design: 10 critical components. Theory into Practice, 53, 64–71.
- Pleasants, J., Clough, M. P., Olson, J. K., & Miller, G. (2019a). Fundamental issues regarding the nature of technology: Implications for STEM education. Science & Education, 28, 561–597.
- Pleasants, J., Olson, J. K., & Tank, K. M. (2019b). What students learn from engineering instruction: Perspectives from elementary teachers. The Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30, 691–715.
- Pringle, R. M., Lord, C. G., & Sheppard, T. D. (2020). Secondary STEM learning. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 115–127). Routledge.
- Pryor, B. W., Pryor, C. R., & Kang, R. (2016). Teachers' thoughts on integrating STEM into social studies instruction: Beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral decisions. Journal of Social Studies Research, 40(2), 123–136.
- Rasul, M. S. , Zahriman, N. , Halim, L. , Rauf, R. A. , & Amnah, R. (2018). Impact of integrated stem smart communities program on students scientific creativity. Journal of Engineering Science and Technology, 13, 80–89. http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/i-Cite%202018/i-Cite_10.pdf
- Redmond, A., Thomas, J., High, K., Scott, M., Jordan, P., & Dockers, J. (2011). Enriching science and math through engineering. School Science and Mathematics, 111, 399–408.
- Rennie, L., Venville, G., & Wallace, J. (Eds.). (2012a). Integrating science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Routledge. Rennie, L., Venville, G., & Wallace, J. (Eds.). (2012b). Knowledge that counts in a global community: Exploring the contribution of integrated curriculum. Routledge.
- Rincón, B. E., & Lane, T. B. (2017). Latin@ s in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) at the intersections. Equity & Excellence in Education, 50(2), 182–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2017.1301838
- Rinke, C. R., Gladstone-Brown, W., Kinlaw, C. R., & Cappieloo, J. (2016). Characterizing STEM teacher education: Affordances and constraints of explicit STEM preparation for elementary teachers. School Science and Mathematics, 116(6), 300–309.
- 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), 699–692.
- Roehrig, G. H., Dare, E. A., Ring-Whalen, E., & Wieselmann, J. R. (2021). Understanding coherence and integration in integrated STEM curriculum. International Journal of STEM Education, 8(2), 1–21. http://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00259-8
- 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, 119, 31–44.
- Ronis, D. L. (2007). Problem-based learning for math and science: Integrating inquiry and the internet. Corwin.
- Ryan, M., Gale, J., & Usselman, M. (2017). Integrating engineering into core science instruction: Translating NGSS principles into practice through iterative curriculum design. International Journal of Engineering Education, 33(1), 321–331.
- Ryu, M., Mentzer, N., & Knobloch, N. (2019). Preservice teachers' experiences of STEM integration: Challenges and implications for integrated STEM teacher preparation. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 29(3), 493–512.
- Sampson, V., Enderle, P., & Grooms, J. (2013). Argumentation in science education. The Science Teacher, 80(5), 30–33.
- Schaffhauser, D. (2015). Finland ditching single subjects in New Ed Reform Push. https://thejournal.com/articles/2015/03/25/finland-ditching-single-subjects-in-new-ed-reform-push.aspx
- 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.
- Schreffler, J., Vasquez III, E., Chini, J., & James, W. (2019). Universal design for learning in postsecondary STEM education for students with disabilities: A systematic literature review. International Journal of STEM Education, 6(8), 1–10.
- Scottish Government . (2019). STEM education and training strategy for Scotland: First annual report.
- www.gov.scot/publications/stem-strategy-education-training-scotland-first-annual-report/
- Shahali, E. H., Halim, L., Rasul, M. S., Osman, K., & Zulkifeli, M. A. (2017). STEM learning through engineering design: Impact on middle secondary students' interests towards STEM. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 13(5), 1189–1211.

- Shernoff, D. J., Sinha, S., Bressler, D. B., & Ginsburg, L. (2017). Assessing teacher education and professional development needs for the implementation of integrated approaches to STEM education. International Journal of STEM Education, 4(13), 1–16.
- Sias, C. M., Nadelson, L. S., Juth, S. M., & Seifert, A. L. (2017). The best laid plans: Educational innovation in elementary teacher generated integrated STEM lesson plans. Journal of Educational Research, 110(3), 227–238.
- Sondergeld, T. A., & Johnson, C. C. (2019). Development and validation of a 21st century skills assessment: Using an iterative multimethod approach. School Science and Mathematics, 119, 312–326.
- 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). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Song, G., & Wang, Z. (2021). Factors influencing middle school students' interdisciplinary competence in science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1–32. http://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21692
- Southerland, S. A. (2012). Is it possible to teach science for all in a climate of accountability? Educational policy and the equitable teaching of science. 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. 21–39). Springer.
- Stein, M., & Muzzin, M. (2018). Learning from failure. Science and Children, 55(8), 62-65.
- Stepien, W., & Gallagher, S. (1993). Problem-based learning: As authentic as it gets. Educational Leadership, 50, 25–25.
- Strutynska, O., & Umryk, M. (2019). Learning startups as a project based approach in STEM education. E-Learning, 529. www.researchgate.net/profile/Todorka-
- Glushkova/publication/338607517 APPLICATION OF SUBJECT DOMAIN ONTOLOGIES IN E-
- LEARNING/links/5e1f24a345851517e1d1c0c3/APPLICATION-OF-SUBJECT-DOMAIN-ONTOLOGIES-IN-E-
- LEARNING.pdf#page=530
- Struyf, A., De Loof, H., de Boeve Pauw, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2019). Students' engagement in different STEM learning environments: Integrated STEM education as promising practice? International Journal of Science Education, 41(10), 1387–1407.
- Subotnik, R. F., Tai, R. H., Almarode, J., & Crowe, E. (2013). What are the value added contributions of selective secondary schools of mathematics, science, and technology? Talent Development and Excellence, 5(1), 87–97.
- Suh, E., Hoffman, L., & Zollman, A. (2020). STEM inclusion research for English language learners (ELLs). In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 311–322). Routledge.
- Tank, K. M. (2014). Examining the effects of integrated science, engineering, and nonfiction literature on student learning in elementary classrooms [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (Publication No: AAT 3630271).
- Tank, K. M., Moore, T. J., Dorie, B. L., Gajdzik, E., Sanger, M. T., Rynearson, A. M., & Mann, E. F. (2018). Engineering in early elementary classrooms through the integration of high-quality literature, design, and STEM+C content. In L. English & T. Moore (Eds.), Early engineering learning (pp. 175–201). Springer.
- Tasiopoulou, E., Myrtsioti, E., Gori, J. N., Xenofontos, N., Chovardas, A., Cinganotto, L., Anichini, G., Garista, P., Benedetti, F., Guida, M., Minchini, C., Benassi, A., & Gras-Velazquez, A. (2020). STE(A) M IT integrated STEM teaching state of play, June 2020. European Schoolnet. http://steamit.eun.org/files/D2.1 STEAM IT State of play final.pdf
- Teo, T. W. (2019). STEM education landscape: The case of Singapore. Paper presented at the International Annual Meeting on STEM Education.
- Thibaut, L., Ceuppens, S., De Loof, H., De Meester, J., Goovaerts, L., Struyf, A., Pauw, J. B., Dehaene, W., Deprez, J., De Cock, M., Hellinckx, L., Knipprath, H., Langie, G., Stuyven, K., Van de Velde, D., Van Petegem, P., & Depaepe, F. (2018). Integrated STEM education: A systematic review of instructional practices in secondary education. European Journal of STEM Education, 27(1), 3–14.
- Thibaut, L., Knipprath, H., Dehaene, W., & Depaepe, F. (2019). Teachers' attitudes toward teaching integrated STEM: The impact of personal background characteristics and school context. International Journal of Science and Math Education, 17(5), 987–1007. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-018-9898-7
- Tikly, L., Joubert, M., Barrett, A. M., Bainton, D., Cameron, L., & Doyle, H. (2018). Supporting secondary school STEM education for sustainable development in Africa. University of Bristol, Bristol Working Papers in Education Series. www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/education/documents/Supporting%20Secondary%20School%20STEM%20Education%20for%20Sustainabale%20Development%20in%20Africa.pdf
- Timms, M., Moyle, K., Weldon, P., & Mitchell, P. (2018). Challenges in STEM learning in Australian schools: Literature and policy review. Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Togou, M. A., Lorenzo, C., Lorenzo, E., Cornetta, G., & Muntean, G. M. (2018, July). Raising students' interest in STEM education via remote digital fabrication: An Irish primary school case study. In International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies (EduLearn), Mallorca, Spain. www.researchgate.net/profile/Covadonga-
- Lorenzo/publication/326715051_RAISING_STUDENTS'_INTEREST_IN_STEM_EDUCATION_VIA_REMOTE_DIGITAL_FABRICATION_AN_IRISH_PRIMARY_SCHOOL_CASE_STUDY/links/5ec2b3fd458515626cb11fff/RAISING-STUDENTS-INTEREST-IN-STEM-EDUCATION-VIA-REMOTE-DIGITAL-FABRICATION-AN-IRISH-PRIMARY-SCHOOL-CASE-STUDY.pdf
- Tolliver, E. R. (2016). The effects of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM education on elementary student achievement in urban schools (Publication No. 10251650) [Doctoral dissertation, Grand Canyon University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Toma, R. B., & Greca, I. M. (2018). The effect of integrative STEM instruction on elementary students' attitudes toward science. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 14(4), 1383–1395. www.ejmste.com/download/the-effect-of-integrative-stem-instruction-on-elementary-students-attitudes-toward-science-5353.pdf
- Ugras, M. , & Genc, Z. (2018). Investigating preschool teacher candidates' STEM teaching intention and the views about STEM education. Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, 7(2), 724-744.
- Van Driel, J. H., & Berry, A. (2012). Teacher professional development focusing on pedagogical content knowledge. Educational Researcher, 41(1), 26–28.
- Van Veen, K., Zwart, R., & Meirink, J. (2011). What makes teacher professional development effective? A literature review. In M. Kooy & K. Van Veen (Eds.), Teacher learning that matters: International perspectives (pp. 3–21). Routledge.
- Vasquez, J. A. (2014). STEM beyond the acronym. Educational Leadership, 72(4), 10-15.
- Vasquez, J. A., Sneider, C., & Corner, M. (2013). STEM lesson essentials, grades 3–8: Integrating science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Heinemann.

- Venville, G., Rennie, L. J., & Wallace, J. (2012). Curriculum integration: Challenging the assumption of school science as powerful knowledge. In B. Fraser, K. Tobin, C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education. Springer international handbooks of education (Vol. 24). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7 49
- Venville, G. J., 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.
- 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.
- Verma, A. K., & McKinney, S. E. (2015). Engaging students in STEM careers with project based learning MarineTech Project. www.actapress.com/Abstract.aspx?paperId=36719
- 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.
- Wang, H.-H., & Knobloch, N. A. (2018). Levels of STEM integration through agriculture, food, and natural resources. Journal of Agricultural Education, 59(3), 258–277.
- Wang, X. (2013). Why students choose STEM majors: Motivation, high school learning, and postsecondary context of support. American Educational Research Journal, 50(5), 1081–1121.
- Wang, Z., & Song, G. (2021). Towards an assessment of students' interdisciplinary competence in middle school science. International Journal of Science Education, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1877849
- Warkentien, S., Goeking, J., Dilig, R., Knapp, L., & Stanley, R. (2022). Interdisciplinary Education: Literature review and landscape analysis. RTI International.
- 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.
- Wiebe, E., Kite, V., & Park, S. (2020). Integrating computational thinking in STEM. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. English (Eds.), Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 196–209). Routledge.
- Wiswall, M., Stiefel, L., Schwartz, A. E., & Boccardo, J. (2014). Does attending a STEM high school improve student performance? Evidence from New York City, Economics of Education Review, 40, 93–105.
- Wu, S. P. W., & Rau, M. A. (2019). How students learn content in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) through drawing activities. Educational Psychology Review, 87–120. https://doi.org/10/1007/s10648-019-09467-3
- Yager, R. E. (1996). History of S/T/S as reform in the United States. In R. E. Yager (Ed.), Science/technology/society as reform in science education. SUNY Press.
- Yang, Y., He, P., & Liu, X. (2018). Validation of an instrument for measuring students' understanding of interdisciplinary science in grades 4–8 over multiple semesters: A Rasch measurement study. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 16(4), 639–654.
- Yang, Y., Liu, X., & Gardella Jr, J. A. (2018). Effects of professional development on teacher pedagogical content knowledge, inquiry teaching practices, and student understanding of interdisciplinary science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(4), 263–282.
- You, H. S., Marshall, J. A., & Delgado, C. (2018). Assessing students; disciplinary and interdisciplinary understanding of global carbon cycling. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(3), 377–398.
- Young, V. M., House, A., Wang, H. Singleton, C., & Klopfenstein, K. (2011). Inclusive STEM schools: Early promise in Texas and unanswered questions. A paper prepared for the Committee on Highly Successful STEM Schools or Programs for K-12 STEM Education, Board on Science Education and Board on Testing and Assessment, National Research Council, 1–25.
- Zhan, X., Sun, D., Wan, Z. H., Hua, Y., & Xu, R. (2021). Investigating teacher perceptions of integrating engineering into science education in mainland China. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 19(7), 1397–1420.
- Zhang, D., & Shen, J. (2015). Disciplinary foundations for solving interdisciplinary scientific problems. International Journal of Science Education, 37(15), 2555–2576.

Teaching Biology

- Aivelo, T., & Uitto, A. (2019). Teachers' choice of content and consideration of controversial and sensitive issues in teaching of secondary school genetics. International Journal of Science Education, 41(18), 2716–2735.
- Aivelo, T., & Uitto, A. (2021). Factors explaining students' attitudes towards learning genetics and belief in genetic determinism. International Journal of Science Education, 43(9), 1408–1425.
- Akçay, S. (2017). Prospective elementary science teachers' understanding of photosynthesis and cellular respiration in the context of multiple biological levels as nested systems, Journal of Biological Education, 51(1), 52–65.
- Alberts, B., Hopkin, K., Johnson, A. D., Morgan, D., Raff, M., Roberts, K., & Walter, P. (2019). Essential cell biology (5th ed.). WW Norton & Company.
- AlHarbi, Nawaf N. S., Treagust, David F., Chandrasegaran, A. L., & Won, Mihye. (2015). Influence of particle theory conceptions on pre-service science teachers' understanding of osmosis and diffusion. Journal of Biological Education, 49(3), 232–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2014.923488
- Allen, D., & Tanner, K. (2003). Approaches to cell biology teaching: mapping the journey concept maps as signposts of developing knowledge structures. Cell Biology Education, 2(3), 133–136.
- Allen, M. (2010). Misconceptions in primary science. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Allen, M. (2017). Early understandings of simple food chains: A learning progression for the preschool years. International Journal of Science Education, 39(11), 1485–1510.
- Allen, M., Harper, L., & Clark, Z. (2021). Preschoolers' concepts of digestive physiology and their links with body mass index. Research in Science Education, 51, 1795–1816.
- Alred, A. R., Doherty, J. H., Hartley, L. M., Harris, C. B., & Dauer, J. M. (2019). Exploring student ideas about biological variation, International Journal of Science Education, 41(12), 1682–1700.
- Anderson, C. W., & Doherty, J. H. (2017). Core ideas LS2 ecosystems: Interactions, energy, and dynamics. In R. Golan, J. Krajcik & A. Rivet (Eds.), Disciplinary core ideas reshaping teaching and learning (pp. 123–144). NSTA press.

- Andersson, J., Löfgren, R., & Tibell, L. A. E. (2020). What's in the body? Children's annotated drawings. Journal of Biological Education, 54(2), 176–190.
- Bahar, M., Johnstone A., & Hansell, M. (1999). Revisiting learning difficulties in biology, Journal of Biological Education, 33(2), 84–86.
- Bayer, C. N., & Luberda, M. (2016). Measure, then show: grasping human evolution through an inquiry-based, data-driven hominin skulls lab. PLoS ONE, 11(8), e0160054.
- Beals, A. M., McNall, D., Krall, R., & Wymer, C. L. (2012). Energy flow through an ecosystem: conceptions of in-service elementary and middle school teachers. International Journal of Biology Education, 2, 1–18.
- Becerra, B., Núñez, P., Vergara, C., Santibáñez, D., Krüger, D., & Cofré, H. L. (2022). Developing an instrument to assess pedagogical content knowledge for evolution. Research in Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-022-10042-0
- Ben-Zvi Assaraf, O., & Snapir, Z. (2018). Human biology. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 62–73). Routledge.
- Ben-Zvi Assaraf, O. , Dodick. J. , & Tripto, J. (2013). High school students' understanding of the Human Body System. Research in Science Education, 43(1), 33–56.
- $Ben-Zvi\ Assaraf,\ O.\ ,\ \&\ Knippels,\ M.\ P.\ J.\ (2022).\ Fostering\ understanding\ of\ complex\ systems\ in\ biology\ education.\ Springer.$
- Bergan-Roller, H. E., Galt, N. J., Helikar, T., & Dauer, J. T. (2020). Using concept maps to characterize cellular respiration knowledge in undergraduate students. Journal of Biological Education, 54(1), 33–46.
- Bermudez, G., & Lindemann-Matthies, P. (2020). "What matters is species richness" high school students' understanding of the components of biodiversity. Research in Science Education, 50, 2159–2187.
- Boerwinkel, D. J., Yarden, A., & Waarlo, A. J. (2017). Reaching a consensus on the definition of genetic literacy that is required from a twenty-first-century citizen. Science & Education, 26(10), 1087–1114.
- Bravo-Torija, B., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2012). Progression in complexity: Contextualizing sustainable marine resources management in a 10th grade classroom. Research in Science Education, 42, 5–23.
- Bravo, P., & Cofré, H. (2016). A new approach to capture and develop biology teachers' pedagogical content knowledge through learning study: the case of human evolution. International Journal of Science Education, 38(16), 2500–2527.
- Brotman, J. S. , Mensah, F. M. , & Lesko, N. (2011). Urban high school students' learning about HIV/AIDS in different contexts. Science Education, 95(1), 87-120.
- Brown, M. H., & Schwartz, R. S. (2009). Connecting photosynthesis and cellular respiration: Preservice teachers' conceptions. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46(7), 791–812.
- Butler, J., Mooney Simmie, G., & O'Grady, A. (2015). An investigation into the prevalence of ecological misconceptions in upper secondary students and implications for pre-service teacher education. European Journal of Teacher Education, 38(3), 300–319.
- Byrne, J., & Grace, M. (2018). Health and disease. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 74–86). Routledge.
- Camacho, J. P., Colicoy, N. J., Morales, C., Rubio, N., Muñoz, A., & Rodríguez, G. (2012). Los modelos explicativos del estudiantado acerca de la célula eucarionte animal [The student's explanatory models about the animal eukaryotic cell]. Revista Eureka Sobre Enseñanza y Divulgación de las Ciencias, 9(2), 196–212.
- Castéra, J., & Clement, P. (2014). Teachers' Conceptions about the genetic determinism of human behaviour: A survey in 23 Countries. Science & Education, 23, 417–443.
- Castéra, J., Clement, P., Abrougui, M., Nisiforou, O., Valanides, N., Turcinaviciene, J., Sarapuu, T., Agorram, B., Calado, F., & Carvalho, G. (2008). Genetic determinism in school textbooks: A comparative study conducted among 16 countries. Science Education International, 19(2), 163–184.
- Cherif, A. H., Siuda, J. E., Jedlicka, D. M., Bondoc, J. M., & Movahedzadeh, F. (2016). Not all the organelles of living cells are equal! or are they? Engaging students in deep learning and conceptual change. Journal of Education and Practice, 13, 74–86.
- Chi, M. T. H. (2013). Two kinds and four sub-types of misconceived knowledge, ways to change it, and the learning outcomes. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research in conceptual change (pp. 62–83). Taylor and Francis.
- Chi, M., Kristensen, A., & Roscoe, R. (2012a). Misunderstanding emergent causal mechanism in natural selection. In K. Rosengren, S. Brem, M. Evans & G. Sinatra (Eds.), Evolution challenges: Integrating research and practice in teaching and learning about evolution (pp. 145–173). Oxford University Press.
- Chi, M. T. H. , Roscoe, R. D. , Slotta, J. D. , Roy, M. , & Chase, C. C. (2012b). Misconceived causal explanations for emergent processes. Cognitive Science, 36(1), 1–61.
- 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(2), 149-169.
- Cleland, C. E. (2020). Is it possible to scientifically reconstruct the history of life on Earth? The biological sciences and deep time. In K. Kampourakis & T. Uller (Eds.), Philosophy of science for biologists (pp. 193–215). Cambridge University Press.
- Cofré, H. L., Jiménez, J., Santibáñez, D., & Vergara, C. A. (2016). Chilean pre-service and in-service teachers and undergraduate students' understandings of evolutionary theory. Journal of Biological Education, 50(1), 10–23.
- Cofré, H. L., Cuevas, E., & Becerra, B. (2017). The relationship between biology teachers' Understanding of the nature of science and the understanding and acceptance of the theory of evolution. International Journal of Science Education., 39(16), 2243–2260.
- Cofré, H. L., Santibáñez, D., Jiménez, J. P., Spotorno, A., Carmona, F., Navarrete, K., & C. A. Vergara, (2018a). The effect of teaching the nature of science on students' acceptance and understanding of evolution: myth or reality? Journal of Biological Education, 52(3), 248–261.
- Cofré, H. L., Núñez, P., Santibáñez, D., Pavez, J. P., & C. A. Vergara, (2018b). Theory, evidence, and examples about teaching nature of science and biology using history of science: A Chilean experience. In M. E. Brzezinski Prestes & C. C. Silva (Eds.), Teaching science with context: Historical, philosophical, sociological approaches (pp. 65–84). Springer.
- Cofre, H. L., Vergara, C., & Sportorno, A. (Eds.). (2021). Enseñar evolución y genética para la alfabetización científica [Teaching evolution and genetics for scientific literacy]. Ediciones Universitarias de Valparaíso.
- Dawson, V. (2011). A case study of the impact of the introduction of socio-scientific themes in a reproduction unit in a Catholic girls' school. In T. Sadler (Ed.) Socioscientific problems in the classroom: Teaching, learning, and research (pp. 313–346). Springer.
- Dawson, V., & Carson, K. (2020). Introducing argumentation about climate change socioscientific issues in a disadvantaged school. Research in Science Education, 50, 863–883.

- Demetriou, D., Korfiatis, K., & Constantinou, C. (2009). Comprehending trophic relations through food web construction. Journal of Biological Education, 43(2), 53–59.
- Dempster, E., & Stears, M. (2014). An analysis of children's Drawings of what they think is inside their bodies: A South African regional study. Journal of Biological Education, 48(2), 71–79.
- Deniz, H., & Borgerding, L. (2018). Evolutionary theory as a controversial topic in science curriculum around the globe. In H. Deniz & L. Borgerding (Eds.), Evolution education around the globe (pp. 3–11). Springer.
- Deutch, C. E. (2018). Mendel or molecules first: What is the best approach for teaching general genetics? American Biology Teacher, 80(4), 264–269.
- Dillon, J., & Avraamidou, L. (2020). Towards a viable response to COVID-19 from the Science Education Community. Journal for Activist Science & Technology Education, 11(2), 1–6.
- Donovan, B., Semmens, R., Keck, P., Brimhall, E., Busch, K., Windling, M., Duncan, A., Stuhlsatz., M., Bracey, Z., Bloom, M., Kowalski, S., & Salazar, B. (2019). Toward a more humane genetics education: Learning about the social and quantitative complexities of human genetic variation research could reduce racial bias in adolescent and adult populations. Science Education, 103, 529–560.
- Donovan, B., Windling, M., Salazar, B., Duncan, A., Stuhlsatz., M., & Keck, P. (2020). Genomics literacy matters: Supporting the development of genomics literacy through genetics education could reduce the prevalence of genetic essentialism. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(4), 520–550.
- Dotger, B., Dotger, S. Masingila, J., Rozelle, J., Bearkland, M., & Binnert, A. (2018). The Right "Fit": Exploring science teacher candidates' approaches to natural selection within a clinical simulation. Research in Science Education, 48, 637–661.
- Dougherty, M. (2009). Closing the gap: Inverting the genetics curriculum to ensure an informed public. The American Journal of Human Genetics, 85, 6–12.
- Drewes, A., Henderson, J., & Mouza, C. (2019). Professional development design considerations in climate change education: teacher enactment and student learning. International Journal of Science Education, 40(1), 67–89.
- Duncan, R. G., Castro-Faix, M., & Choi, J. (2016). Informing a learning progression in genetics: which should be taught first, mendelian inheritance or the central dogma of molecular biology? International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 14, 445–472.
- Duncan, R. G., & Freidenreich, H. B., Chinn, C. A., & Bausch, A. (2011). Promoting middle school students' understandings of molecular genetics. Research in Science Education, 41, 147–167.
- Duncan, R. G., Krajcik, J., & Rivet, A. E. (2017). Disciplinary core ideas: Reshaping teaching and learning. National Science Teaching Association.
- Duncan, R. G., 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.
- Eisenberg, M. E., Madsen, N., Oliphant, J. A., & Sieving, R. E. (2013). Barriers to providing the sexuality education that teachers believe students need. The Journal of School Health, 83(5), 335–342.
- Emmons, N., Smith, H., & Kelemen, D. (2016). Changing minds with the story of adaptation: Strategies for teaching young children about natural selection. Early Education and Development, 27(8), 1205–1221.
- Evans, E. M., Rosengren, K., Lane, J. D., & Price, K. S. (2012). Encountering counterintuitive ideas: Constructing a developmental learning progression for evolution understanding. In K. Rosengren, S. Brem, M. Evans & G. Sinatra (Eds.), Evolution challenges: Integrating research and practice in teaching and learning about evolution (pp. 174–198). Oxford University Press.
- Fančovičová, J., & Prokop, P. (2019). Examining secondary school students' misconceptions about the human Body: correlations between the methods of drawing and opened-ended questions. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 18(4), 549–557.
- Fernández, M., & Jiménez-Tejada, P. M. (2019). Difficulties learning about the cell. Expectations vs. reality. Journal of Biological Education, 53(3), 333–347.
- Fiedler, D., Sbeglia, G. C., Nehm, R. H., & Harms, U. (2019). How strongly does statistical reasoning influence knowledge and acceptance of evolution? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 1183–1206.
- France, B., Mora, H. A., & Bay, J. L. (2012). Changing perspectives: Exploring a pedagogy to examine other perspectives about stem cell research. International Journal of Science Education, 34(5), 803–824.
- Freidenreich, H. B., Duncan, R. G., & Shea, N. (2011). Exploring middle school students' understanding of three conceptual models in genetics. International Journal of Science Education, 33(17), 2323–2349.
- Friedrichsen, P. J., Linke, N., & Barnett, E. (2016). Biology teachers' professional development needs for teaching evolution. Science Educator, 25(1), 51–61.
- Frejd, J., Stolpe, K., Hultén, M., & Schönborn, K. J. (2022). Making a fictitious animal: 6–7-year-old Swedish children's meaning making about evolution during a modelling task. Journal of Biological Education, 56(3), 323–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2020.1799843
- Garcia-Barros, S., Martínez-Losada, C., & Garrido, M. (2011). What do children aged four to seven know about the digestive system and the respiratory system of the human being and of other animals? International Journal of Science Education 33 (15), 2095–2122. Glaze, A., & Goldston, M. (2015). US science teaching and learning of evolution: A critical review of literature 2000–2014. Science Education. 99(3), 500–518.
- Gericke, N., & El-Hani, C. N. (2018). Genetics. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 111–123). Routledge.
- Gericke, N., & Hagberg, M. (2007). Definition of historical models of gene function and their relation to students' understanding of genetics. Science & Education, 16(7), 849–881.
- Gilissen, M. G. R., Knippels, M. P. J., & van Joolingen, W. R. (2020). Bringing systems thinking into the classroom, International Journal of Science Education, 42(8), 1253–1280.
- Gonzalez-Weill, C., & Harms, U. (2012). Del Árbol al cloroplasto: Concepciones alternativas de estudiantes de 9º y 10º grado sobre los Conceptos "ser vivo" y "Célula" [From tree to chloroplast: K-9 and K-10 students' conceptions about "living being" and "cell"]. Enseñanza de las Ciencias, 30(3), 31.
- Gotwals, A., & Songer, N. (2009). Reasoning up and down a food chain: Using an assessment framework to investigate students' middle knowledge. Science Education, 94, 259–281.

- Gray, R. E. (2014). The distinction between experimental and historical sciences as a framework for improving classroom inquiry. Science Education, 98(2), 327–341.
- Großschedl, J., Welter, V., & Harms, U. (2019). A new instrument for measuring pre-service biology teachers' pedagogical content knowledge: The PCK-IBI. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 402–439.
- Ha, M. X., Wei, J., Wang, D., Hou, F., & Nehm, R. H. (2019). Chinese pre-service biology teachers' evolutionary knowledge, reasoning patterns, and acceptance levels. International Journal of Science Education, 41(5), 628–651.
- Harlen, W. (Ed.). (2010). Principles and big ideas of science education. Ashford Colour Press.
- Harms, U., & Bertsch, U. (2018). Energy, photosynthesis, and respiration. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.) Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 139–152). Routledge.
- Harms, U., & Reiss, M. J. (2019). (Eds). Evolution education re-considered. Understanding what works. Springer.
- Haskel-Ittah, M., & Yarden, A. (2021). Genetics education. Springer.
- Hawley, P. H., & Sinatra, G. M. (2019). Declawing the dinosaurs in the science classroom: Reducing Christian teachers' anxiety and increasing their efficacy for teaching evolution. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(4), 375–401.
- Herman, B. C. (2018). Students' environmental NOS views, compassion, intent, and action: Impact of place-based socioscientific issues instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(4), 600–638.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Liu, L., Gray, S., & Jordan, R. (2015). Using representational tools to learn about complex systems: A tale of two classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52, 6–35.
- 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(3), 307–331.
- Hogan, K. (2000). Assessing students' systems reasoning in ecology. Journal of Biological Education, 35, 22–28.
- Hokayem, H., & Gotwals, A. (2016). Early elementary students' understanding of ecosystems: A learning progression approach. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(10), 1524–1545.
- Homburger, S. A., Drits-Esser, D., Malone, M., Pompei, K., Breitenbach, K., Perkins, R. D., Anderson, P. C., Barber, N. C., Hawkins, A. J., Katz, S., Kelly, M., Starr, H., Bass, K. M., Roseman, Jo E., Hardcastle, J., De Boer, G., & Stark, L. A. (2019). Development and pilot testing of a three-dimensional, phenomenon-based unit that integrates evolution and heredity. Evolution, Education and Outreach, 12, 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12052-019-0106-1
- Hovardas, T., & Korfiatis, K. (2011). Towards a critical re-appraisal of ecology education: scheduling an educational intervention to revisit the 'balance of nature' metaphor. Science & Education, 20, 1039–1053.
- Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P., Bugallo-Rodriguez, A., & Duschl, R. A. (2000). "Doing the lesson" or "doing science": argument in high school genetics. Science Education, 84, 757–792.
- Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Evagorou, M. (2018). Argumentation in biology education. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.) Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 249–262). Routledge.
- Jin, H., & Anderson, C. (2012). A learning progression for energy in socio-ecological systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(9), 1149–1180.
- Jin, H., Shin, H. J., Hokayem, H., Qureshi, F., & Jenkins, T. (2019). Secondary students' understanding of ecosystems: A learning progression approach. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17, 217–235.
- Jordan, R., Brooks, W. R., Hmelo-Silver, C., Eberbach, C., & Sinha, S. (2014). Balancing broad ideas with context: An evaluation of student accuracy in describing ecosystem processes after a system-level intervention. Journal of Biological Education, 48(2), 57–62. Jordan, R. F., Singer, J., Vaughan, & Berkowitz, A. (2009). What should every citizen know about ecology? Frontiers in Ecology and Environment, 7. https://doi.org/10.1890/070113.
- Kampourakis, K. (Ed.) (2013). The philosophy of biology: A companion for educators. Springer.
- Kampourakis, K. (2021). Should we give peas a chance? An argument for a Mendel-free biology curriculum. In M. Haskel-Ittah & A. Yarden (Eds.), Genetics education (pp. 3–16). Springer.
- Kampourakis, K., & Reiss, M. (Eds.) (2018). Teaching Biology in Schools: Global Research, Issues, and Trends. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kampourakis, K., & Stasinakis, P. (2018). Development. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: global research, issues, and trends (pp. 99–110). Routledge.
- Käpylä, K., 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(10), 1395–1415.
- Khishfe, R., Alshaya, F. S., BouJaoude, S., Mansour, N., & Alrudiyan, K. I. (2017). Students' understandings of nature of science and their arguments in the context of four socio-scientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 39(3), 299–334.
- Korfiatis, K. (2018). Ecology. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 153–163). Routledge.
- Krüger, D., & Santibáñez, D. (2021). Preconcepciones y obstáculos para el aprendizaje de la Genética [Preconceptions and obstacles to learning Genetics]. In H. L. Cofré, C. Vergara-Diaz, & A. Spotorno (Eds.), Enseñar Evolución y Genética para la alfabetización científica (pp. 181–204). Ediciones Universitarias de Valparaíso.
- Kubsch, M., Nordine, J., Fortus, D., Krajcik, J., & Neumann, K. (2020). Supporting students in using energy ideas to interpret phenomena: The role of an energy representation. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 18, 1635–1654. Larkin, D. B., & Perry-Ryder, G. M. (2015). Without the light of evolution: A case study of resistance and avoidance in learning to teach high school biology. Science Education, 99(3), 549–576.
- Lazarowitz, R. (2014). High school biology curricula development: Implementation, teaching, and evaluation from the 20th to the 21st century. In N. Lederman & S. Abell, S. (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 426–447). Routledge.
- Lederman, N. G. (2018). Nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry in biology teaching. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 216–235). Routledge.
- Lewis, R. W. (1972). The structure of the Cell Theory. American Biology Teacher, 34, 209–211.
- Liu, L., & Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2013). Promoting the collaborative use of cognitive and metacognitive skills through conceptual representations in Hypermedia. In D. F. Treagust & C. Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education, models and modeling in science education (pp. 75–92). Springer.
- Lucero, M., Petrosino, A., & Delgado, C. (2017). Exploring the relationship between secondary science teachers' subject matter knowledge and knowledge of student conceptions while teaching evolution by natural selection. Journal of Research in Science

Teaching, 54(2), 219-246.

Macintyre, A. K. J., Montero Vega, A. R., & Sagbakken, M. (2015). From disease to desire, pleasure to the pill: A qualitative study of adolescent learning about sexual health and sexuality in Chile. BMC Public Health, 15, 945. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2253-0

Magnusson, S., Krajcik, J., & Borko, H. (1999). Nature, sources, and development of pedagogical content knowledge for science teaching. In J. Gess-Newsome & N. Lederman (Eds.), *Examining pedagogical content knowledge: The construct and its implications for science education* (pp. 95–132). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Malone, K. L., Schuchardt, A. M., & Sabree, Z. (2019). Models and modeling in evolution. In U. Harms & M. J. Reiss (Eds.), Evolution education reconsidered. Understanding what Works (pp. 0207–0226). Springer.

Mambrey, S. J., Timm, J. J., Landskron, & Schmiemann, P. (2020). The impact of system specifics on systems thinking Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(10), 1632–1651.

Marquet, P. A., Allen, A. P., Brown, J. H., Dunne, J. A., Enquist, B. J., Gillooly, J. F., Gowaty, P. A., Green, J. L., Harte, J., Hubbell, S. P., O' Dwyer, J., Okie, J. G., Ostling, A., Ritchie, M., Storch, D., & West, G. B. (2014). On theory in ecology. BioScience, 64(8), 701–710.

Matuk, C., Zhang, J., Uk, I., & Linn, M. C. (2019). Qualitative graphing in an authentic inquiry context: How construction and critique help middle school students to reason about cancer. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 905–936.

Mayr, E. (1996). This is biology: The science of the living world. Harvard University Press.

McComas, W. (2002). The ideal environmental science curriculum: I. History, rationales, misconceptions & standards. American Biology Teacher, 64(9), 665–672.

McComas, W. (2003). The Nature of the ideal environmental science curriculum: Advocates, textbooks, & conclusions (Part II of II). American Biology Teacher, 65(3), 171–178.

McComas, W. (2007). Biology education under the microscope: Examining the history and current state of biology education. The Science Teacher, 74(7), 28–33.

McComas, W. F. (2018a). The nature of science & the next generation of biology education. The American Biology Teacher, 77(7), 485–491.

McComas, W. F. (2018b). Cell biology. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 48–61). Routledge.

McComas, W. F., Reiss, J. M., Dempster, E., Lee, Y. C., Olander, C., Clément, P., Jan Boerwinkel, D., & Waarlo, A. J. (2018). Considering grand challenges in biology education: Rationales and proposals for future investigations to guide instruction and enhance student understanding in the Life Sciences. The American Biology Teacher, 80(7), 483–492.

McLure, F., Won, M., & Treagust, D. F. (2020). Students' understanding of the emergent processes of natural selection: the need for ontological conceptual change. International Journal of Science Education, 42(9), 1485–1502.

Mead, R., Hejmadi, M., & Hurst, L. D. (2017). Teaching genetics prior to teaching evolution improves evolution understanding but not acceptance. PLoS Biology,15(5), 2002255. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2002255

Menzel, S., & Bögeholz, S. (2009). The loss of biodiversity as a challenge for sustainable development: how do pupils in Chile and Germany perceive resource dilemmas? Research in Science Education, 39, 429–447.

Millar, R., & Osborne, J. (1998). Beyond 2000: Science education for the future: The report of a seminar series funded by the Nuffield Foundation. King's College London.

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), 675–698.

Moss, L. (2003). What genes can't do. The MIT Press.

Nehm, R. H. (2018). Evolution. In teaching biology in schools. Global research, issues, and trends. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.) Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 164–177). Routledge.

Nehm, R., Beggrow, E., Opfer, J., & Ha, M. (2012). Reasoning about natural selection: Diagnosing contextual competency using the ACORNS Instrument. The American Biology Teacher, 74(2), 92–98.

Nehm, R. H., & Kampourakis, K. (2016). Conceptual change in science and science education. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory (pp. 1–5). Springer Science, Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_41–1 Neubrand, C., & Harms, U. (2017). Tackling the difficulties in learning evolution: Effects of adaptive self – explanation prompts, Journal of Biological Education, 51(4), 336–348.

NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.

Nichols, K. (2018). Impact of professional learning on teachers' representational strategies and students' cognitive engagement with molecular genetics concepts. Journal of Biological Education, 52(1), 31–46.

Núñez, P., Castillo, P., Hinojosa, C., Parraguez, C., & Cofré. H. (2022). Inquiry-based activities for teaching about natural selection: dog evolution and the secret ingredient of an amazing experiment. The American Biology Teacher, 84(2), 94–99.

Oliver, J. S., Hodges, G. W., Moore, J. N., Cohen, A., Jang, Y., Brown, S. A., Kwon, K. A., Jeong, S., Raven, S. P., Jurkiewicz, M., & Robertson, T. P. (2019). Supporting high school student accomplishment of biology content using interactive computer-based curricular case studies. Research in Science Education, 49(6), 1783–1808.

Opitz, S., Blankenstein, A., & Harms, U. (2017). Student conceptions about energy in biological contexts. Journal of Biological Education, 51(4), 427–440.

Orbanić, N. D., Dimec, D. S., & Cencič, M. (2016). The effectiveness of a constructivist teaching model on students' understanding of photosynthesis. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 15(5), 575–587.

Orlander, A. A. (2016). 'So, what do men and women want? Is it any different from what animals want?' sex education in an upper secondary school. Research in Science Education, 46, 811–829.

Orlander, A. A., & Lundegård, I. (2012). 'It's Her body'. When students' argumentation shows displacement of content in a science classroom. Research in Science Education, 42, 1121–1145.

Osborne, J., Donovan, B., Henderson, J., MacPherson, A., & Wild, A. (2017). Arguing from evidence in middle school science. 24 activities for productive talk and deeper learning. Sage Publications.

Özgür, S. (2013). The persistence of misconceptions about the human blood circulatory system among students in different grade levels. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 8(2), 255–268.

- Park, S., & Chen, Y.-C. (2012). Mapping out the integration of the components of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) for teaching photosynthesis and heredity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(7), 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-009-9163-8
- Park, S., Suh, J., & Seo, K. (2018). Development and validation of measures of secondary science teachers' PCK for teaching photosynthesis. Research in Science Education, 48(3), 549–573.
- Parker, J. M., Anderson, C. W., Heidemann, M., Merrill, J., Merritt, B., Richmond, G., & Urban-Lurain, M. (2012). Exploring undergraduates' understanding of photosynthesis using diagnostic question clusters. CBE Life Science Education, 11(1), 47–57.
- Parraguez, C., Núñez, P., Krüger, D., & Cofré, H. (2021). Describing changes in student thinking about evolution in response to instruction: The case of a group of Chilean ninth-grade students. Journal of Biological Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2021.2009006.
- https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/citedby/10.1080/00219266.2021.2009006?scroll=top&needAccess=true
- Patrick, P. G., & Tunnicliffe, S. D. (2010). Science teachers' drawings of what is inside the human body. Journal of Biological Education, 44(2), 81–87.
- Pavez, J., Vergara, C. A., Santibáñez, D., & Cofré, H. L. (2016). Using a professional development program for enhancing Chilean biology Teachers' understanding of Nature of Science (NOS) and their perceptions about using history of science to teach NOS. Science & Education, 25, 383–405
- Peart, D. J. (2022). Hand drawing as a tool to facilitate understanding in undergraduate human biology: a critical review of the literature and future perspectives. Studies in Science Education, 58(1), 81–93.
- Peterson, E. L. (2020). What methods do life scientists use? A brief history with philosophical implications. In K. Kampourakis & T. Uller (Eds.) Philosophy of science for biologists (pp. 168–192). Cambridge University Press.
- Pinxten, R., Vandervieren, E., & Janssenswillen, P. (2020). Does integrating natural selection throughout upper secondary biology education result in a better understanding? A cross-national comparison between Flanders, Belgium and the Netherlands. International Journal of Science Education, 42(10), 1609–1634.
- Pobiner, B., Watson, W., Beardsley, P., & Bertka, C. (2018). Using human example to teach evolution to high school students: Increasing understanding and decreasing cognitive biases and misconceptions. In U. Harms & M. Reiss (Eds.), Evolution education re-considered. Understanding what works (pp. 185–205). Springer.
- Prokop, P., Fančovičová, J., & Tunnicliffe, S. D. (2009). The effect of type of instruction on expression of children's knowledge: How do children see the endocrine and urinary system? International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 4(1), 75–93.
- Puig, B., Ageitos, N., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2017). Learning gene expression through modelling and argumentation a case study exploring the connections between the worlds of knowledge. Science & Education, 26, 1193–1222.
- Puig, B., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2011). Different music for the same score: teaching about genes, environment and human actions. In T. Sadler (Ed.) Socioscientific problems in the classroom: teaching, learning, and research (pp. 201–238). Springer.
- Puig, B., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2022). Critical thinking in biology and environmental education. Facing challenges in a post-truth world. Springer.
- Quessada, M., & Clément, P. (2018). Evolution education in France: Evolution is widely taught and accepted. In H. Deniz & L. Borgeding (Eds.), Evolution education around the globe (1st ed., pp. 213–233). Springer.
- Reinfried, S., & Tempelmann, S. (2014). The impact of secondary school students' preconceptions on the evolution of their mental models of the greenhouse effect and global warming. International Journal of Science Education, 36(2), 304–333.
- Reinoso R., Delgado-Iglesias, J., & Fernández, I. (2019). Learning difficulties, alternative conceptions and misconceptions of student teachers about respiratory physiology. International Journal of Science Education, 41(18), 2602–2625.
- Reiss, M. (2018). Reproduction and sex education. Teaching biology in schools. Global research, issues, and trends. In K.
- Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 87–98), Routledge,
- Reiss, M. J., & Tunnicliffe, S. D. (2001). Students' understandings of human organs and organ systems. Research in Science Education, 31(3), 383–399.
- Reiss, M., & Kampourakis, K. (2018). Introduction: Biology didactics. In K. Kampourakis & M. Reiss (Eds.), Teaching biology in schools: Global research, issues, and trends (pp. 1–8). Routledge.
- Rogat, A., Hug, B., & Golan, R. (2017). Core idea LS1 from molecules to organisms: Structures and processes. In R. Golan, J. Krajcik, & A. Rivet (Eds.), Disciplinary core ideas reshaping teaching and learning (pp. 99–122). NSTA press.
- Röllke, K., Sellmann-Risse, D., Wenzel, A., & Grotjohann, N. (2021). Impact of inquiry-based learning in a molecular biology class on the dimensions of students' situational interest, International Journal of Science Education, 43(17), 2843–2865.
- Romine, W. L., Walter, E. M., Bosse, & Todd, A. N. (2017). Understanding patterns of evolution acceptance A new implementation of the measure of acceptance of the theory of evolution. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(5), 642–671.
- Rousell, R., & Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles, A. (2020). A systematic review of climate change education: giving children and young people a 'voice' and a 'hand' in redressing climate change. Children's Geographies, 18(2), 191–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2019.1614532.
- Ryoo, K., & Linn, M. C. (2012). Can dynamic visualizations improve middle school students' understanding of energy in photosynthesis? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(2), 218–243.
- Sadler, T. D., Romine, D. L., Menon D., Ferdig, R. D., & Annetta, L. (2015). Learning biology through innovative curricula: A comparison of game and nongame-based approaches. Science Education, 99(4), 696–720.
- Sánchez-Tapia, I., Krajcik, J., & Reiser, B. (2018). "We do not know what is the real story anymore": Curricular contextualization principles that support indigenous students in understanding natural selection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 348–376. Scharmann, L. (2018). Evolution and nature of science instruction. Evolution Education & Outreach, 11,14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12052-018-0088-4
- Schizas, D., Papatheodorou, E., & Stamou, G. (2021). Unraveling the holistic nature of ecosystems: Biology teachers' conceptions of methodological choices regarding the study of ecosystems. Environmental Education Research, 27(1), 22–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1819963
- Schmelzing, S., van Driel, J., Jüttner, M., Brandenbusch, S., Sandmann, A., & Neuhaus, B. (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(6), 1369–1390.
- Schramm, J. W., Jin, H., Keeling, E. G., Johnson, M., & Shin, H. J. (2018). Improved student reasoning about carbon-transforming processes through Inquiry-Based Learning activities derived from an empirically validated learning progression. Research in Science Education, 48(5), 887–911.
- Schrödinger, E. (1946). What is life? Macmillan.
- Schwartz, R., & Brown, M. H. (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, models and modeling in science education (pp. 203–223). Springer.
- Schwartz, R., Cofré, H., & Santibáñez, D. (2021). Modelando en genética: estrategias para desarrollar alfabetización científica [Modeling in genetics: Strategies for developing scientific literacy]. In H. L. Cofré, C. Vergara-Diaz, & A. Sportorno (Eds.), Enseñar Evolución y Genética para la alfabetización científica (pp. 205–230). Ediciones Universitarias de Valparaíso.
- Seoh, K. H. R., Subramaniam, R., & Hoh, Y. K. (2016). How humans evolved according to grade 12 students in Singapore. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(2), 291–323.
- Sesli, E., & Kara, Y. (2012). Development and application of a two-tier multiple-choice diagnostic test for high school students' understanding of cell division and reproduction. Journal of Biological Education, 46(4), 214–225.
- Sickel, A. J., & Friedrichsen, P. (2012). Using the FAR guide to teach simulations: An example with natural selection. The American Biology Teacher, 74(1), 47–51.
- Sickel, A. J., & Friedrichsen, P. (2013). Examining the evolution education literature with a focus on teachers: Major findings, goals for teacher preparation, and directions for future research. Evolution: Education and Outreach, 6(1), 23. https://doi.org/10.1186/1936-6434-6-23
- Sickel, A. J., & Friedrichsen, P. (2018). Using multiple lenses to examine the development of beginning biology teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching natural selection simulations. Research in Science Education, 48, 29–70.
- Sirovina, D., & Kovačević, G. (2019). Importance of an appropriate visual presentation for avoiding a misconception of the menstrual cycle. Journal of Biological Education, 53(3), 302–309.
- Smith, M., Wood, W. B., Adams, W. K., Wieman, C., Knight, J. K., Guild, N., & Su, T. T. (2009). Why peer discussion improves student performance on in-class concept questions. Science, 322, 122–124.
- Snapir, Z., Eberbach, C., Ben-Zvi-Assaraf, O., Hmelo-Silver, C., & Tripto, J. (2017). Characterising the development of the understanding of human body systems in high-school biology students: A longitudinal study. International Journal of Science Education, 39(15), 2092–2127.
- Stern, F., Delaval, M., Kampourakis, K., & Muller, A. (2020). Implicit associations of teleology and essentialism concepts with genetics concepts among secondary school students. PLoS ONE, 15(11), e0242189.
- Stern, F., & Kampourakis, K. (2017). Teaching for genetics literacy in the post-genomic era. Studies in Science Education, 53(2), 193–225.
- Suwono, H., Prasetyo, T., Lestari, U., Lukiati, B., Fachrunnisa, R., Kusairi, S., Saefi, M., Fauzi, A., & Atho'Illah, M. F. (2021). Cell biology diagnostic test (CBD-test) portrays pre-service teacher misconceptions about biology cell. Journal of Biological Education, 55(1), 82–105.
- Tal, T., Kali, Y., Magid, S., & Madhok, J. J. (2011). Enhancing the authenticity of a web-based module to teaching simple inheritance. In T. Sadler (Ed.), Socioscientific problems in the classroom: Teaching, learning, and research (pp. 11–38). Springer. Todd, A., Romine, W., & Cook Whitt, K. (2017). Development and validation of the learning progression-based assessment of modern genetics (LPA-MG) in a high school context. Science Education, 101(1), 32–65.
- Todd, A., Romine, W., & Correa-Menendez, J. (2019). Modeling the transition from a phenotypic to genotypic conceptualization of genetics in a University-Level introductory biology context. Research in Science Education, 49, 569–589.
- Treagust, D. F., & C. Y. Tsui (Eds.) (2013). Multiple representations in biological education, models and modeling in science education. Springer.
- Tripto, J., Ben Zvi Assaraf, O., & Amit, M. (2018). Recurring patterns in the development of high school biology students' system thinking over time. Instructional Science, 46(1), 639–680.
- Upadhyay, B., E., Atwood, & Tharu, B. (2020). Actions for sociopolitical consciousness in a high school science class: A case study of ninth grade class with predominantly indigenous students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(7), 1119–1147.
- van Lieshout, E. , & Dawson, V. (2016). Knowledge of, and attitudes towards Health-related biotechnology applications amongst Australian year 10 high school students, Journal of Biological Education, 50(3), 329–344.
- Varela, B., Sesto, V., & García-Rodeja, I. (2020). An investigation of secondary students' mental models of climate change and the greenhouse effect. Research in Science Education, 50, 599–624.
- Verhoeff, R. P., Knippels, M. C. P. J., Gilissen, M. G. R., & Boersma, K. T. (2018). The theoretical nature of system thinking. Perspectives on system thinking in biology education. Frontiers in Education, 3, 1–11.
- Verhoeff, R. P., Waarlo, A. J., & Boersma, K. T. (2008). Systems modelling and the development coherent understanding of cell biology. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 543–568.
- Veselinovska, S. S., Gudeva, L. K., & Djokic, M. (2011). Applying appropriates methods for teaching cell biology. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 2837–2842.
- Vijapurkar, J., Kawalkar, A., & Nambiar, P. (2014). What do cells really look like? An Inquiry into students' difficulties in visualising a 3-D biological cell and lessons for pedagogy. Research in Science Education, 44(2), 307–333.
- Vlaardingerbroek, B., Taylor, N., & Bale, C. (2014). The problem of scale in the interpretation of pictorial representations of cell structure. Journal of Biological Education, 48(3), 154–162.
- Weissová, M., & Prokop, P. (2020). Alternative conceptions of obesity and perception of obese people amongst children. Journal of Biological Education, 54(5), 463–475.
- Wenderoth, M. P., Scott, E., Jackson, M., Cerchiara, J., Moon, S., McFarland, J., & Doherty, J. (2020). Developing a learning progression in physiology to characterize how students' reason about ion movement. The FASEB Journal 34(S1), 1–1. https://doi.org/10.1096/fasebj.2020.34.s1.09744
- Wernecke, U., Schütte, J., Schwanewedel, K., & Harms, U. (2018). Enhancing conceptual knowledge of energy in biology with incorrect representations. CBE Life Sciences Education, 17(1), 1–11.

Werner, S., Förtsch, C., Boone, W., von Kotzebue, L., & Neuhaus, B. J. (2019). Investigating how German biology teachers use three-dimensional physical models in classroom instruction: a Video Study. Research in Science Education, 49, 437–463.

Wilson, C. D., Anderson, C. W., Heidemann, M., Merrill, J. E., Merritt, B. W., Richmond, G., Sibley, D. F., & Parker, J. M. (2006). Assessing students' ability to trace matter in Dynamic systems in cell biology. CBE-Life Science Educations, 5, 323–331.

Wolfe, A. J. (2012). The cold war context of the golden jubilee, or why we think of Mendel as the father of genetics. Journal of the History of Biology, 45, 389–414.

Won, Wan, & Cheng. (2011). Learning the nature of science through socio-scientific issues. In T. Sadler (Ed.), Socio-scientific issues in the classroom: Teaching, learning, and research (pp. 245–270). Springer.

Wyner, Y., & Doherty, J. H. (2017). Developing a learning progression for three-dimensional learning of the patterns of evolution. Science Education, 101, 787–817.

Zabel, J., & Gropengiesser, H. (2011). Learning progress in evolution theory: climbing a ladder or roaming a landscape? Journal of Biological Education, 45(3), 143–149.

Zangori, L., Ke, L., Sadler, T. D., & Peel, A. (2020). Exploring primary students causal reasoning about ecosystems, International Journal of Science Education, 42(11), 1799–1817.

Zangori, L., Peel, A., Kinslow, A., Friedrichsen, P., & Sadler, T. D. (2017). Student development of model-based reasoning about carbon cycling and climate change in a socio-scientific issues unit. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(10), 1249–1273.

Zion, M., & Klein, S. (2015). Conceptual understanding of homeostasis. International Journal of Biology Education, 4(1), 1–27.

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.

Teaching Physics

Akben, N. (2020). Effects of the problem-posing approach on students' problem solving skills and metacognitive awareness in science education. Research in Science Education, 50(3), 1143–1165. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9726-7

Alonzo, A. C., & Steedle, J. T. (2009). Developing and assessing a force and motion learning progression. Science Education, 93(3), 389–421.

Alonzo, A. C., & von Aufschnaiter, C. (2018). Moving beyond misconceptions: Learning progressions as a lens for seeing progress in student thinking. The Physics Teacher, 56(7), 470–473. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.5055332

Alstein, P., Krijtenburg-Lewerissa, K., & van Joolingen, W. R. (2021). Teaching and learning special relativity theory in secondary and lower undergraduate education: A literature review. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 17(2), 023101. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.17.023101

Andersson, B. (1990). Pupils' conceptions of matter and its transformations (age 12–16). Studies in Science Education, 18(1), 53–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057269008559981

Asikainen, M. A., & Hirvonen, P. E. (2014). Probing pre-and in-service physics teachers' knowledge using the double-slit thought experiment. Science & Education, 23(9), 1811–1833.

Baily, C., & Finkelstein, N. D. (2009). Development of quantum perspectives in modern physics. Physical Review Special Topics – Physics Education Research, 5(1), 010106. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.5.010106

Baily, C., & Finkelstein, N. D. (2010). Teaching and understanding of quantum interpretations in modern physics courses. Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research, 6(1), 010101.

Bain, K., Moon, A., Mack, M. R., & Towns, M. H. (2014). A review of research on the teaching and learning of thermodynamics at the university level. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 15(3), 320–335.

Bao, L., Hogg, K., & Zollman, D. (2002). Model analysis of fine student models: An example with Newton's third law. American Journal of Physics, 70(7), 766–778.

Bao, L., & Koenig, K. (2019). Physics education research for 21st century learning. Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research, 1(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-019-0007-8

Baumert, J. (2002). Deutschland im internationalen Bildungsvergleich [Germany on an international comparison of educational systems]. In J. K. N. Kilius & L. Reisch (Ed.), Die Zukunft der Bildung (pp. 100–150). Suhrkamp.

Baumert, J., & Kunter, M. (2013). The COACTIV model of teachers' professional competence. In M. Kunter, J. Baumert, W. Blum, U. Klusmann, S. Krauss, & M. Neubrand (Eds.), Cognitive activation in the mathematics classroom and professional competence of teachers: Results from the COACTIV project (mathematics teacher education no. 8) (pp. 25–48). Springer.

Bevan, B. (2017). The promise and the promises of Making in science education. Studies in Science Education, 53(1), 75–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2016.1275380

Blomberg, G., Renkl, A., Gamoran Sherin, M., Borko, H., & Seidel, T. (2013). Five research-based heuristics for using video in preservice teacher education. [Fünf evidenzbasierte Heuristiken für den Einsatz von Video in der universitären Lehrerausbildung]. Journal for educational research online, 5(1), 90–114. https://doi.org/URN:urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-80215

Boholm, M., Möller, N., & Hansson, S. O. (2016). The concepts of risk, safety, and security: applications in everyday language. Risk Analysis, 36(2), 320–338. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12464

Borromeo Ferri, R. (2011). Wege zur Innenwelt des mathematischen Modellierens [Ways to the inner world of mathematical modelling]. Springer.

Borromeo Ferri, R. (2018). Instructional competency: For effective and quality lessons. In Learning how to teach mathematical modeling in school and teacher education (pp. 77–102). Springer International Publishing.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). How people learn (Vol. 11). National Academy Press.

Brewe, E. (2008). Modeling theory applied: Modeling Instruction in introductory physics. American Journal of Physics, 76(12), 1155–1160. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.2983148

Brewe, E. , & Sawtelle, V. (2018). Modelling instruction for university physics: Examining the theory in practice. European Journal of Physics, 39(5), 054001. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6404/aac236

Brobst, J., Markworth, K., Tasker, T., & Ohana, C. (2017). Comparing the preparedness, content knowledge, and instructional quality of elementary science specialists and self-contained teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(10), 1302–1321.

https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21406

- Bryan, L. A., Moore, T. J., Johnson, C. C., & Roehrig, G. H. (2016). Integrated STEM education In C. C. Johnson, E. E. Peters-Burton, & T. J. Moore (Eds.), STEM road map: A framework for integrated STEM education (pp. 23–38). Routledge.
- Bullen, P., & Russell, M. (2007). A blended learning approach to teaching first year engineering degree students. In International Conference on Engineering Education-ICEE.
- https://scholar.google.de/citations?hl=de&user=mygtTa8AAAAJ&view_op=list_works&sortby=title
- Bungum, B., Henriksen, E. K., Angell, C., Tellefsen, C. W., & Bøe, M. V. (2015). ReleQuant Improving teaching and learning in quantum physics through educational design research. Nordic Studies in Science Education, 11(2), 153–168. https://doi.org/10.5617/nordina.2043
- Burge, B., Lenkeit, J., & Sizmur, J. (2015). PISA in practice: Cognitive activation in maths: How to use it in the classroom. NFER.
- Cairns, D., & Areepattamannil, S. (2019). Exploring the relations of inquiry-based teaching to science achievement and dispositions in 54 countries. Research in Science Education, 49(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–017–9639-x
- Cartwright, J. H. E., González, D. L., & Piro, O. (2021). Dynamical systems, celestial mechanics, and music: Pythagoras revisited. The Mathematical Intelligencer, 43(1), 25–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00283-020-10025-x
- Chabay, R., & Sherwood, B. (2006). Restructuring the introductory electricity and magnetism course. American Journal of Physics, 74(4), 329–336.
- Chalkiadaki, A. (2018). A systematic literature review of 21st century skills and competencies in primary education. International Journal of Instruction, 11(3), 1–16.
- Chi, M. T. H., Feltovich, P. J., & Glaser, R. (1981). Categorization and representation of physics problems by experts and novices. Learning Research and Development Center.
- Chiriacescu, B., Chiriacescu, F.-S., Miron, C., & Barna, V. (2020). Whiteboard animation: A tool for teaching the special theory of relativity. AIP Conference Proceedings, 2218(1), 060006. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0001535
- Chu, G., Humer, I., & Eckhardt, C. (2019). Special relativity in immersive learning (*Proceedings*). Immersive Learning Research Network. Springer International Publishing.
- Clark, D. B., & Linn, M. C. (2013). The knowledge integration perspective: Connections across research and education. International Handbook of Research on Conceptual Change, 520–538.
- Clark, D. B., Nelson, B. C., Chang, H.-Y., Martinez-Garza, M., Slack, K., & D'Angelo, C. M. (2011). Exploring Newtonian mechanics in a conceptually-integrated digital game: Comparison of learning and affective outcomes for students in Taiwan and the United States. Computers & Education, 57(3), 2178–2195.
- Cohen, R., Eylon, B.-S., & Ganiel, M. (1983). Potential difference and current in simple electric circuits: A study of students' concepts. American Journal of Physics, 51, 407–412.
- Colin, P., & Viennot, L. (2001). Two models in optics: Anticipating teachers' reactions. In R. Pinto & S. Surinach (Eds.), Physics teacher education beyond 2000 (pp. 197–200). Elsevier.
- Cox, A. J., Belloni, M., Dancy, M., & Christian, W. (2003). Teaching thermodynamics with Physlets® in introductory physics. Physics Education, 38(5), 433.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? European Journal of Teacher Education, 40(3), 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399
- Dekkers, P., & Thijs, G. (1998). Making productive use of students' initial conceptions in developing the concept of force. Science Education, 82(1), 31–51.
- Doran, Y. J. (2017). The discourse of physics: Building knowledge through language, mathematics and image (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315181134.
- Dörner, D., & Funke, J. (2017). Complex problem solving: What it is and what it is not. Frontiers in Psychology, 8(1153). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01153
- Dounas-Frazer, D. R., & Lewandowski, H. J. (2018). The modelling framework for experimental physics: description, development, and applications. European Journal of Physics, 39(6), 064005. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361–6404/aae3ce
- Driver, R., & Millar, R. (1986). Energy matters: Proceedings of an invited conference: Teaching about energy within the secondary science curriculum. University of Leeds, Centre for Studies in Science and Mathematics Education.
- Duit, R. (2007). STCSE Bibliography: Students' and teachers' conceptions and science education. Kiel.
- Eisenkraft, A., Nordine, J., Chen, R. F., Fortus, D., Krajcik, J., Neumann, K., & Scheff, A. (2014). Introduction: Why focus on energy instruction? In R. F. Chen, A. Eisenkraft, D. Fortus, J. Krajcik, K. Neumann, J. Nordine, & A. Scheff (Eds.), Teaching and learning of energy in K 12 education (pp. 1–11). Springer.
- Emden, M., & Sumfleth, E. (2016). Assessing students' experimentation processes in guided inquiry. International Journal of Science & Mathematics Education, 14(1).
- Eylon, B.-S., & Ganiel, U. (1990). Macro-micro relationship: The missing link between electrostatics and electrodynamics in students' reasoning. International Journal of Science Education, 12(1), 79–94.
- Eylon, B.-S., Ronen, M., & Ganiel, U. (1996). Computer simulations as tools for teaching and learning: Using a simulation environment in optics. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 5(2), 93–110.
- Fauth, B., Decristan, J., Decker, A.-T., Büttner, G., Hardy, I., Klieme, E., & Kunter, M. (2019). The effects of teacher competence on student outcomes in elementary science education: The mediating role of teaching quality. Teaching and Teacher Education, 86, 102882. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102882
- Feyerabend, P. K. (2020). Philosophy and the physicists (1955). In M. Collodel & E. Oberheim (Eds.), Feyerabend's formative years. Volume 1. Feyerabend and popper: Correspondence and unpublished papers (pp. 475–485). Springer International Publishing.
- Feynman, R. P. (2011). The Feynman lectures on physics (New millennium ed. ed.). BasicBooks Perseus Running [distributor].
- 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(4), 309–349. www.jstor.org/stable/43156373
- Fischer, H. E., Labudde, P., Neumann, K., & Viiri, J. (2014). Theoretical framework. In H. E. Fischer, P. Labudde, K. Neumann, & J. Viiri (Eds.), Quality of instruction in physics comparing Finland, Germany and Switzerland (pp. 7–24). Waxmann.
- Fischler, H., & Lichtfeldt, M. (1992). Modern physics and students' conceptions. International Journal of Science Education, 14(2), 181–190.

- Fleischer, J., Buchwald, F., Leutner, D., Wirth, J., & Rumann, S. (2017). Analytical problem solving: Potentials and manifestations. In B. Csapó & J. Funke (Eds.), The nature of problem solving: Using research to inspire 21st century learning. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264273955-4-en
- Fortus, D., Krajcik, J. S., Reiser, B. J., & Sutherland, L. M. (2012). Why do some things stop while others keep going? Transformation and Conservation of Energy: Activate Learning.
- 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. v. Tartwijk, P. d. Brok, & J. Levy (Eds.), Interpersonal relationships in education (pp. 167–185). SensePublishers.
- Galileo, G. (1623). Il Saggiatore, https://www.liberliber.it/online/autori/autori-q/galileo-galilei/il-saggiatore/
- Galili, I. (2018). Physics and mathematics as interwoven disciplines in science education. Science & Education, 27(1), 7–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191–018–9958-y
- Gasser, L., Grütter, J., Buholzer, A., & Wettstein, A. (2018). Emotionally supportive classroom interactions and students' perceptions of their teachers as caring and just. Learning and Instruction, 54, 82–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.08.003
- Geller, C., Neumann, K., & Fischer, H. E. (2014). A deeper look inside teaching skripts: Learning process orientations in Finland, Germany and Switzerland. In H. E. Fischer, P. Labudde, K. Neumann, & J. Viiri (Eds.), Quality of instruction in physics: Comparing Finland, Germany and Switzerland (pp. 81–92). Waxmann.
- Goovaerts, L., De Cock, M., Struyven, K., & Dehaene, W. (2019). Developing a module to teach thermodynamics in an integrated way to 16 year old pupils. European Journal of STEM Education, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.20897/ejsteme/3964
- Greefrath, G., & Vorhölter, K. (2016). Teaching and learning mathematical modelling: approaches and developments from German speaking countries. In Teaching and learning mathematical modelling: Approaches and developments from german speaking countries (pp. 1–42). Springer International Publishing.
- Haagen-Schützenhöfer, C., & Hopf, M. (2020). Design-based research as a model for systematic curriculum development: The example of a curriculum for introductory optics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 16(2), 020152.
- Hadenfeldt, J. C., Neumann, K., Bernholt, S., Liu, X., & Parchmann, I. (2016). Students' progression in understanding the matter concept. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(5), 683–708. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21312
- Halloun, I. A., & Hestenes, D. (1987). Modeling instruction in mechanics. American Journal of Physics, 55(5), 455–462. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.15130
- Hammann, M., Hoi Phan, T. T., Ehmer, M., & Grimm, T. (2008). Assessing pupils' skill in experimentation. Journal of Biological Education, 42(2), 66–72.
- Hardiman, P. T., Dufresne, R., & Mestre, J. P. (1989). The relation between problem categorization and problem solving among experts and novices. Memory & cognition, 17(5), 627–638.
- Harrison, A. G., & Treagust, D. F. (2002). The particulate nature of matter: Challenges in understanding the submicroscopic world. In J. Gilbert, O. d. Jong, R. Justi, D. F. Treagust, & J. van Driel (Eds.), Chemical education: Towards research-based practice (pp. 189–212). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hart, C. (2008). Models in physics, models for physics learning, and why the distinction may matter in the case of electric circuits. Research in Science Education, 38(5), 529–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–007–9060-y
- Hartinger, A., & Griest, H. (2015). Perspektivrahmen Sachunterricht [Perspective framework for science at elementary school]. In J. Kahlert, M. Fölling-Albers, M. Götz, A. Hartinger, S. Miller, & S. Wittkowske (Eds.), Handbuch Didaktik des Sachunterrichts (pp. 257–263). Klinkhardt.
- Haryono, H. E., & Aini, K. N. (2021). Diagnosis misconceptions of junior high school in Lamongan on the heat concept using the three-tier test. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1806(1), 012002. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742–6596/1806/1/012002
- Hazelton, R. L. C. , Stetzer, M. R. , Heron, P. R. L. , & Shaffer, P. S. (2013). Investigating student ability to apply basic electrostatics concepts to conductors. AIP Conference Proceedings, 1513(1), 166–169. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4789678
- Heller, P., & Hollabaugh, M. (1992). Teaching problem solving through cooperative grouping. Part 2: Designing problems and structuring groups. American Journal of Physics, 60(7), 637–644.
- Heller, P., Keith, R., & Anderson, S. (1992). Teaching problem solving through cooperative grouping. Part 1: Group versus individual problem solving. American Journal of Physics, 60(7), 627–636.
- Hennessy, S., Twigger, D., Driver, R., O'Shea, T., O'Malley, C. E., Byard, M., Draper, S., Hartley, R., Mohamed, R., & Scanlon, E. (1995). A classroom intervention using a computer-augmented curriculum for mechanics. International Journal of Science Education, 17(2), 189–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/0950069950170204
- Henriksen, E. K., Angell, C., Vistnes, A. I., & Bungum, B. (2018). What is light? Science & Education, 27(1), 81–111.
- Henriksen, E. K., Bungum, B., Angell, C., Tellefsen, C. W., Frågåt, T., & Bøe, M. V. (2014). Relativity, quantum physics and philosophy in the upper secondary curriculum: Challenges, opportunities and proposed approaches. Physics Education, 49(6), 678–684. https://doi.org/10.1088/0031–9120/49/6/678
- Herrmann-Abell, C. F., & DeBoer, G. E. (2018). Investigating a learning progression for energy ideas from upper elementary through high school. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(1), 68–93. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21411
- Hestenes, D., Wells, M. and Swackhamer, G. (1995). Force Concept Inventory. Self publishes work.
- https://www.webassign.net/features/textbooks/fci/details.html
- Hewson, P. W. (1982). A case study of conceptual change in special relativity: The influence of prior knowledge in learning‡. European Journal of Science Education, 4(1), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/0140528820040108
- Ho, S. S., Leong, A. D., Looi, J., Chen, L., Pang, N., & Tandoc, E. (2019). Science literacy or value predisposition? A meta-analysis of factors predicting public perceptions of benefits, risks, and acceptance of nuclear energy. Environmental Communication, 13(4), 457–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2017.1394891
- Hofstein, A., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2007). The laboratory in science education: The state of the art. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 8(2), 105–107. https://doi.org/10.1039/B7RP90003A
- Hotulainen, R., Vinni-Laakso, J., & Kupiainen, S. (2020). Development of learning to learn competence across secondary education and its association with attainment in Finnish/Swedish high-stake exit exam. Thinking Skills and Creativity, 38, 100738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100738
- Hubber, P. (2006). Year 12 students' mental models of the nature of light. Research in Science Education, 36(4), 419–439. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–006–9013-x

- Hughes, T., & Kersting, M. (2021). The invisibility of time dilation. Physics Education, 56(2), 025011. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6552/abce02
- Huseby, A., & Bungum, B. (2019). Observation in quantum physics: challenges for upper secondary physics students in discussing electrons as waves. Physics Education, 54(6), 065002.
- Ince, E. (2018). An overview of problem solving studies in physics education. Journal of Education and Learning, 7, 191. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v7n4p191
- Irawati, R. K., & Sofianto, E. W. N. (2019). The misconception analysis of natural science students on heat and temperature material using four tier test. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1321, 032104. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742–6596/1321/3/032104
- Ireson, G. (1999). A multivariate analysis of undergraduate physics students' conceptions of quantum phenomena. European Journal of Physics, 20(3), 193.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2018). Cooperative learning: The foundation for active learning. In S. M. Brito (Ed.), Active learning beyond the future (pp. 61–70): IntechOpen.
- Junglas, P. (2006). Simulation programs for teaching thermodynamics. Global Journal of Engineering Education, 10(2), 175–180.
- Kamphorst, F., Vollebregt, M. J., Savelsbergh, E. R., & van Joolingen, W. R. (2019). Students' preinstructional reasoning with the speed of light in relativistic situations. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 15(2), 020123. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.15.020123
- Kane, S. A., & Gelman, B. A. r. e. (2020). Introduction to physics in modern medicine (3rd ed.). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kaur, T., Blair, D., Stannard, W., Treagust, D., Venville, G., Zadnik, M., Mathews, W., & Perks, D. (2020). Determining the intelligibility of einsteinian concepts with middle school students. Research in Science Education, 50(6), 2505–2532. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–018–9791-y
- Klahr, D. (2000). Scientific discovery as problem solving. In D. Klahr, K. Dunbar, A. L. Fay, D. Penner, C. D. Schunn, & H. A. Simon (Eds.), Exploring science: The cognition and development of discovery processes (pp. 21–40). The MIT Press.
- Klahr, D., & Dunbar, K. (1988). Dual space search during scientific reasoning. Cognitive Science, 12, 1-48.
- Kloser, M. (2013). A place for the nature of biology in biology education. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 16(1), 1–21.
- Kohlmyer, M. A., Caballero, M. D., Catrambone, R., Chabay, R. W., Ding, L., Haugan, M. P., Jackson Marr, M., Sherwood, B. A., & Schatz, M. F. (2009). Tale of two curricula: The performance of 2000 students in introductory electromagnetism. Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research, 5(2), 020105.
- Köller, O., & Parchmann. (2012). Competencies: The German notation of learning outcomes. In S. Bernholt, K. Neumann, & P. Nentwig (Eds.), Making it tangible. Learning outcomes in science education (pp. 151–172). Waxmann.
- Koponen, I. T. (2007). Models and modelling in physics education: A critical re-analysis of philosophical underpinnings and suggestions for revisions. Science & Education, 16(7), 751–773. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-006-9000-7
- Krajcik, J. S., Chen, R. F., Eisenkraft, A., Fortus, D., Neumann, K., Nordine, J., & Scheff, A. (2014). Conclusion and summary comments: teaching energy and associated research efforts. In R. F. Chen, A. Eisenkraft, D. Fortus, J. Krajcik, K. Neumann, J. Nordine, & A. Scheff (Eds.), Teaching and learning of energy in K 12 education (pp. 357–363). Springer.
- Krijtenburg-Lewerissa, K., Pol, H. J., Brinkman, A., & Van Joolingen, W. R. (2017). Insights into teaching quantum mechanics in secondary and lower undergraduate education. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 13(1), 010109.
- 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(3), 257–289.
- Larkin, J. H., & Reif, F. (1979). Understanding and teaching problem-solving in physics. European Journal of Science Education, 1(2), 191–203.
- Laws, P. W., Willis, M. C., Jackson, D. P., Koenig, K., & Teese, R. (2015). Using research-based interactive video vignettes to enhance out-of-class learning in introductory physics. The Physics Teacher, 53(2), 114–117. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.4905816 Le Deist, F. D., & Winterton, J. (2005). What is competence? Human Resource Development International, 8(1), 27–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/1367886042000338227
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20382
- Lehavi, Y., Mualem, R., Bagno, E., Eylon, B.-S., & Pospiech, G. (2019). Taking the phys-math interplay from research into practice. In G. Pospiech, M. Michelini, & B.-S. Eylon (Eds.), Mathematics in physics education (pp. 335–353). Springer International Publishing.
- Leonard, M. J., Hannahoe, R. M., Nollmeyer, G. E., & Shaw, J. A. (2013). Teaching and learning geometric optics in middle school through the turning eyes to the big sky project. Optical Engineering, 52(6), 069001.
- Leonard, W. J., Dufresne, R. J., & Mestre, J. P. (1996). Using qualitative problem-solving strategies to highlight the role of conceptual knowledge in solving problems. American Journal of Physics, 64(12), 1495–1503.
- Leutner, D., Fleischer, J., Grünkorn, J., & Klieme, E. (2017). Competence assessment in education: An introduction. In D. Leutner, J. Fleischer, J. Grünkorn, & E. Klieme (Eds.), Competence assessment in education: research, models and instruments (pp. 1–6). Springer International Publishing.
- Lewis, E. L., Stern, J. L., & Linn, M. C. (1993). The effect of computer simulations on introductory thermodynamics understanding. Educational Technology, 45–58.
- Linn, M. C., & Songer, N. B. (1991). Teaching thermodynamics to middle school students: What are appropriate cognitive demands? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28(10), 885–918.
- Lipowsky, F., Rakoczy, K., Pauli, C., Drollinger-Vetter, B., Klieme, E., & Reusser, K. (2009). Quality of geometry instruction and its short-term impact on students' understanding of the Pythagorean theorem. Learning and Instruction, 19(6), 527–537. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.11.001
- Liritzis, I., Laskaris, N., Vafiadou, A., Karapanagiotis, I., Volonaki, P., & Papageorgopoulou, C. (2020). Archeometry: an overview. Scientific Culture, 6, 49.
- Liu, X. , & Lesniak, K. M. (2005). Students' progression of understanding the matter concept from elementary to high school. Science Education, 89(3), 433-450. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20056
- Liu, Y. (2011). Development of instructional courseware in thermodynamics education. Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 19(1), 115–124. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.20297

- McDermott, L. C., & Shaffer, P. S. (1992). Research as a guide for curriculum development: An example from introductory electricity. Part I: Investigation of student understanding. American Journal of Physics, 60(11), 994–1003.
- McLure, F., Won, M., & Treagust, D. F. (2020). Teaching thermal physics to year 9 students: the thinking frames approach. Physics Education, 55(3), 035007. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361–6552/ab6c3c
- Méheut, M. (2004). Designing and validating two teaching-learning sequences about particle models. International Journal of Science Education, 26(5), 605–618.
- Mešić, V., Hajder, E., Neumann, K., & Erceg, N. (2016). Comparing different approaches to visualizing light waves: An experimental study on teaching wave optics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(1), 010135.
- Mešić, V., Neumann, K., Aviani, I., Hasović, E., Boone, W. J., Erceg, N., Grubelnik, V., Sušac, A., Glamočić, S., Karuza, M., Vidak, A., Alihodžić, A., & Repnik, R. (2019). Measuring students' conceptual understanding of wave optics: A Rasch modeling approach. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 15(1), 010115. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.15.010115
- Metioui, A., Brassard, C., Levasseur, J., & Lavoie, M. (1996). The persistence of students' unfounded beliefs about electrical circuits: The case of Ohm's law. International Journal of Science Education, 18(2), 193–212.
- Mikelskis-Seifert, S., Ringelband, U., & Brückmann, M. (2008). Four decades of research in science education from curriculum development to quality improvement. Waxmann.
- Millar, R. (2014). Towards a research-informed teaching sequence for energy. In R. F. Chen , A. Eisenkraft , D. Fortus , J. Krajcik , K. Neumann , J. Nordine , & A. Scheff (Eds.), Teaching and learning of energy in K-12 education (pp. 187–206). Springer International Publishing.
- Mills, R., Bourke, T., & Siostrom, E. (2020). Complexity and contradiction: Disciplinary expert teachers in primary science and mathematics education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 89, 103010. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103010
- Müller, R., & Wiesner, H. (1999, March). Students'conceptions of quantum physics. Papers presented at the Annual Meeting National Association for Research in Science Teaching, (p. 20).
- Müller, R., & Wiesner, H. (2002). Teaching quantum mechanics on an introductory level. American Journal of Physics, 70(3), 200–209.
- Mullis, I. V. S., & Martin, M. O. (Eds.). (2017). TIMSS 2019 assessment frameworks. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. Herengracht 487, Amsterdam, 1017 BT, The Netherlands.
- Mulop, N., Yusof, K., & Tasir, Z. (2014). The improvement of confidence level of students learning thermodynamics through a multimedia courseware. In 2014 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON) (pp. 733–738). https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON.2014.6826175
- Mustofa, Z., Sutopo, S., Mufti, N., & Asmichatin, A. (2019). The impact of modeling instruction based on system toward work-energy concept understanding. Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pendidikan Fisika, 5(2). https://doi.org/10.21009/1.05209
- Nawrath, D., Maiseyenka, V., & Schecker, H. (2011). Experimentelle kompetenz ein modell für die unterrichtspraxis [experimental competence: A model for teaching practice]. Praxis der Naturwissenschaften Physik in der Schule, 60(6), 42–48.
- Neumann, I. , Fulmer, G. W. , & Liang, L. L. (2013). Analyzing the FCI based on a force and motion learning progression. Science Education Review Letters, 8–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.18452/8208
- Neumann, K. (2020). Primary, secondary and university pre-service physics teacher education: What scientific education is relevant for becoming a physics teacher in a technological world? In J. Guisasola & K. Zuza (Eds.), Research and innovation in physics education: Two sides of the same coin (pp. 53–61). Springer International Publishing.
- Neumann, K., Fischer, H. E., & Kauertz, A. (2010). From PISA to educational standards: The impact of large-scale assessments on science education in Germany. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 8(3), 545–563.
- Neumann, K., Härtig, H., Harms, U., & Parchmann, I. (2017). Science teacher preparation in Germany. In J. Pedersen, T. Isozaki, & T. Hirano (Eds.), Model science teacher preparation programs: An international comparison of what works best (pp. 29–52). Information Age Publishing.
- Neumann, K., Kind, V., & Harms, U. (2019). Probing the amalgam: the relationship between science teachers' content, pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 41(7), 847–861. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1497217
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21061
- Ngo, C. C., & Lai, F. C. (2003). An online thermodynamics courseware. Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 11(2), 75–82. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.10039
- Nie, Y., Xiao, Y., Fritchman, J. C., Liu, Q., Han, J., Xiong, J., & Bao, L. (2019). Teaching towards knowledge integration in learning force and motion. International Journal of Science Education, 41(16), 2271–2295. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1672905
- Nielsen, S. S., & Nielsen, J. A. (2021). A competence-oriented approach to models and modelling in lower secondary science education: Practices and rationales among Danish teachers. Research in Science Education, 51(S2), 565–593. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-09900-1
- Niss, M. (2010). Modeling a crucial aspect of students' mathematical modeling. In R. Lesh, P. L. Galbraith, C. R. Haines, & A. Hurford (Eds.), Modeling students' mathematical modeling competencies: ICTMA 13 (pp. 43–59). Springer.
- Nordine, J., Fortus, D., Lehavi, Y., Neumann, K., & Krajcik, J. (2018). Modelling energy transfers between systems to support energy knowledge in use. Studies in Science Education, 54(2), 177–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2018.1598048
- Nordine, J. C., Krajcik, J., & Fortus, D. (2011). Transforming energy instruction in middle school to support integrated understanding and future learning: Transforming energy instruction in middle school. Science Education, 95(4), 670–699. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20423
- NRC (N. R. C.) (2000). Inquiry and the national science education standards. A guide for teaching and learning (0-309-06476-7). National Academic Press.
- NRC (N. R. C.) (2008). Ready, set, science! Putting research to work in K-8 science classrooms. National Academies Press.
- NRC (N. R. C.) (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. The National Academies Press.
- NSF (N. S. F.) (1996). Shaping the future: New expectations for undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology. National Science Foundation [NSF]

- Nussbaum, J. (1985). The particulare nature of matter in the gaseous phase. In R. Driver, E. Guesne, & A. Tiberghien (Eds.), Children's ideas in science (pp. 125–144). Open University Press.
- OECD (O. f. E. C.-o. a. D.) (2001). Knowledge and Skills for Life (978-92-64-19671-1 978-92-64-19590-5).
- Opitz, S. T., Neumann, K., Bernholt, S., & Harms, U. (2019). Students' energy understanding across biology, chemistry, and physics contexts. Research in Science Education, 49(2), 521–541. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9632-4
- Osborne, J., Henderson, B., Macpherson, A., & Yao, S.-Y. (2016). The development and validation of a learning progression for argumentation in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21316
- Oser, F., & Baeriswyl, F. J. (2001). Choreographies of teaching: Bridging instruction to learning. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook on research on teaching (4th ed., pp. 1031–1065). American Educational Research Association (AERA).
- Ott, N., Brünken, R., Vogel, M., & Malone, S. (2018). Multiple symbolic representations: The combination of formula and text supports problem solving in the mathematical field of propositional logic. Learning and Instruction, 58, 88–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.04.010
- Papadouris, N., & Constantinou, C. P. (2011). A philosophically informed teaching proposal on the topic of energy for students aged 11–14. Science & Education, 20(10), 961–979.
- Perales, F. J., & Nievas, F. (1995). Teaching geometric optics: Research, results and educational implications. Research in Science & Technological Education, 13(2), 187–203.
- Petri, J., & Niedderer, H. (1998). A learning pathway in high-school level quantum physics. International Journal of Science Education, 20(9), 1075–1088.
- Pietrocola, M. (2008). Mathematics as structural language of physical thought. Connecting Research in Physics Education with Teacher Education, 2.
- 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.
- Pospiech, G. (2019). Framework of mathematization in physics from a teaching perspective. In G. Pospiech, M. Michelini, & B.-S. Eylon (Eds.), Mathematics in physics education (pp. 1–33). Switzerland: Springer.
- Pospiech, G., & Fischer, H. E. (2021). Physical: Mathematical modelling and its role in learning physics. In H. E. Fischer & R. Girwidz (Eds.), Physics education (pp. 200–229). Springer Nature.
- Poutot, G., & Blandin, B. (2015). Exploration of students' misconceptions in mechanics using the FCI. American Journal of Educational Research, 3(2), 116–120.
- Rainson, S., & Viennot, L. (1997). Superposition of electric fields and causality: From research to teaching.
- Ramseger, J., & Romain, G. (2017). An overview of the equalprime project, its history and research design. In M. W. Hackling, J. Ramseger, & H.-L. S. Chen (Eds.), Quality teaching in primary science education: cross-cultural perspectives (pp. 3–18). Springer International Publishing.
- Rebello, N. S., Cui, L., Bennett, A. G., Zollman, D. A., & Ozimek, D. J. (2007). Transfer of learning in problem solving in the context of mathematics & physics. In D. Jonassen (Ed.), Learning to solve complex scientific problems. Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Reddy, M. V. B., & Panacharoensawad, B. (2017). Students problem-solving difficulties and implications in physics: An empirical study on influencing factors. Journal of Education and Practice, 8, 59–62.
- 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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Roseman, J. E., Herrmann-Abell, C. F., & Koppal, M. (2017). Designing for the next generation science standards: educative curriculum materials and measures of teacher knowledge. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(1), 111–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2016.1277598
- Roth, K. J., Druker, S. L., 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). U.S. Government Printing Office. https://nces.ed.gov/
- Russ, R. S., & Odden, T. O. B. (2017). Intertwining evidence- and model-based reasoning in physics sensemaking: An example from electrostatics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 13(2), 020105.
- https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.13.020105
- Schleicher, A. (2010). Assessing literacy across a changing world. Science, 328(5977), 433-434.
- https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1183092
- Schmidt, W. H., Wang, H. C., & McKnight, C. C. (2005). Curriculum coherence: An examination of US mathematics and science content standards from an international perspective. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 37(5), 525–559. https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027042000294682
- Schmidt-Weigand, F., Hänze, M., & Wodzinski, R. (2009). Complex problem solving and worked examples. Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie, 23(2), 129–138. https://doi.org/10.1024/1010–0652.23.2.129
- Schwarz, C. V., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Kenyon, L., Achér, A., Fortus, D., Shwartz, Y., 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(6), 632–654.
- Schwichow, M., Osterhaus, C., & Edelsbrunner, P. A. (2020). The relation between the control-of-variables strategy and content knowledge in physics in secondary school. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 63, 101923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101923
- Scotti di Uccio, U., Colantonio, A., Galano, S., Marzoli, I., Trani, F., & Testa, I. (2020). Development of a construct map to describe students' reasoning about introductory quantum mechanics. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 16(1), 010144. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.16.010144
- Seidel, T., & Shavelson, R. J. (2007). Teaching effectiveness research in the past decade: The role of theory and research design in disentangling meta-analysis results. Review of Educational Research, 77(4), 454–499. doi:10.3102/0034654307310317
- Shaffer, P. S., & McDermott, L. C. (1992). Research as a guide for curriculum development: An example from introductory electricity. Part II: Design of instructional strategies. American Journal of Physics, 60(11), 1003–1013.
- Sin, C. (2014). Epistemology, sociology, and learning and teaching in physics. Science Education, 98(2), 342–365. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21100

- Sinatra, G. M., & Taasoobshirazi, G. (2018). The self-regulation of learning and conceptual change in science: Research, theory, and educational applications. In D. H. Schunk & J. A. Greene (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance (pp. 153–165). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Smith, N., & Owocki, S. P. (2006). On the role of continuum-driven eruptions in the evolution of very massive stars and population III stars. The Astrophysical Journal, 645(1), L45.
- Spatz, V., Hopf, M., Wilhelm, T., Waltner, C., & Wiesner, H. (2020). Introduction to Newtonian mechanics via two-dimensional dynamics: The effects of a newly developed content structure on German middle school students. European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 8(2), 76–91. https://doi.org/10.30935/scimath/9548
- Spitzer, W., & Fraser, J. (2020). Advancing community science literacy. Journal of Museum Education, 45(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2020.1720403
- Stavy, R. (1989). Students' conceptions of matter. In P. Adey (Ed.), Adolescent development and school science (pp. 273–282). Falmer Press.
- Stefanel, A., Michelini, M., & Santi, L. (2014). Upper secondary students face optic diffraction using simple experiments and on-line measurements. Frontiers of Fundamental Physics 14 (FFP14), 240.
- Stocklmayer, S., & Treagust, D. (1996). Images of electricity: How do novices and experts model electric current? International Journal of Science Education, 18(2), 163–178.
- Stringher, C., Brito Rivera, H. A., Patera, S., Silva Silva, I., Castro Zubizarreta, A., Davis Leme, C., Torti, D., del Carmen Huerta, M., & Scrocca, F. (2021). Learning to learn and assessment: Complementary concepts or different worlds? Educational Research, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2021.1871576
- Sund, P., & Gericke, N. (2020). Teaching contributions from secondary school subject areas to education for sustainable development: A comparative study of science, social science and language teachers. Environmental Education Research, 26(6), 772–794. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1754341
- Taasoobshirazi, G., & Carr, M. (2008). A review and critique of context-based physics instruction and assessment. Educational Research Review, 3(2), 155–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2008.01.002
- Teig, N., Scherer, R., & Nilsen, T. (2019). I know I can, but do I have the time? The role of teachers' self-efficacy and perceived time constraints in implementing cognitive-activation strategies in science. Frontiers in Psychology, 10(1697). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01697
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690902874894
- Trout, J. J., & Jacobsen, T. (2019). 'The science of ice cream,' an undergraduate, interdisciplinary, general education course taught in the physics program. Physics Education, 55(1), 015009. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6552/ab51ef
- Ufer, S., & Bochnik, K. (2020). The role of general and subject-specific language skills when learning mathematics in elementary school. Journal für Mathematik-Didaktik, 41(1), 81–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13138-020-00160-5
- Uhden, O., Karam, R., Pietrocola, M., & Pospiech, G. (2012). Modelling mathematical reasoning in physics education. Science & Education, 21(4), 485–506.
- UNESCO . (2012). International standard classification of education, ISCED 2011. UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- Uwamahoro, J., Ndihokubwayo, K., Ralph, M., & Ndayambaje, I. (2021). Physics students' conceptual understanding of geometric optics: Revisited analysis. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 1–13.
- van Leeuwen, A., & Janssen, J. (2019). A systematic review of teacher guidance during collaborative learning in primary and secondary education. Educational Research Review, 27, 71–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.02.001
- van Roon, P. H., van Sprang, H. F., Verdonk, A. H. (1994). 'Work' and 'heat': On the road towards thermodynamics. International Journal of Science Education, 16(2), 131–144.
- Velentzas, A., & Halkia, K. (2013). The use of thought experiments in teaching physics to upper secondary-level students: Two examples from the theory of relativity. International Journal of Science Education, 35(18), 3026–3049.
- Viennot, L., & Rainson, S. (1992). Students' reasoning about the superposition of electric fields. International Journal of Science Education, 14(4), 475–487.
- Villani, A., & Arruda, S. M. (1998). Special theory of relativity, conceptual change and history of science. Science & Education, 7(1), 85–100. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008609018266
- Vogt, A., Klepsch, M., Baetge, I., & Seufert, T. (2020). Learning from multiple representations: prior knowledge moderates the beneficial effects of signals and abstract graphics. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 601125. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.601125 Vosniadou, S. (2008). International handbook of research on conceptual change. Routledge.
- Vu, N. V., & Barrows, H. S. (1994). Use of standardized patients in clinical assessments: recent developments and measurement findings. Educational Researcher, 23, 23–30.
- Wackermann, R., Trendel, G., & Fischer, H. E. (2010). Evaluation of a theory of instructional sequences for physics instruction. International Journal of Science Education, 32(7), 963–985. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690902984792
- International Journal of Science Education, 32(7), 963–985. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690902984792 Waddington, D., Nentwig, P., & Schanze, S. (2007). Making it comparable. Standards in science education 1664. Waxmann.
- Wallace, D. (2020). Fundamental and emergent geometry in Newtonian physics. The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 71, 1–32.
- Weaver, J. P., Chastain, R. J., DeCaro, D. A., & DeCaro, M. S. (2018). Reverse the routine: Problem solving before instruction improves conceptual knowledge in undergraduate physics. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 52, 36–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.12.003
- Wentzel, K. R., Muenks, K., McNeish, D., & Russell, S. (2018). Emotional support, social goals, and classroom behavior: A multilevel, multisite study. Journal of Educational Psychology, 110(5), 611–627. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000239
- White Brahmia, S. (2019). Quantification and its importance to modeling in introductory physics. European Journal of Physics, 40(4), 044001. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6404/ab1a5a
- Wieman, C., & Perkins, K. (2005). Transforming physics education. Physics Today, 58(11), 36-41.
- Williams, M. (2018). The missing curriculum in physics problem-solving education. Science & Education, 27(3), 299–319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-9970-2
- Wosilait, K., Heron, P. R., Shaffer, P. S., & McDermott, L. C. (1998). Development and assessment of a research-based tutorial on light and shadow. American Journal of Physics, 66(10), 906–913.

Zhu, G., & Singh, C. (2012). Improving students' understanding of quantum measurement. I. Investigation of difficulties. Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research, 8(1), 010117.

Zuza, K., De Cock, M., van Kampen, P., Kelly, T., & Guisasola, J. (2020). Guiding students towards an understanding of the electromotive force concept in electromagnetic phenomena through a teaching-learning sequence. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 16(2), 020110. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.16.020110

Chemistry Education Research

Abdinejad, M. , Talaie, B. , Qorbani, H. S. , & Dalili, S. (2021). Student perceptions using augmented reality and 3d visualization technologies in chemistry education. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30, 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09880-2

Albright, H., Stephenson, C. R. J., & Schindler, C. S. (2021). Converting a two-week chemistry course for high school students to a virtual format during COVID. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(7), 2457–2464.

An, J., Poly, L-P and Holme, T. A. (2020). Usability testing and the development of an augmented reality application for laboratory learning. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(1), 97–105.

Ali, N., & Ullah, S. (2020). Review to analyze and compare virtual chemistry laboratories for their use in education. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(10), 3563–3574.

Angel, A., & Salgado, M. (2018). Land Art Math: Una actividad STEAM para fomentar la competencia matemática en Educación Infantil. Edma 0-6: Educación Matemática en la Infancia, 7(1), 1–11.

Anisimova, T. I., Sabirova, F. M., & Shatunova, O. V. (2020). Formation of design and research competencies in future teachers in the framework of STEAM education. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 15(2), 204–217 https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i02.11537.

Arksey H, & O'Malley L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory & Practice, 8:19–32.

Astuti, T. N., Sugiyarto, K. H., & Ikhsan, J. (2020). Effect of 3D visualization on students' critical thinking skills and scientific attitude in chemistry. International Journal of Instruction, 13(1) 151–164.

Aw, J. K., Boellaard, K. C., Tan, T. K., Yap, J., Loh, Y. P., Colasson, B., Blanc, E., Lam, Y., & Fung, F. M. (2020). Interacting with three-dimensional molecular structures using an augmented reality mobile app. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(10), 3877–3881. Aydeniz, M. (2019). Teaching and learning chemistry through argumentation. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 11–31). Royal Society of Chemistry.

Aydin-Günbatar, S. (2020). Making homemade indicator and strips: A STEM + activity for acid-base chemistry with entrepreneurship applications. Science Activities: Projects and Curriculum Ideas in STEM Classrooms, 57(3), 132–141.

Aydin-Gunbatar, S., Ekiz-Kiran, B., & Oztay, E. S. (2020). Pre-service chemistry teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for integrated STEM development with LESMeR model. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 21(4), 1063–1082.

Azuma, R. T. (1997). A survey of augmented reality. Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments, 6(4), 355–385.

Babak, S. (2020). Creating augmented reality USDZ files to visualize 3D objects on student phones in the classroom. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(1), 253–257.

Bancroft, S. F., Fowler, S. R., Jalaeian, M., Patterson, K. (2020). Leveling the field: Flipped instruction as a tool for promoting equity in general chemistry. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(1), 36–47.

Bain, K., & Towns, M. H. (2016). A review of research on the teaching and learning of chemical kinetics. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 17, 246–262.

Barry, C. (2020). Trust in science and Covid-19. John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. https://publichealth.ihu.edu/2020/trust-in-science-and-covid-19

Bat-Shahar, D., Bronwyn, T., Kate, P., & Anat, Y. (2019). Teachers personalize videos and animations of biochemical processes: Results from a professional development workshop. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 20(4), 772–786.

Bennie, S. J., Ranaghan, K. E., Deeks, H., Goldsmith, H. E., O'Connor, M. B., Mulholland, A. J., Glowacki, D. R. (2019). Teaching enzyme catalysis using interactive molecular dynamics in virtual reality. Journal of Chemical Education, 96, 2488–2496.

Blonder, R., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2016). Learning about teaching the extracurricular topic of nanotechnology as a vehicle for achieving a sustainable change in science education. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 14(3), 345–372. Bodner G. M. (2005). Research in chemical education as a career path: Past and future. Paper presented at the Gordon Research Conference on Chemistry Education Research and Practice. New London, CT, USA.

Brannon, J. P., Ramirez, I., Williams, D., Barding, G. A., Jr., Liu, Y., McCulloch, K. M., Chandrasekaran, P., & Stieber, S. C. E. (2020). Teaching crystallography by determining small molecule structures and 3-D printing: An inorganic chemistry laboratory module. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(8), 2273–2279.

Broyer, R. M., Miller, K., Ramachandran, S., Fu, S., Howell, K., & Cutchin, S. (2021). Using virtual reality to demonstrate glove hygiene in introductory chemistry laboratories, Journal of Chemical Education, 98(1), 224–229.

Burchett, S., Hayes, J., Pfaff, A., Satterfield, E. T., Skyles, A., & Woelk, K. (2016). Piloting blended strategies to resolve laboratory capacity issues in a first-semester general chemistry course. Journal of Chemical Education, 93(7), 1217–1222.

Burnard, P., & Colucci-Gray, L. (2019). Why science and art creativities matter (re-)configuring STEAM for future-making education. Brill/sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004421585

Calik, M., Özsevgeç, T., Ebenezer, J., Artun, H., & Küçük, Z. (2014). Effects of "environmental chemistry" elective course via technology-embedded scientific inquiry model on some variables. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 23(3), 412–430. Caprile, M., Palmen, R., Sanz, & Dente, G. (2015). Encouraging STEM studies for the labour market. Directorate-General for Internal Policies: European Parliament.

Carpendale, J., Delaney, S., & Rochette, E. (2020). Modeling meaningful chemistry teacher education online: Reflections from chemistry preservice teacher educators in Australia. Journal of Chemical Education, 97, 2534–2543.

Caspari, I., Kranz, D., & Graulich, N. (2018). Resolving the complexity of organic chemistry students' reasoning through the lens of a mechanistic framework. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 19(4), 1117–1141.

- Cen, L., Ruta, D., Al Qassem, L. M. M. S., & Jason, Ng. (2020). Augmented immersive reality (air) for improved learning performance: A quantitative evaluation, IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 13(2), 283–296.
- Cengiz T. (2010). The effect of the virtual laboratory on students' achievement and attitude in chemistry. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2(1):37–53.
- Cetin-Dindar, A., Boz, Y., Yildiran Sonmez, D., & Demirci Celep, N. (2018). Development of pre-service chemistry teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 19, 167–183.
- Chamizo, J. A. (2013). A new definition of models and modeling in chemistry's teaching. Science & Education, 22(7), 1613–1632.
- Clemmons, T. D., Fouché, L., Rummey, C., Lopez, R. E., & Spagnoli, D. (2019). Introducing the first year laboratory to undergraduate chemistry students with an interactive 360° experience. Journal of Chemical Education, 96(7), 1491–1496.
- Colucci-Gray, L. (2019). Developing an ecological view through STEAM pedagogies in science education. In P. Burnard & L. Colucci-Gray (Eds.), Why science and art creativities matter. Configuring STEAM for future-making education (pp. 1–19). Brill/Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004421585 008.
- Conradty, C., & Bogner, F. X. (2020). STEAM teaching professional development works: Effects on students' creativity and motivation. Smart Learning Environments, 7, 1–20 https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-020-00132-9.
- Cooper, M. M. (2020). The crosscutting concepts: critical component or "third wheel" of three-dimensional learning? Journal of Chemical Education, 97(4), 903–909.
- Cooper, M. M., & Stowe, R. L. (2018). Chemistry education research from personal empiricism to evidence, theory and informed practice. Chemical Reviews, 118, 6053–6087.
- Christian, J., & Talanquer, V. (2012). Content-Related Interactions in Self-initiated Study Groups. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 2231–2255.
- Christodolou, A., & Grace, M. (2019). Argumentation within Societal Contexts in Chemistry Education. In, S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in Chemistry Education: Research, Policy and Practice (pp. 197–222). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Cigdemoglu, C., Arslan, H. O., & Cam, A. (2017). Argumentation to foster pre-service science teachers' knowledge, competency and attitude on the domains of chemical literacy of acids and bases. Chemical Education Research and Practice, 18, 288–303.
- Clark, D. B., Stegmann, K., Weinberger, A., Menekse, M., & Erkens, G. (2007). Technology-enhanced learning environments to support students' argumentation. In S. Erduran & M. P. Jiménez-Aleixandre (Eds.), Argumentation in science education: Perspectives from classroom-based research (pp. 217–244). Springer.
- Cohen, R., & Kelly, A. M. (2019). Community college chemistry coursetaking and STEM academic persistence. Journal of Chemical Education, 96(1), 3–11.
- Constable, D. J. C., Jimenez-Gonzalezz, C., & Matlin, S. A. (2019). Navigating complexity using systems thinking in chemistry, with implications for chemistry education. Journal of Chemical Education, 96(12), 2689–2699.
- Crandell, O. M., Lockhart, M. A., & Cooper, M. M. (2020). Arrows on the page are not a good gauge: evidence for the importance of causal mechanistic explanations about nucleophilic substitution in organic chemistry. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(2), 313–327.
- Crowe, C. D., Hendrickson-Stives, A. K., Kuhn, S. L., Jackson, J. B., & Keating, C. D. (2021). Designing and 3D printing an improved method of measuring contact angle in the middle school classroom. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(6), 1997–2004.
- Crujeiras-Perez, B., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2019). Interdisciplinarity and argumentation in chemistry education. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 32–61). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Cullinane, A., & O'Dwyer, A. (2019). Lesson resources and teaching strategies on argumentation for secondary chemistry education. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 62–78). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Dalyot, K., Sharon, A. J., Orr, D., Ben-David, Y. B., & Baram-Tsabari, A. (2019). Public Engagement with Science in Everyday Life: Perceptions of Wi-Fi Radiation Risks in Schools. Research in Science Education, 51(3), 1035–1054. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-09894-w
- Dai, R., Laureanti, J. A., Kopelevich, M., & Diaconescu, P. L. (2020). Developing a virtual reality approach toward a better understanding of coordination chemistry and molecular orbitals. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(10), 3647–3651.
- DeKorver, B., Chaney, A., & Herrington, D. (2020). Strategies for teaching chemistry online: a content analysis of a chemistry instruction online learning community during the time of COVID-19. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(9), 2825–2833.
- Deng, J. M., & Flynn, A. B. (2021). Reasoning, granularity, and comparisons in students' arguments on two organic chemistry items. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 22(3), 749–771.
- De la Garza, A. (2019). Internationalizing the curriculum for STEAM (STEM + Arts and Humanities): From intercultural competence to cultural humility. Journal of Studies in International Education, 25(2), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319888468.
- Dinh, D. H., & Nguyen, Q. L. (2020). The involvement of gender in STEM training for teachers. European Journal of Educational Research, 9(1), 363–373.
- Dunlop, L., Hodgson, A., & Stubbs, J. E. (2020). Building capabilities in chemistry education: Happiness and discomfort through philosophical dialogue in chemistry. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 21(1), 438–451.
- Dunnagan, C. L., & Gallardo-Williams, M. T. (2020). Overcoming physical separation during COVID-19 using virtual reality in organic chemistry laboratories. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(9), 3060–3063.
- Dunnagan, C. L., Dannenberg, D. A., Cuales, M. P., Earnest, A. D., Gurnsey, R. M., & Gallardo-Williams, M. T. (2020). Production and evaluation of a realistic immersive virtual reality organic chemistry laboratory experience: infrared spectroscopy. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(1), 258–262.
- Elford, D., Lancaster, S. J., & Jones, G. A. (2021). Stereoisomers, not stereo enigmas: A stereochemistry escape activity incorporating augmented and immersive virtual reality. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(5), 1691–1704.
- Eichengreen, B., Aksoy, C. G., & Saka, O. (2021). Revenge of the experts: Will Covid-19 renew or diminish public trust in science? Journal of Public Economics, 193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104343.
- Enneking, K. M., Breitenstein, G. R., Coleman, A. F., Reeves, J. H., Wang, Y., & Grove, N. P. (2019). The evaluation of a hybrid, general chemistry laboratory curriculum: Impact on students' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning. Journal of Chemical Education, 96(6), 1058–1067.
- Erduran, S. (2001). Philosophy of chemistry: An emerging field with implications for chemical education. Science & Education, 10, 581–593
- Erduran, S. (2005). Applying the philosophical concept of reduction to the chemistry of water: Implications for chemical education. Science & Education, 14(2), 161–171.

- Erduran, S. (2007). Breaking the law: Promoting domain-specificity in science education in the context of arguing about the Periodic Law in chemistry. Foundations of Chemistry, 9(3), 247–263.
- Erduran, S. (2009). Beyond philosophical confusion: establishing the role of philosophy of chemistry in chemical education research. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 8(10), 5–14.
- Erduran, S. (2013). Editorial: Philosophy, chemistry and education: An introduction. Science & Education, 22, 1559.
- Erduran, S. (2018). Toulmin's argument pattern as a "horizon of possibilities" in the study of argumentation in science education.
- Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13(4), pp. 1091–1099. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-017-9847-8.
- Erduran, S. (2019). Argumentation in chemistry education: An overview. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 1–9). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Erduran, S., Aduriz-Bravo, A., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2007). Developing epistemologically empowered teachers: examining the role of philosophy of chemistry in teacher education. Science & Education, 16(9–10), 975–989.
- Erduran, S., & Dagher, Z. (2014). Reconceptualizing the nature of science for science education: Scientific knowledge, practices and other family categories. Springer.
- Erduran, S., & Duschl, R. (2004). Interdisciplinary characterizations of models and the nature of chemical knowledge in the classroom. Studies in Science Education, 40, 111–144.
- Erduran, S., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (Eds.) (2007). Argumentation in science education: perspectives from classroom-based research. Springer.
- Erduran, S., & Kaya, E. (2019). Epistemic beliefs and teacher education. In Transforming teacher education through the epistemic core of chemistry (pp. 51–80). Springer.
- Erduran, S., & Mugaloglu, E. (2014). Philosophy of chemistry in chemical education: Recent trends and future directions. In, M. Matthews (Ed.), Handbook of research on history, philosophy and sociology of science (pp. 287–316). Springer.
- Erduran, S., & Pabuccu, A. (2015). Promoting argumentation in the context of chemistry stories. In I. Eilks & A. Hofstein (Eds.), Relevant chemistry education: From theory to practice (pp. 143–161). Sense Publishers.
- Erduran, S., & Scerri, E. (2003). The nature of chemical knowledge and chemical education. In J. K. Gilbert, O. de Jong, R. Justi, D. F. Tragust & J. H. van Driel (Eds.), Chemical education: Towards research-based practice (pp. 7–27). Kluwer.
- Eriksen, K., Nielsen, B. E., & Pittelkow, M. (2020). Visualizing 3D molecular structures using an augmented reality app. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(5), 1487–1490.
- Ferrell, J. B., Campbell, J. P., McCarthy, D. R., McKay, K. T., Hensinger, M., Srinivasan, R., Zhao, X., Wurthmann, A., Li, J., & Schneebeli, S. T. (2019). Chemical exploration with virtual reality in organic teaching laboratories. Journal of Chemical Education, 96, 1961–1966.
- Fourches, D., & Feducia, J. (2019). Student-guided three-dimensional printing activity in large lecture courses: A practical guideline. Journal of Chemical Education, 96, 291–295.
- Fung, F. M. (2015). Using first-person perspective filming techniques for a chemistry laboratory demonstration to facilitate a flipped pre-lab. Journal of Chemical Education, 92(9), 1518–1521.
- Fung, F. M., Choo, W. Y., Ardisara, A., Zimmermann, C. D., Watts, S., Koscielniak, T., Blanc, E., Coumoul, X., & Dumke, R. (2019). Applying a virtual reality platform in environmental chemistry education to conduct a field trip to an overseas site. Journal of Chemical Education, 96, 382–386.
- Gallardo-Williams, M., Morsch, L. A., Paye, C., & Seery, M. K. (2020). Student-generated video in chemistry education. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 21(2), 488–495.
- Gandhi, H. A. , Jakymiw, S. , Barrett, R. , Mahaseth, H. , & White, A. D. (2020). Real-time interactive simulation and visualization of organic molecules. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(11), 4189-4195.
- Garritz, A. (2013). Teaching the philosophical interpretations of quantum mechanics and uantum chemistry through controversies. Science & Education, 22(7), 1787–1807.
- Garrido, N., Pitto-Barry, A., Soldevila-Barreda, J., Lupan, A., Comerford-Boyes, L., Martin, W. H. C. & Barry, N. P. E. (2020). The sound of chemistry: translating infrared wavenumbers into musical notes. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(3), 703–709.
- Graulich, N., & Bhattacharyya, G. (2017). Investigating students' similarity judgments in organic chemistry. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 18(4), 774–784.
- Gawlik-Kobylinska, M., Walkowiak, W., & Maciejewski, P. (2020). Improvement of a sustainable world through the application of innovative didactic tools in green chemistry teaching: A review. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(4), 916–924.
- Géraldine F., Queiroz, A. C. M., Hambrick, L., Brown, B. A., & Bailenson, J. N. (2021). Participatory research on using virtual reality to teach ocean acidification: A study in the marine education community. Environmental Education Research, 27(2), 254–278.
- Gerdon, A. E. (2020). Connecting chemistry to social justice in a seminar course for chemistry majors. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(12), 4316–4320.
- Grumman, A. S., & Carroll, F. A. (2019). 3D-printing electron density isosurface models and high-resolution molecular models based on van Der Waals Radii. Journal of Chemical Education, 96, 1157–1164.
- Habig, S. (2020). Who can benefit from augmented reality in chemistry? Sex differences in solving stereochemistry problems using augmented reality. British Journal of Educational Technology, 51(3), 629–644. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12891
- Hacker, D. J., Dunlosky, J., & Graesser, A. C. (2009), Handbook of metacognition in education, Routledge.
- $Hardy, \, D. \, A. \, , \, Archer, \, J. \, , \, Lemaitre, \, P. \, , \, Vehring, \, R. \, , \, Reid, \, J. \, P. \, , \, \& \, Walker, \, J. \, S. \, (2021). \, High time resolution measurements of droplet evaporation kinetics and particle crystallisation. \, Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 23(34), 18568–18579.$
- Hand, B., & Choi, A. (2010). Research in Science Education, 40, 29-44.
- Harle, M., & Towns, M. A. (2011). Review of spatial ability literature, its connection to chemistry, and implications for instruction. Journal of Chemical Education, 88, 351–360.
- Haworth, N. L., & Martin, L. L. (2018). Biomolecules come alive: A computer-based laboratory experiment for chemistry students. Journal of Chemical Education, 95(12), 2256–2262.
- Hawkins, I., & Phelps, A. J. (2013). Virtual laboratory "vs." traditional laboratory: which is more effective for teaching electrochemistry? Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 14, 516–523.
- Healy, E. F., & Blade, G. (2020). Tips and tools for teaching organic synthesis online. Journal of Chemical Education, 9(9), 3163–3167.

- Henderson, J. B., & Osborne, J. F. (2019). Using computer technology to support the teaching and learning of argumentation in chemistry. Argumentation in Chemistry Education, 79–105.
- Henriksen, D. (2014). Full STEAM ahead: Creativity in excellent STEM teaching practices. STEAM, 1(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.5642/steam.20140102.15
- Henrique S. F., Nuno M. F. S. A. C., & Sérgio F. S. (2021). Developing and using BioSIMAR, an augmented reality program to visualize and learn about chemical structures in a virtual environment on any internet-connected device. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(5), 1789–1794.
- Hensen, C., Glinowiecka-Cox, G., & Barbera, J. (2020). Assessing differences between three virtual general chemistry experiments and similar hands-on experiments. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(3), 616–625.
- Herridge, M., Tashiro, J., & Talanquer, V. (2021). Variation in chemistry instructors' evaluations of student written responses and its impact on grading. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 22(4), 948–972.
- Herron, J. D., & Nurrenbern S. C. (1999). Chemical education research: improving chemistry learning. Journal of Chemical Education, 76(10), 1353–1361.
- Hofstein, A., Katchevitch, D., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2019). The development of argumentation skills in the chemistry laboratory. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 173–196). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Honey, M., Pearson, G., & Schweingruber, A. (2014). STEM integration in K-12 education: status, prospects, and an agenda for research. National Academies Press.
- Hosbein, K. N., Lower, M. A.; Walker, J. P. (2021). Tracking student argumentation skills across general chemistry through argument-driven inquiry using the assessment of scientific argumentation in the classroom observation protocol. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(6), 1875–1887.
- Huri, N. H. D., Haslina, N., & Karpudewan, M. (2019). Evaluating the effectiveness of Integrated STEM- lab activities in improving secondary school students' understanding of electrolysis. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 20, 495–508.
- Isaacson, M. D., & Michaels, M. (2015). Ambiguity in speaking chemistry and other STEM content: Educational implications. Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities, 18(1), 1–9.
- Ivano, L., Mamlok-Naaman, R., Simone, A., & Eilks, Ingo, E. (2018). Action research in science education: An analytical review of the literature. Educational Action Research, 26(3), 480–495.
- Izquierdo-Aymerich, M. (2013). School chemistry: An historical and philosophical approach. Science & Education, 22(7), 1633–1653. Jones, O. A. H., Stevenson, P. G., Hameka, S. C., Osborne, D. A., Taylor, P. D., & Spencer, M. J. S. (2021). Using 3D printing to visualize 2D chromatograms and NMR spectra for the classroom, Journal of Chemical Education, 98(3), 1024–1030.
- Johnstone, A. H. (1991). Why is science difficult to learn? things are seldom what they seem. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 7, 75–83.
- Katchevich, D., Hofstein, A., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2013). Argumentation in the chemistry laboratory: Inquiry and confirmatory experiments. Research in Science Education, 43(1), 317–345.
- Kaya, E., & Erduran, E. (2013). Integrating epistemological perspectives on chemistry in chemical education: The cases of concept duality, chemical language and structural explanations. Science & Education, 22(7), 1741–1755.
- Kelley, T. R., & Knowles, J. G. (2016). A conceptual framework for integrated STEM education. International Journal of STEM Education, 3(11). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-016-0046-z
- Kelly, G. J., & Takao, A. (2002). Epistemic levels in argument: An analysis of university oceanography students' use of evidence in writing. Science Education, 86(3), 314–342.
- Kim M. C., & Hannafin M. J. (2011). Scaffolding problem solving in technology-enhanced learning environments (TELEs): Bridging research and theory with practice. Computers & Education, 56(2), 403–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.08.024.
- Kodani, S., & Koga, N. (2021). Discovering the chemical mechanism of common heating agents: A stepwise inquiry with student-designed experiments in a high school laboratory course, Journal of Chemical Education, 98(2), 673–677.
- Koehler, M., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 9(1), 60–70.
- Kornhauser, A. (1979). Trends in research in chemical education. European Journal of Education, 1(1), 21–50.
- Koulougliotis, D., Antonoglou, L., & Salta, K. (2021). Probing Greek Secondary School Students' awareness of green chemistry principles infused in context-based projects related to socio-scientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 43(2), 298–313.
- Kuhn, D., & Udell, W. (2003). The development of argument skills. Child Development, 74(5), 1245–1260.
- Lazarou, D., & Erduran, S. (2021). "Evaluate what I was taught, not what you expected me to know": Evaluating students' Arguments based on science teachers' adaptations to Toulmin's argumentation pattern. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(3), 306–324, https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1820663
- Lee, M-H, Wu, Y, Tien, T, & Chin-Chung, A. (2009). Research trends in science education from 2003 to 2007: a content analysis of publications in selected journals. International Journal of Science Education, 31(15), 1999–2020.
- Levonis, S. M., Tauber, A. L., & Schweiker, S. S. (2021). 360° virtual laboratory tour with embedded skills videos. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(2), 651–654.
- Li, Y., Wang, K., Xiao, Y., & Froyd, J. E. (2020). Research and trends in STEM education: A systematic review of journal publications. International Journal of STEM Education, 7, 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00207-6.
- Lin, T. C., Lin, T. C., Potvin. P., & Tsai, C. C. (2019). Research trends in science education from 2013 to 2017: A systematic content analysis of publications in selected journals. International Journal of Science Education, 41(3), 367–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1550274
- Lin, T. C., Lin, T. C., & Tsai, C. C. (2014). Research trends in science education from 2008 to 2012: A systematic content analysis of publications in selected journals. International Journal of Science Education, 36(8), 1346–1372.
- Logothetis, T. A., & Flowers, C. M. (2020). Squaring the circle by attempting to teach a lab class in the cloud: Reflections after a term in lockdown. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(9), 3018-3022.
- Lombardi, O., & Labarca, M. (2007). The philosophy of chemistry as a new resource for chemistry education. Journal of Chemical Education, 84(1), 187–192.
- Luo, X., Wei, B., Shi, M., & Xiao, X. (2020). Exploring the impact of the reasoning flow scaffold (RFS) on students' scientific argumentation: Based on the structure of observed learning outcomes (SOLO) taxonomy. Chemistry Education Research and

Practice, 21(4), 1083-1094.

- Maestrales, S., Zhai, X., Touitou, I., Baker, Q., Schneider, B., & Krajcik, J. (2021). Using machine learning to score multi-dimensional assessments of chemistry and physics. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30(2), 239–254.
- Mahaffy, P. G., Ho, F. M., Haack, J. A., & Brush, E. J. (2019). Can chemistry be a central science without systems thinking? Journal of Chemical Education, 96(12), 2679–2681.
- Maksimenko, N., Okolzina, A., Vlasova, A., Tracey, C., & Kurushkin, M. (2021). Introducing atomic structure to first-year undergraduate chemistry students with an immersive virtual reality experience. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(6), 2104–2108.
- Mamlok-Naaman, R., & Eilks, I. (2012). Different types of action research to promote chemistry teachers' professional development: A joined theoretical reflection on two cases from Israel and Germany. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 10(3), 581–610.
- Marín-Marín, J. A., Moreno-Guerrero, A. J., Dúo-Terrón, P., & Lopez-Belmonte, J. (2021). STEAM in education: A bibliometric analysis of performance and co-words in Web of Science. International Journal of STEM Education, 8, 41. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-021-00296-x
- Markic, S., Eilks, I., Mamlok-Naaman, R., Hugerat, M., Kortam, N., Dkeidek, I., & Hofstein, A. (2016). One country, two cultures A multi-perspective view on Israeli chemistry teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 22(2), 131–147.
- Maryasin, B., Marquetand, P., & Maulide, N. (2018). Machine learning for organic synthesis: Are robots replacing chemists? Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 57, 6978–6980.
- McCollum, B. M., Regier, L., Leong, J., Simpson, S., & Sterner, S. (2014). The effects of using touch-screen devices on students' molecular visualization and representational competence skills. Journal of Chemical Education, 91(11), 1810–1817.
- Milanovic, V. D., & Trivic, D. D. (2020). Arguments of 14-year-olds in the context of history of the development of organic chemistry. Science & Education, 29(1), 43–74.
- Moozeh, K., Farmer, J., Tihanyi, D., & Evans, G. (2020). Learning beyond the laboratory: A web application framework for development of interactive postlaboratory exercises. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(5), 1481–1486.
- Msimanga, A., & Mudadigwa, B. (2019). Supporting argumentation in chemistry education in low-income contexts. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 275–291). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Müssig, J., Clark, A., Hoermann, S., Loporcaro, G., Loporcaro, C., & Huber, T. (2020). Imparting materials science knowledge in the field of the crystal structure of metals in times of online teaching: A novel online laboratory teaching concept with an augmented reality application. Journal of Chemical Education, 97, 2643–2650.
- Muñoz-Campos, V., Franco-Mariscal, A. J., & Blanco-López, Á. (2020). Integration of scientific practices into daily living contexts: A framework for the design of teaching-learning sequences. International Journal of Science Education, 42(15), 2574–2600.
- Naidoo, J., & Sibanda, D. (2020). Examining science performance of south african grade 9 learners in TIMSS 2015 through a gender lens. South African Journal of Education, 40(2).
- Najami, N., Hugerat, M., Kabya, F., & Hofstein, A. (2020). The laboratory as a vehicle for enhancing argumentation among preservice science teachers. Science & Education, 29(2), 377–393.
- National Research Council . (2012). Discipline-based education research: Understanding and improving learning in undergraduate science and engineering. Washington, DC.
- National Research Council . (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school: expanded (2nd ed.). National Academies Press.
- Ng, Y. P. D. (2019). Assessment of argumentation in chemistry: A model for designing items. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 106–141). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. Achieve, Inc.
- Njoki, P. N. (2020). Remote teaching of general chemistry for nonscience majors during COVID-19. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(9), 3158–3162.
- Noyes, K., McKay, R. L., Neumann, M., Haudek, K. C., & Cooper, M. M. (2020). Developing computer resources to automate analysis of students' explanations of london dispersion forces. Journal of Chemical Education, 97, 3923–3936.
- Orduña-Picón, R., Sevian, H., & Mortimer, E. F. (2020). Conceptual profile of substance: representing heterogeneity of thinking in chemistry classrooms. Science & Education, 29(5) 1317–1360.
- Ovens, M., Ellyard, M., Jacob, H., & Dino, S. (2020). Developing an augmented reality application in an undergraduate DNA precipitation experiment to link macroscopic and submicroscopic levels of chemistry. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(10), 3882–3886.
- Pabuccu-Akis, A. & Demirer, I. (2022). Integrated STEM activity with 3D printing and entrepreneurship applications, Science Activities. https://doi.org/10.1080/00368121.2022.2120452
- Pabuccu, A. (2019). Argumentation in organic chemistry education. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 228–246). Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Pabuccu, A., & Erduran, S. (2017). Beyond rote learning in organic chemistry: The infusion and impact of argumentation in tertiary education. International Journal of Science Education, 39(9), 1154–1172. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1319988
- Pabuccu, A., & Erduran, S. (2016). Investigating students' engagement in epistemic and narrative practices of chemistry in the context of a story on gas behavior. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 17, pp. 523–531, https://doi.org/10.1039/c6rp00011h Peiretti, F., & Bruner, J. M. (2018). Artificial intelligence: The future for organic chemistry? ACS Omega, 3, 13263–13266.
- Penn, M., & Ramnarain, U. (2019). South African University Students' attitudes towards chemistry learning in a virtually simulated learning environment. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 20, 699–709.
- Pence, H. E. (2020). How should chemistry educators respond to the next generation of technology change? Education Sciences, 10(2), 34.
- Petritis, S. J. , Kelley, C. , & Talanquer, V. (2021). Exploring the impact of the framing of a laboratory experiment on the nature of student argumentation. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 22(1), 105-121.
- Phoenix, A., Boddy, J., Walker, C., & Vennam, U. (2017). Everyday engagement with climate change. In Environment in the lives of children and families: Perspectives from India and the UK (pp. 1–20). Bristol University Press. www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv43vt2t.6 Phillips, M. (2019). Readers and authors of educational research: A study of research output on K-12 education policy. SageOpen, April–June, 1–9.

- Pinger, C. W., Geiger, M. K., & Spence, D. M. (2020). Applications of 3D-printing for improving chemistry education. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(1), 112–117.
- Pinkwart, N., & McLaren, B. M. (2012). Educational technologies for teaching argumentation skills. Bentham Science Publishers.
- Prinsley, R., & Baranyai, K. (2015). STEM skills in the workforce: What do employers want? Occasional Papers Series, issue 9, March. Office of the Chief Scientist. Retrieved November 14, 2021, from https://www.chiefscientist.gov.au/2015/04/occasional-paper-stem-skills-in-the-workforce-what-do-employers-want
- Rap, S., Feldman-Maggor, Y., Aviran, E., Shvarts-Serebro, I., Easa, E., Yonai, E., Waldman, R., & Blonder, R. (2020). An applied research-based approach to support chemistry teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Chemical Education, 97, 3278–3284.
- Ren, X., Wang, X., Jin, X., & Li, M. (2021). The impact of personal moral philosophies on the safe practice of students in chemistry and related majors. Science & Education, 30(1), 67–80.
- Renner, M., & Griesbeck, A. (2020). Think and print: 3D printing of chemical experiments. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(10), 3683–3689.
- Russell, T. L. (1983). Analyzing arguments in science classroom discourse: Can teachers' questions distort scientific authority? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20, 27–45.
- Sarıtaş, D., Özcan, H., & Adúriz-Bravo, A. (2021). Observation and inference in chemistry teaching: A model-based approach to the integration of the macro and submicro levels. Science & Education, 30, 1289–1314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-021-00216-z.
- Seeratan, K. L., McElhaney, K. W., Mislevy, J., McGhee, R. Jr., Conger, D., & Long, M. C. (2020). Measuring students' ability to engage in scientific inquiry. A New Instrument to Assess Data Analysis, Explanation, and Argumentation, Educational Assessment, 25(2), 112–135.
- Sendur, G., Polat, M., & Kazanci, C. (2017). Does a course on the history and philosophy of chemistry have any effect on prospective chemistry teachers' perceptions? The case of chemistry and the chemist. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 18(4), 601–629.
- Schmid, J. R., Ernst, M. J., & Thiele, G. (2020). Structural chemistry 2.0: Combining augmented reality and 3D online models. Journal of Chemical Education, 97, 4515–4519.
- Schwartz, B. B., & Baker, M. J. (2017). Dialogue, argumentation and education: History, theory and practice. Cambridge University Press.
- Scerri, E. R. (2000). Philosophy of chemistry: A new interdisciplinary field? Journal of Chemical Education, 77(4), 522.
- Siegel, H. (1995). Why should educators care about argumentation? Informal Logic, 17(2), 159-176.
- Sjöström, J., & Talanquer, V. (2014). Humanizing chemistry education: From simple contextualization to multifaceted problematization. Journal of Chemical Education, 91(8), 1125–1131.
- Smith, D. W., Lampley, S. A., Dolan, B., Williams, G., Schleppenbach, D., & Blair, M. (2020). Effect of 3D manipulatives on students with visual impairments who are learning chemistry constructs: A pilot study. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 114(5), 370–381.
- Soong, R., Jenne, A., Lysak, D. H., Biswas, R. G., Adamo, A., Kim, K. S., & Simpson, A. (2021). Titrate over the internet: An open-source remote-control titration unit for all students. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(3), 1037–1042.
- Soong, R., Pautler, B. G., Moser, A., Jenne, A., Lysak, D. H., Adamo, A., & Simpson, A. J. (2020). CASE (computer-assisted structure elucidation) study for an undergraduate organic chemistry class. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(3), 855–860.
- Sönmez, E., Kabatas Memis, E., & Yerlikaya, Z. (2021). The effect of practices based on argumentation-based inquiry approach on teacher candidates' critical thinking. Educational Studies, 47(1), 59–83.
- Spitha, N., Doolittle, P. S., Buchberger, A. R., & Samuel Pazicni, S. (2021). Simulation-based guided inquiry activity for deriving the beer–lambert law. Journal of Chemical Education, 98, 1705–1711.
- Spaulding, D. T., Kennedy, J. A. Rózsavölgyi, A., & Colón, W. (2020). Differences in outcomes by gender for peer mentors participating in a STEM persistence program for first-year students. Journal of STEM Education: Innovations and Research, 21(1), 5–10.
- Talanquer, V. (2013). School chemistry: The need for transgression. Science & Education, 22(7), 1757–1773.
- Talanquer, V., Bucat, R., Tasker, R., & Mahaffy, P. G. (2020). Lessons from a pandemic: Educating for complexity, change, uncertainty, vulnerability, and resilience. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(9), 2696–2700.
- Tatli, Z., & Ayas, A. (2010). Virtual laboratory applications in chemistry education. Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 9, 938–942.
- Tatli, Z., & Ayas, A. (2012). Virtual chemistry laboratory: effect of constructivist learning environment. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 13(1), 183–199.
- Tobin, E. (2013). Chemical laws, idealization and approximation. Science & Education, 22(7), 1581–1592.
- Tolvanen, S., Jansson, J. Vesterinen, V. M., & Aksela, M. (2014). How to use historical pproach to teach nature of science in chemistry education? Science & Education, 23(8), 1605–1636.
- Toulmin, S. (1958). The layout of arguments. The uses of argument, 94–145. Cambridge University Press.
- Towns, M. H. & Kraft, A. (2012). The 2010 Rankings of Chemical Education and Science Education Journals by Faculty Engaged in Chemical Education Research. Journal of Chemical Education, 89, 16–20.
- Towns, M., Cole, R. S., Moon, A. C., & Stanford, C. (2019). Argumentation in physical chemistry. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 247–274).
- Royal Society of Chemistry. Teo, T. W., Goh, M. T., & Yeo, L. W. (2014). Chemistry education research trends: 2004–2013. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 15, 470–487.
- Tsai, C-C. (2018). The effect of online argumentation of socio-scientific issues on students' scientific competences and sustainability attitudes. Computers & Education, 116, 14–27.
- Tumay, H. (2016). Emergence, learning difficulties, and misconceptions in chemistry undergraduate students' conceptualizations of acid strength. Science & Education, 25(1), 21–46.
- Tuysuz, M., & Tuzun, U. N. (2020). An enrichment workshop using argumentation-based forensic chemistry activities to improve the critical thinking of gifted students. Journal of Science Learning, 4(1), 91–100.
- Upahi, J. E., & Ramnarain, U. (2019). Representations of chemical phenomena in secondary school chemistry textbooks. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 20(1), 146–159.

Uzuntiryaki-Kondakci, E., Tuysuz, M., Sarici, E., Soysal, C., & Kilinc, S. (2021). The role of the argumentation-based laboratory on the development of pre-service chemistry teachers' argumentation skills, International Journal of Science Education, 43(1), 30–55. Vasquez, J., Sneider, C., & Comer, M. (2013). STEM lesson essentials, grades 3–8: Integrating science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Heinemann.

Yaman, F. (2020). Pre-service science teachers' development and use of multiple levels of representation and written arguments in general chemistry laboratory courses. Research in Science Education, 50(6), 2331–2362.

Yilmaz, O. (2021). Augmented reality in science education: An application in higher education. Shanlax International Journal of Education, 9(3), 136–148.

York, S., & Orgill, M. K. (2020). Chemist table: A tool for designing or modifying instruction for a systems thinking approach in chemistry education. Journal of Chemical Education, 97(8), 2114–2129.

Wang, M., Callaghan, V., Bernhardt, J., White, K., & Peña-Rios, A. (2018). Augmented reality in education and training: Pedagogical approaches and illustrative case studies. Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing, 9(5), 1391–1402. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12652-017-0547-8

de Waard, E. F., Prins, G. T., & van Joolingen, W. R. (2020). Pre-university students' perceptions about the life cycle of bioplastics and fossil-based plastics. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 21(3), 908–921.

Watts, F. M., & Finkenstaedt-Quinn, S. A. (2021). The current state of methods for establishing reliability in qualitative chemistry education research articles. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 22, 565–578. https://doi.org/10.1039/d1rp00007a

Winkelmann, K. Keeney-Kennicutt, W. Fowler, D., & Macik, M. (2017). Development implementation, and assessment of general chemistry lab experiments performed in the virtual world of second life. Journal of Chemical Education, 94, 849–858.

Wiyarsi, A., Prodjosantoso, A. K., & Nugraheni, A. R. E. (2021). Promoting students' scientific habits of mind and chemical literacy using the context of socio-scientific issues on the inquiry learning. Frontiers in Education, 6, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.660495

Woody, A. I. (2013). How is the ideal gas law explanatory? Science & Education, 22(7), 1563-1580.

Wright, L., & Oliver-Hoyo, M. (2021). Development and evaluation of the H NMR MoleculAR application. Journal of Chemical Education, 98(2), 478–488.

Wu, S. H., Lai, C. L., Hwang, G. J., & Tsai, C. C. (2021). Research trends in technology-enhanced chemistry learning: A review of comparative research from 2010 to 2019. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30, 496–510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09894-w

Zembal-Saul, C., & Vaishampayan, A. (2019). Research and practice on science teachers' continuous professional development in argumentation. In S. Erduran (Ed.), Argumentation in chemistry education: Research, policy and practice (pp. 142–172). Royal Society of Chemistry.

Earth Science Education

AGI . (n.d.) https://www.americangeosciences.org/community/agi-guidelines-ethical-professional-conduct

Ali, H. N., Sheffield, S. L., Bauer, J. E., Caballero-Gill, R. P., Gasparini, N. M., Libarkin, J., Gonzales, K. K., Willenbring, J., Amir-Lin, E., Cisneros, J., Desai, D., Erwin, M., Gallant, E., Gomez, K. J., Keisling, B. A., Robert Mahon, R., Erika Marín-Spiotta, E., Leiaka Welcome, L., & Schneider, B. (2021). An actionable anti-racism plan for geoscience organizations. Nature Communications, 12(1), 1–6.

Almeida, A., & Vasconcelos, C. (2015). Geoethics: Masters' students knowledge and perception of its importance. Research in Science Education, 45(6), 889–906.

Apple, J. , Lemus, J. , & Semken, S. (2014). Teaching geoscience in the context of culture and place. Journal of Geoscience Education, 62(1), 1–4.

Ariccio, S., Petruccelli, I., Cancellieri, U. G., Quintana, C., Villagra, P., & Bonaiuto, M. (2020). Loving, leaving, living: Evacuation site place attachment predicts natural hazard coping behavior. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 70(101), 431.

Arthurs, L. A. (2019). Undergraduate geoscience education research: Evolution of an emerging field of discipline-based education research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(2), 118–140.

Atchison, C. L., & Libarkin, J. C. (2016). Professionally held perceptions about the accessibility of the geosciences. Geosphere, 12(4), 1154–1165.

Atit, K., Weisberg, S. M., Newcombe, N. S., & Shipley, T. F. (2016). Learning to interpret topographic maps: Understanding layered spatial information. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 1(1), 1–18.

Australian Academy of Science (AAS). (2018). Our planet, Australia's future: A decade of transition in Geoscience: A decadal plan for Australian Geoscience 2018–27. AAS. www.science.org.au/supporting-science/science-policy-and-sector-analysis/decadal-plans-science/australian-geoscience

Awāsis, S. (2021). Gwaabaw: Applying Anishinaabe harvesting protocols to energy governance. The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien, 65(1), 8–23.

Banilower, E. R., Trygstad, P. J., & Smith, P. S. (2015). The first five years: What the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education reveals about novice science teachers and their teaching. In newly hired teachers of science (pp. 1–29). Brill. Banilower, Eric R., Sean Smith, P., Malzahn, Kristen A., Plumley, Courtney L., Gordon, Evelyn M., & Hayes, Meredith L. (2018). Report of the 2018 NSSME+. Horizon Research, Inc.

Ben-Zvi Assaraf, O., & Orion, N. (2005). Development of systems thinking skills in the context of earth system education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 1–43.

Ben-Zvi Assaraf, O., & Orion, N. (2010). System thinking skills at the elementary school level. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(5), 540–563.

Ben-Zvi Assaraf, O., Orion, N., & Ronen. D. (2008). The blue-planet earth systems approach (BEPESA) for the study of water related systems. In C. A. Brebbia (Ed.), Environmental problems in coastal regions (pp. 161–172). WIT Press.

Bernard, R. E., & Cooperdock, E. H. (2018). No progress on diversity in 40 years. Nature Geoscience, 11(5), 292–295.

- Blank, R., & D. Langesen. 2005. State indicators of science and mathematics education. Council of Chief State School Officers. Bofferding, L., & Kloser, M. (2015). Middle and high school students' conceptions of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies. Environmental Education Research, 21(2), 275–294.
- Brkich, K. L. (2014). Urban fifth graders' connections-making between formal earth science content and their lived experiences. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 9(1), 141–164.
- Bursztyn, N., Pederson, J., Shelton, B., Walker, A., & Campbell, T. (2015). Utilizing geo-referenced mobile game technology for universally accessible virtual geology field trips. International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, 3(2), 93–100.
- Bush, D., Sieber, R., Seiler, G., & Chandler, M. (2016). The teaching of anthropogenic climate change and earth science via technology-enabled inquiry education. Journal of Geoscience Education, 64(3), 159–174.
- Byars-Winston, A., Rogers, J., Branchaw, J., Pribbenow, C., Hanke, R., & Pfund, C. (2016). New measures assessing predictors of academic persistence for historically underrepresented racial/ethnic undergraduates in science. CBE Life Sciences Education, 15(3), 32.
- Carabajal, I. G., Marshall, A. M., & Atchison, C. L. (2017). A synthesis of instructional strategies in geoscience education literature that address barriers to inclusion for students with disabilities. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 531–541.
- 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(8), 1187–1218.
- Chang, C.-Y., Lee, W.-C., & Yeh, T.-K. (2006). Taiwanese earth science curriculum guidelines and their relationships to the earth systems education of the United States. Journal of Geoscience Education, 54(5), 620–624.
- Clary, R. M., & Wandersee, J. H. (2014). Lessons from US fossil parks for effective informal science education. Geoheritage, 6(4), 241–256.
- Cooper, M. M., Caballero, M. D., Ebert-May, D., Fata-Hartley, C. L., Jardeleza, S. E., Krajcik, J. S., Laverty, J. T., Matz, R. L., Posey, L. A., & Underwood, S. M. (2015). Challenge faculty to transform STEM learning. Science, 350(6258), 281–282.
- Czajka, C. D., & McConnell, D. (2019). The adoption of student-centered teaching materials as a professional development experience for college faculty. International Journal of Science Education, 41(5), 693–711.
- Dawborn-Gundlach, L. M., Pesina, J., Rochette, E., Hubber, P., Gaff, P., Henry, D., Gibson, M., Kelly, L., & Redman, C. (2017). Enhancing pre-service teachers' concept of Earth Science through an immersive, conceptual museum learning program (Reconceptualising Rocks). Teaching and Teacher Education, 67, 214–226.
- DeChenne, S. E., Carew, J., & Stains, M. (2014). Adoption of instructional practices grounded in discipline-based. Journal of College Science Teaching, 43(6), 89–99.
- Di Capua G., Peppoloni S., & Bobrowsky P. (2017). The cape town statement on geoethics. In S. Peppoloni, G. Di Capua, P. T. Bobrowsky, & V. Cronin (Eds.), Geoethics at the heart of all geoscience. *Annals of Geophysics*, 60, Fast Track 7. doi:10.1007/s11528-017-0191-3
- Dodick, J., & Orion, N. (2003). Cognitive factors affecting student understanding of geological time. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, 415–442.
- Drost, R., Casteel, M., Libarkin, J., Thomas, S., & Meister, M. (2016). Severe weather warning communication: Factors impacting audience attention and retention of information during tornado warnings. Weather, Climate, and Society, 8(4), 361–372.
- Duraiswami, R. A., & Krishnamurthy, P. (2020). Report on the Teacher Training Workshop in Earth Science Education, UGC-HRDC, Savitribai Phule University of Pune (SPPU), Pune, India. Journal of the Geological Society of India, 96(4), 420.
- Dutt, K. (2020). Race and racism in the geosciences. Nature Geoscience, 13(1), 2-3.
- Egger, A. E. (2019). The role of introductory geoscience courses in preparing teachers and all students for the future: Are we making the grade? GSA Today, 29(10), 4–10.
- Ellins, K. K., Snow, E., Olson, H. C., Stocks, E., Willis, M., Olson, J., & Odell, M. R. (2013). The texas earth and space science (TXESS) revolution: A model for the delivery of earth science professional development to minority-serving teachers. Journal of Geoscience Education, 61(2), 187–201.
- Evanoff, R. (2007). Bioregionalism and cross-cultural dialogue on a land ethic. Ethics Place and Environment, 10(2), 141–156. Eyov, L. (2017). The earth science cross-country class as an intersection point between formal and informal education. Unpublished master's thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science.
- Fang, S. C., Hsu, Y. S., & Hsu, W. H. (2016). Effects of explicit and implicit prompts on students' inquiry practices in computer-supported learning environments in high school earth science. International Journal of Science Education, 38(11), 1699–1726. Foth, H. D., & Starr, J. L. (1971). Meeting the challenge of teaching earth science in college. Journal of Geological Education, 19(1), 20, 22
- Frelindich, N. (1998). From Sputnik to TIMSS: Reforms in science education make headway despite setbacks. Harvard Education Letters, 14(5). http://www.project2061.org/publications/articles/articles/harvard.htm
- Friedman, G. M. (1978). The golden age of the geoscientist. Science, 201(4352), 215–215.
- Geoscience on the chopping block . (2021). Nature Reviews Earth & Environment, 2, 587. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-021-00216-1
- German Geographical Society . (2014). Educational standards in geography for the intermediate school certificate with sample assignments. http://geographiedidaktik.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/edu standards geo 3 2014 web.pdf
- Gilbert, L., Teasdale, R., & Manduca, C. (2020). A new vision of sustainability in earth science education. Eos, 101.
- Goldman, K. H., Kessler, C., & Danter, E. (2010). Science on a sphere: Cross-site summative evaluation. Institute for Learning Innovation.
- Gonzales, L. M., & Keane, C. M. (2010). Who will fill the geoscience workforce supply gap? Environmental Science & Technology, 44, 550–555.
- Grant, C. A., MacFadden, B. J., Antonenko, P., & Perez, V. J. (2016). 3-D fossils for K-12 education: a case example using the giant extinct shark Carcharocles megalodon. The Paleontological Society Papers, 22, 197–209.
- Gratani, M., Sutton, S. G., Butler, J. R., Bohensky, E. L., & Foale, S. (2016). Indigenous environmental values as human values. Cogent Social Sciences, 2(1), 1185811.
- Greco, R., & Almberge, L. (Eds.) (2018). Earth science education: Global perspectives. Pouso Alegre: IFSULDEMINAS, 355 p. il.

- Hamann, K. R., & Reese, G. (2020). My influence on the world (of others): Goal efficacy beliefs and efficacy affect predict private, public, and activist pro-environmental behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 76(1), 35–53.
- 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.
- Hayward, J., & Hart, J. K. (2015). The value of educators "on the floor": Comparing three modes of presenting science on a Sphere®. Journal of Museum Education, 40(2), 180–194.
- Heyd, T. (2004). Themes in Latin American environmental ethics: community, resistance and autonomy. Environmental Values, 13(2), 223–242.
- Hoffman, M., & Barstow, D. (2007). Revolutionizing earth system science education for the 21st century: Report and recommendations from a 50-state analysis of earth science education standards. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- Hoisch, T. D., & Bowie, J. I. (2010). Assessing factors that influence the recruitment of majors from introductory geology classes at Northern Arizona University. Journal of Geoscience Education, 58(3), 166–176.
- Hubenthal, M. (2018). Exploring undergraduates' conceptions of elasticity, within a plate tectonics context, before and after experience with rock's elastic behavior. Journal of Geoscience Education, 66(4), 261–277.
- Hurd, P. D. (1986). Perspectives for the reform of science education. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 353-358.
- IPCC. (2021). Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M. I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J. B. R. Matthews, T. K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu and B. Zhou (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press.
- IUGS . (n.d.). IUGS commission on geoscience education. https://iugscoge.org/
- Jaimes, P., Libarkin, J. C., & Conrad, D. (2020). College student conceptions about changes to earth and life over time. CBE Life Sciences Education, 19(3), 35.
- Kali, Y., Orion, N., & Eylon, B. (2003). The effect of knowledge integration activities on students' perception of the earth's crust as a cyclic system. The Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, (6), 545–565.
- Karpudewan, M., Roth, W. M., & Chandrakesan, K. (2015). Remediating misconception on climate change among secondary school students in Malaysia. Environmental Education Research, 21(4), 631–648.
- Keul, A. G., Brunner, B., Allen, J., Wilson, K. A., Taszarek, M., Price, C., Soleiman, G., Sharma, S., Roy, P., Aini, M. S., Elistina, A. B., Kadir, M., & Gomes, C. (2018). Multihazard weather risk perception and preparedness in eight countries. Weather, Climate, and Society, 10(3), 501–520.
- Kier, M. W., Blanchard, M. R., Osborne, J. W., & Albert, J. L. (2014). The development of the STEM career interest survey (STEM-CIS). Research in Science Education, 44(3), 461–481.
- Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants. Milkweed Editions.
- King, C. (2013). Geoscience education across the globe: Results of the IUGS-COGE/IGEO survey. Episodes, 36(1), 19–30.
- King, C. (2015). The need for an international geoscience school syllabus: Its development and publication. Science Education International, 26(4), 420–438.
- King, C., Gorfinkiel, D., & Frick, M. (2021). International comparisons of school-level geoscience education the UNESCO/IGEO expert opinion survey. International Journal of Science Education, 43(1), 56–78.
- Kirby, C. K., Libarkin, J. C., & Thomas, S. (2021). Geoscientists' drawings of natural selection. Journal of Geoscience Education, 1–12.
- Kirkby, K. C. (2014). Place in the city: Place-based learning in a large urban undergraduate geoscience program. Journal of Geoscience Education, 62(2), 177–186.
- Klippel, A., Zhao, J., Jackson, K. L., La Femina, P., Stubbs, C., Wetzel, R., Blair, J., Wallgrün, J. O., & Oprean, D. (2019). Transforming earth science education through immersive experiences: Delivering on a long held promise. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 57(7), 1745–1771.
- Kopnina, H., Washington, H., Taylor, B., & Piccolo, J. J. (2018). Anthropocentrism: More than just a misunderstood problem. Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 31(1), 109–127.
- 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.
- LaDue, N. D., Libarkin, J. C., & Thomas, S. R. (2015). Visual representations on high school biology, chemistry, earth science, and physics assessments. Journal of science education and technology, 24(6), 818–834.
- Lazar, K. B., Moysey, S. M., Brame, S., Coulson, A. B., Lee, C. M., & Wagner, J. R. (2018). Breaking out of the traditional lecture hall: Geocaching as a tool for experiential learning in large geology service courses. Journal of Geoscience Education, 66(3), 170–185.
- Levy, A., Orion, N., & Leshem, Y. (2018). Variables that influence the environmental behavior of adults. Environmental Education Research, 24(3), 307–325, doi:10.1080/13504622,2016.1271865
- Levy, B. L., Oliveira, A. W., & Harris, C. B. (2021). The potential of "civic science education": Theory, research, practice, and uncertainties. Science Education, 1–23.
- Lewis, E. B., & Baker, D. R. (2010). A call for a new geoscience education research agenda. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(2), 121–129.
- Libarkin, J. C. (2006). Geoscience education in the United States. Planet, 17(1), 60-63.
- Libarkin, J. C. (2021). Geocognition and geoscience education research programs. Geocognition Research Lab.
- https://geocognitionresearchlaboratory.com/graduate-study/geocognition-geoscience-education-research-programs/
- Libarkin, J. C., Gold, A. U., Harris, S. E., McNeal, K. S., & Bowles, R. P. (2018). A new, valid measure of climate change understanding: Associations with risk perception. Climatic change, 150(3), 403–416.
- Libarkin, J. C., Thomas, S. R., & Ording, G. (2015). Factor analysis of drawings: Application to college student models of the greenhouse effect. International Journal of Science Education, 37(13), 2214–2236.
- Lucchesi, S. (2017). Geosciences at the service of society: The path traced by Antonio Stoppani. Annals of Geophysics, 60.
- Luft, J. A., Hanuscin, D., Hobbs, L., & Törner, G. (2020). Teaching in science: An overlooked problem. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(7), 719–724.

- Maity, S., Sahu, T. N., & Sen, N. (2021). Panoramic view of digital education in COVID-19: A new explored avenue. Review of Education, 9(2), 405–423.
- Mattheis, A., Murphy, M., & Marin-Spiotta, E. (2019). Examining intersectionality and inclusivity in geosciences education research: A synthesis of the literature 2008–2018. Journal of Geoscience Education, 67(4), 505–517.
- Mayer, V. J. (1995). Using the earth system for integrating the science curriculum. Science Education, 79, 375–391.
- Mayer, V. J., & Wall, C. (1972). Research in earth science education: An annotated bibliography. Information Analysis Center for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education.
- McCallum, C., Libarkin, J., Callahan, C., & Atchison, C. (2018). Mentoring, social capital, and diversity in earth system science. Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 24(1).
- McNeal, K. S., & Petcovic, H. L. (2017). Sparking conversations about graduate programs in geoscience education research. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 399–406.
- Merhav, O. (2013). High-school students' engagement in knowledge integration process, based on logical thinking and systems thinking. Unpublished master's thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science.
- Michie, M., Hogue, M., & Rioux, J. (2018). The application of both-ways and two-eyed seeing pedagogy: Reflections on engaging and teaching science to post-secondary Indigenous students. Research in Science Education, 48(6), 1205–1220.
- Mills, R., Tomas, L., & Lewthwaite, B. (2016). Learning in earth and space science: a review of conceptual change instructional approaches. International Journal of Science Education, 38(5), 767–790.
- Mills, R., Tomas, L., & Lewthwaite, B. (2017). Junior secondary school students' conceptions about plate tec-tonics. International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education, 26(4), 297–310.
- Mirsky, A. (1990). Countering the decline in geoscience majors. Journal of Geological Education, 38(3), 208–213.
- Monroe, M. C., Plate, R. R., Oxarart, A., Bowers, A., & Chaves, W. A. (2019). Identifying effective climate change education strategies: A systematic review of the research. Environmental Education Research, 25(6), 791–812.
- Moorman, L., Evanovitch, J., & Muliaina, T. (2021). Envisioning indigenized geography: A two-eyed seeing approach. Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 45(2), 201–220.
- Mosher, S. , & Keane, C. (2021). Vision and change in the geosciences: The future of undergraduate geoscience education. American Geosciences Institute.
- Moutinho, S., Moura, R., & Vasconcelos, C. (2017). Contributions of model-based learning to the restructuring of graduation students' mental models on natural hazards. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13(7), 3043–3068. National Research Council. (2012). Discipline-based education research: Understanding and improving learning in undergraduate science and engineering. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/13362.
- Nazareth, A., Newcombe, N. S., Shipley, T. F., Velazquez, M., & Weisberg, S. M. (2019). Beyond small-scale spatial skills: Navigation skills and geoscience education. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 4(1), 1–17.
- Ndembera, R., Hao, J., Fallin, R., Ray, H. E., Shah, L., & Rushton, G. T. (2020). Demographic factors that influence performance on the Praxis Earth and Space Science: Content Knowledge Test. Journal of Geoscience Education, 1–10.
- NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.
- NSPE. (National Society of Professional Engineers; n.d.). www.nspe.org/resources/ethics/code-ethics
- Núñez, A. M., Rivera, J., & Hallmark, T. (2020). Applying an intersectionality lens to expand equity in the geosciences. Journal of Geoscience Education, 68(2), 97–114.
- Oreskes, N. (2015). How earth science has become a social science. Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung, 246–270.
- Orion, N. (1993). A model for the development and implementation of field trips, as an integral part of the science curriculum. School Science and Mathematics, 93, 325–331.
- Orion, N. (2002). An earth systems curriculum development model. In V. J. Mayer (Ed.), Global science literacy (pp. 159–168). 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. (2015). A chance to change science teaching from the grass roots. SciDev.Net. Creative Commons.
- Orion, N. (2016). Earth systems education and the development of environmental insight. In C. Vasconcelos (Ed.), Geoscience education: Indoor and outdoor (pp. 59–72). Springer International Publishing.
- Orion, N. (2019). The future challenge of Earth science education research. Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research, 1(1), 1–8.
- Orion, N. (2021). Evolution of four decades of research: From cognition to emotion paradigm. In A. Hofstein, A. Harcavi, & A. Yarden (Eds.), Long term research & development in science education: What have we learned? (pp 91–112). Brill.
- Orion, N. (2022). Nature as a teaching resource and the nature of learning. In C. Calheiros & C. Vasconcelos (Eds.), Enhancing environmental education through nature-based solutions (pp. 53–60). Springer Nature. ISBN 978-3-030-87737-8.
- Orion, N., & Ault, C. R. (2007). Learning earth sciences. In Handbook of research on science education (pp. 653–688). Routledge.
- Orion, N., & Hofstein, A. (1994). Factors that influence learning during a scientific field trip in a natural environment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching. 31(10), 1097–1119.
- Orion, N., & Libarkin, J. (2014). Earth system science education. In Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 495–510). Routledge.
- Orion, N., King, C., Krockover, G. H., & Adams, P. E. (1999). The development and status of earth science education: A comparison of three case studies: Israel, England and Wales and the United States of America. Part I. Science Education International, 10(2), 13–23.
- Orion, N., Shankar, R., Greco, R., & Berenguer, J. L. (2020). Promoting the earth system approach and the meaning of learning. European Geologist, 50.
- Ormand, C. J., Shipley, T. F., Tikoff, B., Dutrow, B., Goodwin, L. B., Hickson, T., Atit, K., Gagnier, K., & Resnick, I. (2017). The spatial thinking workbook: A research-validated spatial skills curriculum for geology majors. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 423–434.
- Parker, M., Pearson, C., Donald, C., & Fisher, C. B. (2019). Beyond the belmont principles: A community-based approach to developing an Indigenous ethics model and curriculum for training health researchers working with American Indian and Alaska Native

communities. American Journal of Community Psychology, 64(1-2), 9-20.

Pennington, D., Ebert-Uphoff, I., Freed, N., Martin, J., & Pierce, S. A. (2020). Bridging sustainability science, earth science, and data science through interdisciplinary education. Sustainability Science, 15(2), 647–661.

Press, F. (1991). Geoscience education as viewed from the national academy of sciences. Journal of Geological Education, 39(2), 98–100.

Pugh, K. J., Phillips, M. M., Sexton, J. M., Bergstrom, C. M., & Riggs, E. M. (2019). A quantitative investigation of geoscience departmental factors associated with the recruitment and retention of female students. Journal of Geoscience Education, 67(3), 266–284.

Ricci, J. L., & Riggs, E. M. (2019). Making a connection to field geoscience for Native American youth through culture, nature, and community. Journal of Geoscience Education, 67(4), 487–504.

Roehrig, G., Campbell, K., Dalbotten, D., & Varma, K. (2012). CYCLES: A culturally-relevant approach to climate change education in native communities. Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 6(1), 73–89.

Rollinson, H., Affaton, P., Ayonghe, S., Tredoux, M., & Walsh, K. (1999). Earth science education in Africa: An overview. Journal of African Earth Sciences, 28(4), 773–776.

Roy, E. C. (2002). Earth science in texas: A progress report. Geotimes, 47(9), 24–25.

Schechter, T. (2020). The interrelationships between social well-being and the learning process in the high school earth science program. Unpublished master's thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science.

Schollaert Uz, S., Ackerman, W., O'Leary, J., Culbertson, B., Rowley, P., & Arkin, P. A. (2014). The effectiveness of science on a sphere stories to improve climate literacy among the general public. Journal of Geoscience Education, 62(3), 485–494.

Semken, S., & Freeman, C. B. (2008). Sense of place in the practice and assessment of place-based science teaching. Science Education, 92(6), 1042–1057.

Semken, S., & García, Á. A. (2021). Synergizing standards-based and place-based science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1–14.

Shah, A. A. (2013). The importance of earth sciences education. Scientific Malaysian, 4.

Shankar, R., Orion, N., & King, C. (2017). Teacher training workshop in India: A report. Journal of Geological Society of India, 89, 217–219.

Skamp, K. (2020). Research in science education (RISE): A review (and story) of research in RISE articles (1994–2018). Research in Science Education, 1–33.

Skamp, K., & Green, J. (2022). Earth system science education and the Australian curriculum the way forward to sustainability part I: Key earth system science ideas. Teaching Science, 68(1), 49–55.

St. John, K., McNeal, K. S., MacDonald, R. H., Kastens, K. A., Bitting, K. S., Cervato, C., McDaris, J. R., Petcovic, H. L., Pyle, E. J., Riggs, E. M., Ryker, K., & Teasdale, R. (2020). A community framework for geoscience education research: Summary and recommendations for future research priorities. Journal of Geo-science Education, 69(1), 2–13.

Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Schellnhuber, H. J., Dube, O. P., Dutreuil, S., Lenton, T. M., & Lubchenco, J. (2020). The emergence and evolution of earth system science. Nature Reviews Earth & Environment, 1(1), 54–63.

Stephenson, R. C. (1964). Teacher-training problems in Earth Science. Journal of Geological Education, 12(2), 74-78.

Stokes, A., Feig, A. D., Atchison, C. L., & Gilley, B. (2019). Making geoscience fieldwork inclusive and accessible for students with disabilities. Geosphere, 15(6), 1809–1825.

Stokes, P. J., Levine, R., & Flessa, K. W. (2015). Choosing the geoscience major: Important factors, race/ethnicity, and gender. Journal of Geoscience Education, 63(3), 250–263.

Taylor, J., Banilower, E., & Clayton, G. (2020). National trends in the formal content preparation of US science teachers: Implications of out-of-field teaching for student outcomes. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(7), 768–779.

van der Hoeven Kraft, K. J. (2017). Developing student interest: An overview of the research and implications for geoscience education research and teaching practice. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 594–603.

Van der Linden, S., Maibach, E., & Leiserowitz, A. (2015). Improving public engagement with climate change: Five "best practice" insights from psychological science. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10(6), 758–763.

Vandegrift, E. V., Beghetto, R. A., Eisen, J. S., O'Day, P. M., Raymer, M. G., & Barber, N. C. (2020). Defining science literacy in general education courses for undergraduate non-science majors. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 20(2), 15–30.

Vasconcelos, C., Torres, J., Vasconcelos, L., & Moutinho, S. (2016). Sustainable development and its connection to teaching geoethics. Episodes: International Journal of Geosciences, 39(3), 509–517.

Vasconcelos, C., & Orion, N. (2021). Earth science education as a key component of education for sustainability. Sustainability, 13, 1316. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031316

Vasconcelos, C., Schneider-Voß, S., & Peppoloni, S. (Eds.) (2020). Teaching geoethics: Resources for higher education. U.Porto Edicões.

Vo, T., Forbes, C. T., Zangori, L., & Schwarz, C. V. (2015). Fostering third-grade students' use of scientific models with the water cycle: Elementary teachers' conceptions and practices. International Journal of Science Education, 37(15), 2411–2432.

Ward, E. M. G., Semken, S., & Libarkin, J. C. (2014). The design of place-based, culturally informed geoscience assessment. Journal of Geoscience Education, 62(1), 86–103.

Weiss, Iris R., Knapp, Michael S., Hollweg, Karen S., & Burrill, Gail. (2011). Investigating the influence of standards: A framework for research in mathematics, science, and technology education. National Academy Press.

Wilson, C. (2019). Status of the geoscience workforce 2018. American Geosciences Institute.

Wilson, S. (2001). What is an indigenous research methodology? Canadian Journal of Native Education, 25(2), 175-179.

Wysession, M. E. (2014). The next generation science standards: A potential revolution for geoscience education. Earth's Future, 2(5), 299–302.

Zhao, Y. (2020). COVID-19 as a catalyst for educational change. Prospects, 49(1), 29–33.

Environmental Education

Aarnio-Linnanvuori, E. (2019). How do teachers perceive environmental responsibility? Environmental Education Research, 25(1), 46–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2018.1506910

Achiam, M., Dillon, J., & Glackin, M. (Eds.). (2021). Addressing wicked problems: The role of out-of-school science education. Springer.

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

Aikenhead, G. S. (2007). Expanding the research agenda for scientific literacy. In C. Linder (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction. Geotryckeriet.

Apple, J., Lemus, J., & Semken, S. (2014a). Teaching geoscience in the context of culture and place. Journal of Geoscience Education, 62, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.5408/1089-9995-62.1.1

Apple, J., Lemus, J., & Semken, S. (2014b). Teaching geoscience in the context of culture and place: Theme issue continued. Journal of Geoscience Education, 62, 157. https://doi.org/10.5408/1089-9995-62.2.157

Ardoin, N. M., & Bowers, A. W. (2020). Early childhood environmental education: A systematic review of the research literature. Educational Research Review, 31, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100353

Ardoin, N. M., Bowers, A. W., Roth N. W., & Holthuis, N. (2018). Environmental education and K-12 student outcomes: A review and analysis of research. The Journal of Environmental Education, 49(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2017.1366155
Ashbaugh, B. L. (1970). Interpretive research directions. Environmental Education, 1(3), 77–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/00139254.1970.10801497

Ashley, M. (2005). Tensions between indoctrination and the development of judgment: The case against early closure. Environmental Education Research, 11(2), 187–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350462042000338351

Ballantyne, R. (2004). Young students' conceptions of the marine environment and their role in the development of aquaria exhibits. GeoJournal, 60(2), 159–163. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:GEJO.0000033579.19277.ff

Bauman, Z. (1993). Postmodern ethics. Blackwell.

Belden Russonello & Stewart and American Viewpoint . (1999). Review of existing public opinion data on oceans. https://theoceanproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Review-of-Existing-Public-Opinion-Data-on-Oceans-1999.pdf Bencze, L., Pouliot, C., Pedretti, E., Simonneaux, L., Simonneaux, J., & Zeidler, D. (2020). SAQ, SSI and STSE education: Defending and extending "science-in-context". Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15, 825–851. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09962-7

Bidwell, D. (2017). Ocean beliefs and support for an offshore wind energy project. Ocean & Coastal Management, 146, 99–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2017.06.012

Birmingham, D., & Barton, A. C. (2014). Putting on a green carnival: Youth taking educated action on socioscientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(3), 286–314. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21127

Blumstein, D. T., & Saylan, C. (2007). The failure of environmental education (and how we can fix it). PLoS Biology, 5(5), e120. https://doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050120

Blye, C. J., & Halpenny, E. (2020). Do Canadians leave no trace? Understanding leave no trace attitudes of frontcountry and backcountry overnight visitors to Canadian provincial parks. Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2019.100258

Bord, R. J., Fisher, A., & O'Connor, R. E. (1998). Public perceptions of global warming: United States and international perspectives. Climate Research, 11(1), 75–84

Borg, C., Gericke, N., Höglund, H. O., & Bergman, E. (2014). Subject- and experience-bound differences in teachers' conceptual understanding of sustainable development. Environmental Education Research, 20(4), 526–551. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2013.833584

Capkinoglu, E., Yilmaz, S., & Leblebicioglu, G. (2019). Quality of argumentation by seventh- graders in local socioscientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 827–855. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21609.

Carson, R. (1962). Silent spring. Houghton-Mifflin.

Carson, S. (1978). Environmental education: Principles and practice. Edward Arnold.

Cava, F. (2002). Promoting ocean literacy in the classroom. California Journal of Science Education, 3(1), 49-63.

 $\label{lem:cava} \textbf{Cava}, \textbf{F.} \ , \textbf{Schoedinger}, \textbf{S.} \ , \textbf{Strang}, \textbf{C.} \ , \textbf{\&} \ \textbf{Tuddenham}, \textbf{P.} \ (2005). \ \textbf{Science content and standards for ocean literacy: A report on ocean literacy. http://cosee-ne.cosee.net/about/documents/OLitFinalReport.pdf$

Centers for Ocean Sciences Education Excellence (COSEE) (2005). Ocean literacy: The essential principles of ocean sciences K-12. COSEE.

Chang, C. H., & Pascua, L. (2017). The curriculum of climate change education: A case for Singapore. The Journal of Environmental Education, 48(3), 172–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2017.1289883

Chawla, L. , & Cushing, D. (2007). Education for strategic environmental behaviour. Environmental Education Research, 13(4), 437-452. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620701581539

Chen, C. L., & Tsai, C. H. (2016). Marine environmental awareness among university students in Taiwan: a potential signal for sustainability of the oceans. Environmental Education Research, 22(7), 958–977. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2015.1054266 Clark, C. R., Heimlich, J. E., Ardoin, N. M., & Braus, J. (2020). Using a Delphi study to clarify the landscape and core outcomes in environmental education. Environmental Education Research, 26(3), 381–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1727859 Clark, H. F., Sandoval, W. A., & Kawasaki, J. N. (2020). Teachers' uptake of problematic assumptions of climate change in the NGSS. Environmental Education Research, 26(8), 1177–1192. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1748175

Cudaback, C. (2006). What do college students know about the ocean? Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union, 87(40), 418-421. https://doi.org/10.1029/2006EO400003

Cushman, Jr., J. H. (1997, April 22). Critics rise up against environmental education. The New York Times. www.nytimes.com/1997/04/22/us/critics-rise-up-against-environmental-education.html

- Davis, J. (2005). Educating for sustainability in the early years: Creating cultural change in a child care setting. Australian Journal of Environmental Education, 21, 47–55. www.jstor.org/stable/44656437
- de Leeuw, A., Valois, P., Ajzen, I., & Schmidt, P. (2015). Using the theory of planned behavior to identify key beliefs underlying proenvironmental behavior in high-school students: Implications for environmental interventions. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 42, 128–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.03.005
- DeFelice, A., Adams, J. D., Branco, B., & Pieroni, P. (2014). Engaging underrepresented high school students in an urban environmental and geoscience place-based curriculum. Journal of Geoscience Education, 62, 49–60. https://doi.org/10.5408/12-400.1 Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. Macmillan.
- Dillon, J. (2014). Environmental education. In N. Lederman & S. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 497–515). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203097267
- Dillon, J. (2016). 50 Years of JBE: From science and environmental education to civic science. Journal of Biological Education, 50(2), 120–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2016.1175760
- Dillon, J., Stevenson, R. B., & Wals, A. E. (2016). Introduction to the special section: Moving from citizen to civic science to address wicked conservation problems. Conservation Biology, 30(3), 450–455.
- Disinger, J. (1984). Environmental education research news. The Environmentalist, 4, 109–112. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018560202469
- Dupont, S. (2017). I am the ocean: Arts and sciences to move from ocean literacy to passion for the ocean. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 97(6), 1211–1213.
- Dupont, S., & Fauville, G. (2017). Ocean literacy as a key toward sustainable development and ocean governance. In A. L. D., Paulo, L. E. Nunes, L. E. Svensson, & A. Markandya (Eds.), Handbook on the economics and management of sustainable oceans (pp. 519–537). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315417000376
- Durlak, J. A. , Weissberg, R. P. , Dymnicki, A. B. , Taylor, R. D. , & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467–8624.2010.01564.x
- Eisner, E. (1985). The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs (2nd ed.). Macmillan Publishing Co. Elder, J. (1998). Teaching at the edge. In The Orion Society (Ed.), Stories in the land: A place-based environmental education anthology (pp. 1–15). The Orion Society.
- Ennes, M., Lawson, D. F., Stevenson, K. T., Peterson, M. N., & Jones, M. G. (2021). It's about time: Perceived barriers to in-service teacher climate change professional development. Environmental Education Research, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2021.1909708
- Erdogan, M., Kostova, Z., & Marcinkowski, T. (2009). Components of environmental literacy in elementary science education curriculum in Bulgaria and Turkey. Eurasia, 5(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/75253
- Evans, N., Stevenson, R. B., Lasen, M., Ferreira, J. A., & Davis, J. (2017). Approaches to embedding sustainability in teacher education: A synthesis of the literature. Teaching and Teacher Education, 63, 405–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.01.013 Fauville, G. (2017a). Digital technologies as support for learning about the marine environment: Steps toward ocean literacy. Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg. http://hdl.handle.net/2077/53942
- Fauville, G. (2017b). Questions as indicators of ocean literacy: students' online asynchronous discussion with a marine scientist. International Journal of Science Education, 39(16), 2151–2170. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1365184
- Fauville, G. (2019). Ocean literacy in the twenty-first century. In G. Fauville, D. L. Payne, M. E. Marrero, A. Lantz-Andersson, & F. Crouch (Eds.), Exemplary practices in marine science education (pp. 3–11). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90778-9_1 Fauville, G., Queiroz, A. C., Hambrick, L., Brown, B. A., & Bailenson, J. N. (2020). Participatory research on using virtual reality to teach ocean acidification: a study in the marine education community. Environmental Education Research, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1803797
- Fazel, M., Hoagwood, K., Stephan, S., & Ford, T. (2014). Mental health interventions in schools 1: mental health interventions in schools in high-income countries. Lancet Psychiatry, 1(5), 377–387. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(14)70312-8
- Feinstein, N. W., & Kirchgasler, K. L. (2015). Sustainability in science education? How the next generation science standards approach sustainability, and why it matters. Science Education, 99(1), 121–144. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21137
- 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). Routledge.
- Garrison, T. (2007). Ocean literacy: An in-depth top ten. Oceanography 20(1), 198-199.
- www.tos.org/oceanography/issues/issue_archive/20_1.html
- Gifford, R. (2011). The dragons of inaction: Psychological barriers that limit climate change mitigation and adaptation. American Psychologist, 66(4), 290–302. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023566
- Gifford, R., & Nilsson, A. (2014). Personal and social factors that influence pro-environmental concern and behaviour: A review. International Journal of Psychology, 49(3), 141–157. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12034
- Goralnik, L., & Nelson, M. P. (2015). Empathy and agency in the Isle Royale field philosophy experience. Journal of Sustainability Education, 10(4). www.susted.com/wordpress/content/empathy-and-agency-in-the-isle-royale-field-philosophy-experience_2015_12/Goralnik, L., & Nelson, M. P. (2017). Field philosophy: Environmental learning and moral development in Isle Royale National Park. Environmental Education Research, 23(5), 687–707. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2015.1074661
- Gough, A. (2013). 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). Routledge.
- Gough, A. (2016). Environmental sustainability in schools. Tensions around the teaching of environmental sustainability in schools. In T. Barkatsas & A. Bertram (Eds.), Global learning in the 21st century (pp. 83–102). Sense. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-761-0 6
- Grahn, P., Mårtensson, F., Lindblad, B., Nilsson, P., & Ekman, A. (1997). Ute på dagis [Outdoors at daycare]. Stad och Land [City and country], No. 145. Norra Skåne Offset.
- Greely, T. (2008). Ocean literacy and reasoning about ocean issues: The influence of content, experience and morality. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida.
- https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar.google.co.uk/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=sole+surv

- ey+of+ocean+literacy&btnG=&httpsredir=1&article=1270&context=etd
- Greely, T. M., & Lodge, A. (2009). Measuring ocean literacy: What teens understand about the ocean using the survey of ocean literacy and engagement (SOLE). American Geophysical Union, Fall Meeting 2009, abstract id. ED32A-08.
- Gruenewald, D. A., & Smith, G. A. (Eds.). (2014). Place-based education in the global age: Local diversity. Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315769844
- Gunckel, K. L., Covitt, B. A., & Salinas, I. (2018). Learning progressions as tools for supporting teacher content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge about water in environmental systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(9), 1339–1362. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21454
- Hall, C., Easley, R., Howard, J., & Halfhide, T. (2013). The role of authentic science research and education outreach in increasing community resilience: Case studies using informal education to address ocean acidification and healthy soils. In H. E. Muga & K. D. Thomas (Eds.), Cases on the diffusion and adoption of sustainable development practices (pp. 376–402). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-2842-7.ch014
- Hamilton-Smith, E. (2011). Review: The failure of environmental education (and how we can fix It) by Charles Saylan & Daniel T. Blumstein. Electronic Green Journal, 32. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/81x260wg
- Hart, P. (2007). Environmental education. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 689–726). Routledge.
- Harvester, L., & Blenkinsop, S. (2010). Environmental education and ecofeminist pedagogy: bridging the environmental and the social. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 15, 120–134.
- Hawkey, K., James, J., & Tidmarsh, C. (2019). Using wicked problems to foster interdisciplinary practice among UK trainee teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 45(4), 446–460. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2019.1639263
- Herman, B. C. (2018). Students' environmental NOS views, compassion, intent, and action: Impact of place-based socioscientific issues instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(4), 600–638. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21433
- Herman, B. C., Feldman, A., & Vernaza-Hernandez, V. (2017). Florida and Puerto Rico secondary science teachers' climate change conceptions and teaching practices. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 15(3), 451–471. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-015-9706-6
- Herman, B. C., Newton, M. H., & Zeider, D. (2021). Impact of place-based socioscientific issues instruction on students' contextualization of socioscientific orientations. Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21618.
- Herman, B. C., Owens, D. C., Oertli, R. T., Zangori, L. A., & Newton, M. H. (2019). Exploring the complexity of students' scientific explanations and associated NOS views within a place-based socioscientific issue context. Science and Education, 28(3), 329–366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00034-4
- Herman, B. C., Sadler T. D., Zeidler D. L., & Newton, M. H. (2018). A socioscientific issues approach to environmental education. In G. Reis, & J. Scott (Eds.), International perspectives on the theory and practice of environmental education: A reader. Environmental discourses in science education (Vol. 3, pp. 145–161). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67732-3 11
- Herman, B. C., Zeidler, D. L., & Newton, M. H. (2020). Emotive reasoning through place-based environmental socioscientific issues. Research in Science Education. 50, 2081–2109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9764-1
- Hesselink, F., van Kempen, P. P., & Wals, A. E. J. (2000). ESDebate: International on-line debate on education for sustainable development. IUCN.
- Hodson, D. (2009). Teaching and learning about science: Language, theories, methods, history, traditions and values. Sense. Hodson, D. (2011). Looking to the future: Building a curriculum for social activism. Sense.
- Howard-Jones, P., Sands, D., Dillon, J., & Fenton-Jones, F. (2021). The views of teachers in England on an action-oriented climate change curriculum. Environmental Education Research, 27(11), 1660–1680.
- Howell, R. A., & Allen, S. (2019). Significant life experiences, motivations and values of climate change educators. Environmental Education Research, 25(6), 813–831. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2016.1158242
- Hufnagel, E. (2015). Preservice elementary teachers' emotional connections and disconnections to climate change in a science course. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(9), 1296–1324. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21245
- Hufnagel, E., Kelly, G. J., & Henderson, J. A. (2018). How the environment is positioned in the next generation science standards: A critical discourse analysis. Environmental Education Research, 24(5), 731–753. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1334876
- Johnson, D., & Potts, J. (2002). Planet ocean: Interpreting the lure of the sea at the UK National Maritime Museum. In F. Gomes, F. Taveira Pinto, & L. da Neves (Eds.), Littoral 2002: 6th International Symposium Proceedings: A Multi-Disciplinary Symposium on Coastal Zone Research, Management and Planning, Porto, 22–26 September 2002 (Vol. 1, pp. 41–49). Universidad de Guadalajara.
- Johnson, D., & Potts, J. (2004). Raising awareness of the need to conserve coasts and oceans: The role of museums and aquaria. In Littoral 2004: 7th international symposium: delivering sustainable coasts: Connecting science and policy (pp. 310–315). Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, D., & Potts, J. (2006). Public education: Seeking to engender marine stewardship at the UK National Maritime Museum. Ocean Yearbook Online, 20(1), 623–642.
- Kagawa, F., & Selby, D. (2009). Education and climate change: Living and learning in interesting times. Routledge.
- Kagubare, I. (2019, February 8). Some states still lag in teaching climate science. Scientific American E&E News. www.scientificamerican.com/article/some-states-still-lag-in-teaching-climate-science.
- Keener-Chavis, P., Hotaling, L., & Haynes, S. (2009). The NOAA Ship Okeanos Explorer: Continuing to unfold the president's panel on ocean exploration recommendation for ocean literacy. Marine Technology Society Journal, 43(2), 73–80. https://doi.org/10.1109/OCEANS.2008.5152101
- Kenis, A., & Mathijs, E. (2012). Beyond individual behaviour change: the role of power, knowledge and strategy in tackling climate change. Environmental Education Research, 18(1), 45–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2011.576315
- Kerr, K. (2016). Science learning in the outdoors to support primary-secondary transition. School Science Review, 98(362), 27–32.
- Kerr, K. (2020). Teacher development through coteaching outdoor science and environmental education across the elementary-middle school transition. The Journal of Environmental Education, 51(1), 29–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2019.1604482
- Kim, G., Ko, Y., & Lee, H. (2020). The effects of community-based socioscientific issues program (SSICOMM) on promoting students' sense of place and character as citizens. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17(4), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-019-09976-1

- Klöckner, C. A. (2013). A comprehensive model of the psychology of environmental behaviour. A meta-analysis. Global Environmental Change, 23(5), 1028–1038. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.05.014
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620220145401
- Korteweg, L., & Russell, C. (2012). Decolonizing + Indigenizing = Moving environmental education towards reconciliation. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 17, 5–14.
- Lawson, D. F., Stevenson, K. T., Peterson, M. N., Carrier, S. J., Strnad, L. R., & Seekamp, E. (2019). Children can foster climate change concern among their parents. Nature Climate Change, 9(6), 458–462. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0463-3
- Leitão, R., Maguire, M., Turner, S., Guimarães, L., & Arenas, F. (2018, March). Ocean literacy and information sources:
- Comparison between pupils in Portugal and the UK. In Proceedings of INTED2018 Conference, Valencia (pp. 5058–5067).
- Leopold, A. (1949). A sand county almanac. Oxford University Press.
- Lin, C.-I., & Li, Y.-Y. (2017). An auto-photographic study of undergraduate students' conceptions of ocean sustainability. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 18(4), 554–575. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-11-2015-0182
- Lovell, R. (2021). What works in school based natural environment interventions: A scoping review. Defra.
- Lowan-Trudeau, G. (2019). From reticence to resistance: understanding educators' engagement with indigenous environmental issues in Canada. Environmental Education Research, 25(1), 62–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1422114
- Lucas, A. M. (1979). Environment and environmental education: Conceptual issues and curriculum implications. Australian International Press and Publications.
- Lucas, A. M. (1980). Science and environmental education: Pious hopes, self praise and disciplinary chauvinism. Studies in Science Education 7, 1–26.
- Lundholm, C. (2019). Where to look and what to do? Blank and bright spots in research on environmental and climate change education. Environmental Education Research, 25(10), 1427–1437. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2019.1700066
- Maharramli, B. J., & Houston, D. (2021). Navigating inclusion and legitimacy in campus-community environmental partnerships to advance urban social-ecological resilience. Environmental Education Research, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2021.1897528
- 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). North American Association for Environmental Education.
- Marcinkowski, T., & Reid, A. (2019). Reviews of research on the attitude behavior relationship and their implications for future environmental education research. Environmental Education Research, 25(4), 459–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2019.1634237
- Marrero, M. E., & Mensah, F. M. M. (2010). Socioscientific decision making and the ocean: A case study of 7th grade life science students. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 14(1), 1–27.
- Martin, G., & Wheeler, K. (Eds.). (1975). Insights into environmental education. Oliver & Boyd.
- McNeill, K. L., Lizotte, D. J., Krajcik, J., & Marx, R. W. (2006). Supporting students' construction of scientific explanations by fading scaffolds in instructional materials. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15(2), 153–191. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327809jls1502 1
- Michel, J. O., & Zwickle, A. (2021). The effect of information source on higher education students' sustainability knowledge. Environmental Education Research, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2021.1897527
- Monroe, M. C., Plate, R. R., Oxarart, A., Bowers, A., & Chaves, W. A. (2017). Identifying effective climate change education strategies: a systematic review of the research. Environmental Education Research, 25(6), 791–812. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1360842
- Mónus, F. (2020). Environmental perceptions and pro-environmental behavior comparing different measuring approaches. Environmental Education Research, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1842332
- National Library of Scotland (n.d.). Patrick Geddes (1854–1932). www.nls.uk/learning-zone/politics-and-society/patrick-geddes/ National Research Council (NRC) . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. The National Academy Press.
- Ngcoza, K. M. (2019). Education for sustainable development at the problem-posing nexus of re-appropriated heritage practices and the science curriculum. Southern African Journal of Environmental Education, 35, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajee.v35i1.9
- NGSS Lead States. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academy Press.
- NPR/IPSOS . (2019). Teachers agree that climate change is real and should be taught in schools.
- www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2019-04/npr_teachers_climate_change_topline_april_22_2019.pdf Nyarko, S. C., & Petcovic, H. L. (2021). Ghanaian preservice science teachers' knowledge of ozone depletion and climate change,
- and sources of their knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 1–§22. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1922779 Ohly, H., Gentry, S., Wigglesworth, R., Bethel, A., Lovell, R., & Garside, R. (2016). A systematic review of the health and well-being impacts of school gardening: Synthesis of quantitative and qualitative evidence. BMC Public Health, 16, 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-2941-0
- Ojala, M. (2012). Regulating worry, promoting hope: How do children, adolescents, and young adults cope with climate change? International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 7, 537–561.
- Ojala, M. (2013). Emotional awareness: On the importance of including emotional aspects in education for sustainable development (ESD). Journal of Education for Sustainable Development, 7(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/0973408214526488
- Ojala, M. (2015). Hope in the face of climate change: Associations with environmental engagement and student perceptions of teachers' emotion communication style and future orientation. The Journal of Environmental Education, 46(3), 133–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2015.1021662
- Pacifici, L., & Garrison, J. (2004). Imagination, emotion, and inquiry: The teachable moment. Contemporary Pragmatism, 1(1), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.1163/18758185-90000131
- Pfattheicher, S., Sassenrath, C., & Schindler, S. (2016). Feelings for the suffering of others and the environment: Compassion fosters proenvironmental tendencies. Environment and Behavior, 48(7) 929–945. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916515574549 Plumwood, V. (1991). Nature, self, and gender: Feminism, environmental philosophy, and the critique of rationalism. Hypatia, 6(1), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315239897-13

- Pooley, J. A., & O'Connor, M. (2000). Environmental education and attitudes: Emotions and beliefs are what is needed. Environment and Behavior, 32, 711–723. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916500325007
- Pritchard, T. (1968). Environmental education: Its social relevance in north-west Europe (pp. 21–36). European Committee for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.
- Quigley, C. (2016). Emotions in teaching environmental science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(3), 817–822. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9657-1
- Reid, A. (2019). Blank, blind, bald and bright spots in environmental education research. Environmental Education Research, 25(2), 157–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2019.1615735
- Reid, A., & Dillon, J. (2017). Environmental education. Routledge.
- Rickinson, M., Dillon, J., Teamey, K., Morris, M., Choi, M. Y., Sanders, D., & Benefield, P. (2004). A review of research on outdoor learning. Field Studies Council.
- 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). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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). Routledge.
- 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. Deakin University Press.
- Rosenberg, E., & Togo, M. (2017). Journal development, scholar development and quality. Southern African Journal of Environmental Education, 33, 9–13. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajee.v.33i1.1
- Rousell, D., & Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles, A. (2020). A systematic review of climate change education: giving children and young people a 'voice' and a 'hand' in redressing climate change. Children's Geographies, 18(2), 191–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2019.1614532
- Russ, A., Peters, S. J., Krasny, M. E., & Stedman, R. C. (2015). Development of ecological place meaning in New York City. The Journal of Environmental Education, 46(2), 73–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2014.999743
- Russell, C., & Oakley, J. (2016). Engaging the emotional dimensions of environmental education. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education. 21. 13–22.
- Sadler, K., Vizard, T., Ford, T., Marcheselli, F., Pearce, N., Mandalia, D., Davis, J., Brodie, E., Forbes, N., Goodman, A., Goodman, R., & McManus, S. (2018). Mental health of children and young people in England, 2017: Summary of key findings. Office for National Statistics.
- Sahin, E., Alper, U., & Oztekin, C. (2020). Modelling pre-service science teachers' pro-environmental behaviours in relation to psychological and cognitive variables. Environmental Education Research, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1812538 Sanera, M. (2008). The problem with environmental education today: Is the tail wagging the dog? 2008 Free Market Forum. www.hillsdale.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/FMF-2008-The-Problem-with-Environmental-Education.pdf
- Sanera, M., & Shaw, J. S. (1996). Facts, not fear: A parent's guide to teaching children about the environment. Regnery Publishing. Sanson, A. V., Burke, S. E. L., & Van Hoorn, J. (2018). Climate change: Implications for parents and parenting. Parenting-Science and Practice, 18(3), 200–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2018.1465307
- Saylan, C., & Blumstein, D. (2011). The failure of environmental education (and how we can fix it). University of California Press. Schoedinger, S. F. Cava, F., Strang, C., & Tuddenham, P. (2005). Ocean literacy through science standards. Proceedings of OCEANS 2005 MTS/IEEE (*Volume* 1), 736–740. https://doi.org/10.1109/OCEANS.2005.1639840
- Schoedinger, S., Tran, L. U., & Whitley, L. (2010). From the principles to the scope and sequence: A brief history of the Ocean Literacy Campaign. In C. Strang & L. U. Tran (Eds.) NMEA special report #3 (pp. 3–7). National Marine Educators Association. Schreiner, C., Henriksen, E. K., & Kirkeby Hansen, P. J. (2005). Climate education: Empowering today's youth to meet tomorrow's challenges. Studies in Science Education, 41(1), 3–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057260508560213
- Scott, W., & Gough, S. (2003). Sustainable development and learning. Framing the issues. RoutledgeFalmer. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203464625
- 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, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-63550-4
- Semken, S., & Butler Freeman, C. (2008). Sense of place in the practice and assessment of place-based science teaching. Science Education, 92(6), 1042–1057. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20279
- Semken, S., Ward, E. G., Moosavi, S., & Chinn, P. W. U. (2018). Place-based education in geoscience: Theory, research, practice, and assessment. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 542–562. https://doi.org/10.5408/17-276.1
- Shealy, T., Katz, A., & Godwin, A. (2021). Predicting engineering students' desire to address climate change in their careers: an exploratory study using responses from a US National survey. Environmental Education Research, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2021.1921112
- Silvertown, J. (2009). A new dawn for citizen science. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 24(9), 467–471.
- Siperstein, J. (2015). Finding hope and gratitude in the climate change classroom. Journal of Sustainability Education, 10.
- Sjöström J., & Eilks, I. (2018). Reconsidering different visions on scientific literacy and science education based on the concept of bildung. In Y. J. Dori, Z. R. Mevarech, & D. R. Baker (Eds.), Cognition, metacognition, and culture in STEM education (Vol. 24, pp. 65–88). Springer.
- Skamp, K., & Bergmann, I. (2001). Facilitating Learnscape development, maintenance and use: Teachers' perceptions and self-reported practices. Southern Cross University, School of Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620120081241
- Sobel, D. (2004). Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities. The Orion Society.
- Spector, B. S. (1979, February 21–22). Proceedings of national sea grant college program marine education leaders' meeting. NOAA. Spector, B. S. (1980). Marine literacy: An attainable goal. Marine Technology Society Journal, 14(3), 31–35.
- Stables, A. (1998). Environmental Literacy: Functional, cultural, critical. The case of the SCAA guidelines. Environmental Education Research, 4(2), 155–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350462980040203
- Stapp, W. B. (1969). The concept of environmental education. Environmental Education, 1(1), 30–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/00139254.1969.10801479

- Stapp, W. B., Bennett, D., Bryan, W., Fulton, J., MacGregor, J., Nowak, P., Swan, J., Wall, R., & Havlick, S. (1970). The concept of environmental education. Education Digest, 35(7), 8–10.
- Sterling, S. (2005). Linkingthinking: New perspectives on thinking and learning for sustainability. WWF Scotland.
- Sterling, S. R. (1992). Coming of age: A short history of environmental education (to 1989). National Association for Environmental Education.
- Stock, J. (2010). Identifying obstacles to incorporating ocean content into California secondary classrooms. Master's thesis, Dominican University of California. https://doi.org/10.33015/dominican.edu/2010.edu.01
- Strang, C., DeCharon, A., & Schoedinger, S. (2007). Can you be science literate without being ocean literate. Current: The Journal of Marine Education, 23(1), 7–9. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.30563
- Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) . (2015). Indicators and a monitoring framework for the sustainable development goals: Launching a data revolution for the SDGs. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2013150612-FINAL-SDSN-Indicator-Report1.pdf
- Swan, J. A. (2010). Transpersonal psychology and the ecological conscience. www.jamesswan.com/article-transpersonal psychology and the ecological conscience.html
- Symons, G. (2000). Commitment to sustainable development: A rationale for the curriculum? Primary Teaching Studies, 11(2), 23–29. Tal, T., Lavie Alon, N., & Morag, O. (2014). Exemplary practices in field trips to natural environments. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(4), 430–461. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21137
- Trott, C. D. (2019a). Children's constructive climate change engagement: Empowering awareness, agency, and action. Environmental Education Research, 23. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2019.1675594
- Trott, C. D. (2019b). Reshaping our world: Collaborating with children for community-based climate change action. Action Research, 17(1), 42–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750319829209
- UNESCO . (1978). Intergovernmental conference on environmental education: Tbilisi (USSR), 14–26 October 1977 (Final Report). UNESCO.
- UNESCO-EPD . (1997). Declaration of Thessaloniki. UNESCO Publication No. EPD-97/CONF.401/CLD.Z. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000117772
- Uyarra, M. C., & Borja, A. (2016). Ocean literacy: A 'new' socio-ecological concept for a sustainable use of the seas. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 1(104), 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.02.060
- Valdez, R. X., Peterson, M. N., & Stevenson, K. T. (2018). How communication with teachers, family and friends contributes to predicting climate change behaviour among adolescents. Environmental Conservation, 45(2), 183–191. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0376892917000443
- Vander Ploeg, K. A., Maximova, K., McGavock, J., Davis, W., & Veugelers, P. (2014). Do school-based physical activity interventions increase or reduce inequalities in health? Social Science & Medicine, 112, 80–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.04.032
- Viner, R., Ward, J., Cheung, R., Wolfe, I., & Hargreaves, D. (2018). Child health in 2030 in England: comparisons with other wealthy countries. State of Child Health short report series. Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health.
- Wagner, J. (1993). Ignorance in educational research: or, how can you *not* know that? Educational Researcher, 22(5), 15–23. https://doi.org/10.2307/1176947
- Wals, A. E. J., Brody, M., Dillon, J., & Stevenson, R. B. (2014). Convergence between science and environmental education. Science, 344, 583–584. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1250515
- Wals, A. E. J., & Jickling, B. (2000). Process-based environmental education: setting standards without standardizing. In B. B. Jensen, K. Schnack, & V. Simovska (Eds.) Critical environmental and health education (pp. 127–148). 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). Human Sciences Research Council.
- Warren, K. J. (1990). The power and promise of ecological feminism. Environmental Ethics, 12(2), 125–146. https://doi.org/10.5840/enviroethics199012221
- Weare, K., & Nind, M. (2011). Mental health promotion and problem prevention in schools: what does the evidence say? Health Promotion International, 26(suppl 1), i29–i69. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dar075
- Webster, C. (Ed.). (1970). Samuel Hartlib and the advancement of learning. Cambridge University Press.
- Wheeler, K. (1975). The genesis of environmental education. In G. C. Martin, & K. Wheeler (Eds.), Insights into environmental education (pp. 2–20). Oliver and Boyd.
- Wheeler, K. (1985). International environmental education: A historical perspective. Environmental Education and Information, 4(2), 144–160.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). (1987). Our common future. Oxford University Press.
- Wyles, K. J., Pahl, S., & Thompson, R. C. (2014). Perceived risks and benefits of recreational visits to the marine environment: Integrating impacts on the environment and impacts on the visitor. Ocean & Coastal Management, 88, 53–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.10.005
- Wynes, S., & Nicholas, K. A. (2017). The climate mitigation gap: education and government recommendations miss the most effective individual actions. Environmental Research Letters, 12(7), 074024. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa7541
- Yacoubian, H. A. (2018). Scientific literacy for democratic decision-making. International Journal of Science Education, 40(3), 308–327
- YouGov . (2019). YouGov International Climate Change Survey.
- https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/i6swtiz9ta/YG-Archive-02012020-OxfamClimateCrisis.pdf
- Zeidler, D. (2016). STEM education: A deficit framework for the twenty first century? A sociocultural socioscientific response. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(1), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9578-z
- Zeidler, D. L., Herman, B. C., & Sadler, T. D. (2019). New directions in socioscientific issues research. Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research, 1, 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-019-0008-7
- Zeidler, D. L., Herman, B. C., Clough, M. P., Olson, J. K., Kahn, S., & Newton, M. (2016). Humanitas emptor: Reconsidering recent trends and policy in science teacher education, Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(5), 465–476. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-016-9481-4

Scientific Inquiry Literacy

- 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.
- Allchin, D. (2012). Teaching the nature of science through scientific errors. Science Education, 96(5), 904–926.
- Archila, P. A., Molina, J., & Truscott de Mejía, A. M. (2018). Using formative assessment to promote argumentation in a university bilingual science course. International Journal of Science Education, 40(13), 1669–1695.
- Archila, P. A., Molina, J., & Truscott de Mejía, A. M. (2020). Using historical scientific controversies to promote undergraduates' argumentation. Science & Education, 29(3), 647–671.
- Arias, A. M., Davis, E. A., Marino, J. C., Kademian, S. M., & Palincsar, A. S. (2016). Teachers' use of educative curriculum materials to engage students in science practices. International Journal of Science Education, 38(9), 1504–1526.
- Arnold, J. C., Kremer, K., & Mayer, J. (2014). Understanding students' experiments: What kind of support do they need in inquiry tasks?. International Journal of Science Education, 36(16), 2719–2749.
- Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Malzahn, K. A., Plumley, C. L., Gordon, E. M., & Hayes, M. L. (2018). Report of the 2018 NSSME+. Horizon Research, Inc. http://horizon-research.com/NSSME/2018-nssme/research-products/reports/technical-report
- Bartos, S. A., & Lederman, N. G. (2014). Teachers' knowledge structures for nature of science and scientific inquiry: Conceptions and classroom practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(9), 1150–1184.
- Bathgate, M., Crowell, A., Schunn, C., Cannady, M., & Dorph, R. (2015). The learning benefits of being willing and able to engage in scientific argumentation. International Journal of Science Education, 37(10), 1590–1612.
- Baytelman, A., lordanou, K., & Constantinou, C. P. (2020). Epistemic beliefs and prior knowledge as predictors of the construction of different types of arguments on socioscientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(8), 1199–1227.
- Benedict-Chambers, A., Kademian, S. M., Davis, E. A., & Palincsar, A. S. (2017). Guiding students towards sensemaking: teacher questions focused on integrating scientific practices with science content. International Journal of Science Education, 39(15), 1977–2001.
- Berland, L. K., Schwarz, C. V., Krist, C., Kenyon, L., Lo, A. S., & Reiser, B. J. (2016). Epistemologies in practice: Making scientific practices meaningful for students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(7), 1082–1112.
- Blanco-Anaya, P., Justi, R., & Díaz de Bustamante, J. (2017). Challenges and opportunities in analysing students modelling. International Journal of Science Education, 39(3), 377–402.
- Bruckermann, T., Aschermann, E., Bresges, A., & Schlüter, K. (2017). Metacognitive and multimedia support of experiments in inquiry learning for science teacher preparation. International Journal of Science Education, 39(6), 701–722.
- Bryce, N., Wilmes, S. E., & Bellino, M. (2016). Inquiry identity and science teacher professional development. Cultural Studies of Science Education. 11(2), 235–251.
- Buck, Z. E., Lee, H. S., & Flores, J. (2014). I am sure there may be a planet there: Student articulation of uncertainty in argumentation tasks. International Journal of Science Education, 36(14), 2391–2420.
- Bybee, R. W. (1995). Achieving scientific literacy. The Science Teacher, 62(7), 28.
- Bybee, R. W. (2006). Scientific inquiry and science teaching. In L. B. Flick, & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Scientific inquiry and nature of science: Implications for teaching, learning and teacher education (pp. 1–14). Springer.
- Campbell, T., & Fazio, X. (2020). Epistemic frames as an analytical framework for understanding the representation of scientific activity in a modeling-based learning unit. Research in Science Education, 50(6), 2283–2304.
- 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(3), 291–318.
- Chen, Y. C. (2020). Dialogic pathways to manage uncertainty for productive engagement in scientific argumentation. Science & Education, 29(2), 331–375.
- Chen, Y. C., & Qiao, X. (2020). Using students' epistemic uncertainty as a pedagogical resource to develop knowledge in argumentation. International Journal of Science Education, 42(13), 2145–2180.
- Chen, Y. C., Aguirre-Mendez, C., & Terada, T. (2020). Argumentative writing as a tool to develop conceptual and epistemic knowledge in a college chemistry course designed for non-science majors. International Journal of Science Education, 42(17), 2842–2875.
- Chen, Y. C., Benus, M. J., & Hernandez, J. (2019). Managing uncertainty in scientific argumentation. Science Education, 103(5), 1235–1276.
- Chen, Y. C., Hand, B., & Park, S. (2016). Examining elementary students' development of oral and written argumentation practices through argument-based inquiry. Science & Education, 25(3), 277–320.
- Chi, S., Liu, Z., Wang, Z., & Won Han, S. (2018). Moderation of the effects of scientific inquiry activities on low SES students: PISA 2015 science achievement by school teacher support and disciplinary climate in science classroom across gender. International Journal of Science Education, 40(11), 1284–1304
- Chi, S., Wang, Z., & Liu, X. (2019). Investigating disciplinary context effect on student scientific inquiry competence. International Journal of Science Education, 41(18), 2736–2764.
- Christodoulou, A., & Osborne, J. (2014). The science classroom as a site of epistemic talk: A case study of a teacher's attempts to teach science based on argument. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(10), 1275–1300.
- Cigdemoğlu, C., & Köseoğlu, F. (2019). Improving science teachers' views about scientific inquiry. Science & Education, 28, 439–469.
- Collins, L., Cavagnetto, A., Ferry, N., Adesope, O., Baldwin, K., Morrison, J., & Premo, J. (2019). May I have your attention: An analysis of teacher responses during A multi-year professional learning program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(6), 549–566
- Concannon, J. P. , Brown, P. L. , Lederman, N. G. , & Lederman, J. S. (2020). Investigating the development of secondary students' views about scientific inquiry. International Journal of Science Education, 42(6), 906-933.
- Cox, B., & Forshaw, J. (2009). Why does E=mc2? Harchette Books.
- Crawford, B. (2014). From inquiry to scientific practices in the science classroom. In N. Lederman & S. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II). Routledge.

- Crujeiras-Pérez, B., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2019). Students' progression in monitoring anomalous results obtained in inquiry-based laboratory tasks. Research in Science Education, 49(1), 243–264.
- De Andrade, V., Freire, S., & Baptista, M. (2019). Constructing scientific explanations: a system of analysis for students' explanations. Research in Science Education, 49(3), 787–807.
- Dean, C. (2017). Making Sense of Science: Separating substance from spin. Harvard University Press.
- Di Mauro, M. F., & Furman, M. (2016). Impact of an inquiry unit on grade 4 students' science learning. International Journal of Science Education, 38(14), 2239–2258.
- Dini, V., Jaber, L., & Danahy, E. (2021). Dynamics of scientific engagement in a blended online learning environment. Research in Science Education, 51(2), 439–467.
- Driver, R., Leach, J., & Millar, R. (1996). Young people's images of science. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Duncan, R. G., Chinn, C. A., & Barzilai, S. (2018). Grasp of evidence: Problematizing and expanding the next generation science standards' conceptualization of evidence. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 907–937.
- Dunlop, L., van Turkenburg Diepen, M., Knox, K. J., & Bennett, J. (2020). Open-ended investigations in high school science: Teacher learning intentions, approaches and perspectives. International Journal of Science Education, 42(10), 1715–1738.
- Eliyahu, E. B., Assaraf, O. B. Z., & Lederman, J. S. (2021). Do not just do science inquiry, understand it! The views of scientific
- inquiry of Israeli middle school students enrolled in a scientific reserve course. Research in Science Education, 51(4), 1073–1091. Enderle, P., Dentzau, M., Roseler, K., Southerland, S., Granger, E., Hughes, R., Golden, B., & Saka, Y. (2014). Examining the influence of RETs on science teacher beliefs and practice. Science Education, 98(6), 1077–1108.
- Erduran, S., Dagher, Z. R. (2014). Reconceptualizing nature of science for science education. In Reconceptualizing the nature of science for science education. Contemporary trends and issues in science education (Vol 43). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9057-4 1.
- Fettahlıoğlu, P., & Aydoğdu, M. (2020). Developing environmentally responsible behaviours through the implementation of argumentation-and problem-based learning models. Research in Science Education, 50(3), 987–1025.
- Ford, M. J. (2015). Educational implications of choosing "practice" to describe science in the next generation science standards. Science Education, 99(6), 1041–1048.
- Furtak, E. M., & Penuel, W. R. (2019). Coming to terms: Addressing the persistence of "hands-on" and other reform terminology in the era of science as practice. Science Education, 103(1), 167–186.
- Furtak, E. M., Seidel, T., Iverson, H., & Briggs, D. C. (2012). Experimental and quasi-experimental studies of inquiry-based science teaching: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 82(3), 300–329.
- Gaigher, E., Lederman, N., & Lederman, J. (2014). Knowledge about Inquiry: A study in South African high schools. International Journal of Science Education, 36(18), 3125–3147.
- Göhner, M., & Krell, M. (2020). Preservice science teachers' strategies in scientific reasoning: the case of modeling. Research in Science Education, 1–20.
- González-Howard, M., & McNeill, K. L. (2019). Teachers' framing of argumentation goals: Working together to develop individual versus communal understanding. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(6), 821–844.
- González-Howard, M., & McNeill, K. L. (2020). Acting with epistemic agency: Characterizing student critique during argumentation discussions. Science Education, 104(6), 953–982.
- Grooms, J., Sampson, V., & Enderle, P. (2018). How concept familiarity and experience with scientific argumentation are related to the way groups participate in an episode of argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(9), 1264–1286.
- Großmann, N., & Wilde, M. (2019). Experimentation in biology lessons: Guided discovery through incremental scaffolds. International Journal of Science Education, 41(6), 759–781.
- Gyllenpalm, J., Rundgren, C. J., Lederman, J., & Lederman, N. (2022). Views about scientific inquiry: A study of students' understanding of scientific inquiry in grade 7 and 12 in Sweden. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 60(2), 336–354.
- Hanuscin, D. L., Lee, M. H., & Akerson, V. L. (2011). Elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching the nature of science. Science Education, 95(1), 145–167.
- He, X., Deng, Y., Yu, S., & Wang, H. (2020). The influence of context on the large-scale assessment of high school students' epistemic cognition of scientific argumentation. Science & Education, 29(1), 7–41.
- Heinz, J., Enghag, M., Stuchlikova, I., Cakmakci, G., Peleg, R., & Baram-Tsabari, A. (2017). Impact of initiatives to implement science inquiry: A comparative study of the Turkish, Israeli, Swedish and Czech science education systems. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(3), 677–708.
- Henderson, J. B., MacPherson, A., Osborne, J., & Wild, A. (2015). Beyond construction: Five arguments for the role and value of critique in learning science. International Journal of Science Education, 37(10), 1668–1697.
- Henderson, J. B., McNeill, K. L., González-Howard, M., Close, K., & Evans, M. (2018). Key challenges and future directions for educational research on scientific argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(1), 5–18.
- Herranen, J., & Aksela, M. (2019). Student-question-based inquiry in science education. Studies in Science Education, 55(1), 1–36. Huang, X., Lederman, N. G., & Cai, C. (2017). Improving Chinese junior high school students' ability to ask critical questions. Journal
- Huang, X., Lederman, N. G., & Cai, C. (2017). Improving Chinese junior high school students' ability to ask critical questions. Journ of Research in Science Teaching, 54(8), 963–987.
- Jafari, M., & Meisert, A. (2021). Activating students' argumentative resources on socioscientific issues by indirectly instructed reasoning and negotiation processes. Research in Science Education, 51(2), 913–934.
- Jobér, A. (2017). Revising laboratory work: Sociological perspectives on the science classroom. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(3), 615–635.
- Kampourakis, K. (2016). The "general aspects" conceptualization as a pragmatic and effective means to introducing students to nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(5), 667–682.
- Kapon, S. (2016). Doing research in school: Physics inquiry in the zone of proximal development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(8), 1172–1197.
- Karışan, D., Bilican, K., & Şenler, B. (2017). Bilimsel Sorgulama Hakkında Görüş Anketi: Türkçeye Uyarlama, Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 18(1), 326–343.
- Kaya, F., Borgerding, L. A., & Ferdous, T. (2021). Secondary science teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and implementation of inquiry. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(1), 107–121.

- Khishfe, R. (2014). Explicit nature of science and argumentation instruction in the context of socioscientific issues: An effect on student learning and transfer. International Journal of Science Education, 36(6), 974–1016.
- Khishfe, R. (2020). Retention of acquired argumentation skills and nature of science conceptions. International Journal of Science Education, 42(13), 2181–2204.
- 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.
- Kim, S., & Hand, B. (2015). An analysis of argumentation discourse patterns in elementary teachers' science classroom discussions. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26(3), 221–236.
- Kluge, A. (2014). Combining laboratory experiments with digital tools to do scientific inquiry. International Journal of Science Education, 36(13), 2157–2179.
- Knight-Bardsley, A., & McNeill, K. L. (2016). Teachers' pedagogical design capacity for scientific argumentation. Science Education, 100(4), 645–672.
- Koksal, E. A., & Berberoglu, G. (2014). The effect of guided-inquiry instruction on 6th grade Turkish students' achievement, science process skills, and attitudes toward science. International Journal of Science Education, 36(1), 66–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.721942
- Krell, M., Mathesius, S., van Driel, J., Vergara, C., & Krüger, D. (2020). Assessing scientific reasoning competencies of pre-service science teachers: Translating a German multiple-choice instrument into English and Spanish. International Journal of Science Education, 42(17), 2819–2841.
- Krim, J., Cote, L., Schwartz, R., Stone, E., Cleeves, J., Barry, K., Burgess, W., Buxner, S., Gerton, J., Horvath, L., Keller, J., Lee, S-C., Locke, S., & Rebar, B. (2019). Models and impacts of science research experiences: A review of the literature of CUREs, UREs, and TREs. CBE-Life Sciences Education, 18(4). https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19-03-0069
- Kruit, P. M., Oostdam, R. J., Van den Berg, E., & Schuitema, J. A. (2018). Effects of explicit instruction on the acquisition of students' science inquiry skills in grades 5 and 6 of primary education. International Journal of Science Education, 40(4), 421–441.
- Kuhn, D., Arvidsson, T. S., Lesperance, R., & Corprew, R. (2017). Can engaging in science practices promote deep understanding of them? Science Education, 101(2), 232–250.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.
- Lazarou, D., & Erduran, S. (2021). "Evaluate what I was taught, not what you expected me to know": Evaluating students' arguments based on science teachers' adaptations to toulmin's argument pattern. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(3), 306–324.
- Leblebicioğlu, G., Abik, N. M., Capkinoğlu, E., Metin, D., Dogan, E. E., Cetin, P. S., & Schwartz, R. (2019). Science camps for introducing nature of scientific inquiry through student inquiries in nature: Two applications with retention study. Research in Science Education, 49(5), 1231–1255.
- Leblebicioğlu, G., Çapkınoğlu, E., Peten, D. M., & Schwartz, R. S. (2020). Views of nature of scientific inquiry of students in different high schools. Education & Science/Egitim ve Bilim, 45(201).
- Leblebicioğlu, G., Metin, D., Capkinoğlu, E., Cetin, P. S., Eroglu Dogan, E., & Schwartz, R. (2017). Changes in students' views about nature of scientific inquiry at a science camp. Science & Education, 26(7), 889–917.
- Lederman, J. S., & Bartels, S. L. (2018). Assessing the ultimate goal of science education: Scientific literacy for all! In Kahn, S. (Ed.), Toward inclusion of all learners through science teacher education. Sense Publishers.
- Lederman, J. S., Lederman, N. G., Bartos, S., Bartels, S. L., Meyer, A. A., & Schwartz, R. S. (2014). Meaningful assessment of learners' understandings about scientific inquiry: The views about scientific inquiry (VASI) questionnaire. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(1), 65–83.
- Lederman, J. S., Lederman, N. G., Bartels, S., Jimenez, J., Acosta, K., Akubo, M., Aly, S., de Andrade, M., Atanasova, M., Blanquet, E., Blonder, R., Brown, P., Cardoso, R., Castillo-Urueta, P., Chaipidech, P., Concannon, J., Dogan, O., El-Deghaidy, H., Elzorkani, A., ..., & Wishart, J. (2021). International collaborative follow-up investigation of graduating high school students' understandings of the nature of scientific inquiry: Is progress Being made? International Journal of Science Education, 43(7), 991–1016.
- Lederman, J. S., Lederman, N., Bartels, S., Jimenez, J., Akubo, M., Aly, S., de Andrade, M., Atanasova, M., Blanquet, E., Blonder, R., Brown, P., Cardoso, R., Castillo-Urueta, P., Chaipidech, P., Concannon, J., Dogan, O., El-Deghaidy, H., Elzorkani, A., Ferdous, T., ..., & Zhou, Q. (2019). An international collaborative investigation of beginning seventh grade students' understandings of scientific inquiry: Establishing a baseline. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(4), 486–515.
- Lederman, N. 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. (2019). Contextualizing the relationship between nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry. Science & Education, 28, 249–267.
- Lederman, N. G., & Abell, S. K. (Eds.) (2007). Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 1). Routledge.
- Lederman, N. G., & Abell, S. K. (Eds.). (2014). Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2). Routledge.
- Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2014). Research on teaching and learning of nature of science. In Handbook of research on science education (pp. 614–634). Routledge.
- Lederman, N., & Lederman, J. (2019). Teaching and learning of nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry: Building capacity through systematic research-based professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(7), 737–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1625572
- 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.
- Lee, H. S. , Liu, O. L. , Pallant, A. , Roohr, K. C. , Pryputniewicz, S. , & Buck, Z. E. (2014). Assessment of uncertainty-infused scientific argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(5), 581-605.
- Lee, H. S., Pallant, A., Pryputniewicz, S., Lord, T., Mulholland, M., & Liu, O. L. (2019). Automated text scoring and real-time adjustable feedback: Supporting revision of scientific arguments involving uncertainty. Science Education, 103(3), 590–622.
- Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2006). Cultivating model-based reasoning in science education. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences. University Press.
- Licona, P. R., & Kelly, G. J. (2020). Translanguaging in a middle school science classroom: constructing scientific arguments in English and Spanish. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 15(2), 485–510.

- Lin, F., & Chan, C. K. (2018). Promoting elementary students' epistemology of science through computer-supported knowledge-building discourse and epistemic reflection. International Journal of Science Education, 40(6), 668–687.
- Liou, P-Y. (2020). Students' attitudes toward science and science achievement: An analysis of the differential effects of science instructional practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(3), 310–334.
- Liu, Q. T., Liu, B. W., & Lin, Y. R. (2019). The influence of prior knowledge and collaborative online learning environment on students' argumentation in descriptive and theoretical scientific concept. International Journal of Science Education, 41(2), 165–187.
- Loper, S., McNeill, K. L., & González-Howard, M. (2017). Multimedia educative curriculum materials (MECMs): Teachers' choices in using MECMs designed to support scientific argumentation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(1), 36–56.
- Lunetta, V. N., Hofstein, A., & Clough, M. P. (2007). Learning and teaching in the school science laboratory: An analysis of research, theory, and practice. In Lederman N. G., & Abel S. K. (Eds.) Handbook of research in science education (pp. 393–441). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Manz, E. (2015). Representing student argumentation as functionally emergent from scientific activity. Review of Educational Research, 85(4), 553–590.
- Manz, E., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2020). Rethinking the classroom science investigation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(7), 1148–1174.
- Manz, E., & Renga, I. P. (2017). Understanding how teachers guide evidence construction conversations. Science Education, 101(4), 584–615.
- Manz, E., & Suárez, E. (2018). Supporting teachers to negotiate uncertainty for science, students, and teaching. Science Education, 102(4), 771–795.
- Marco-Bujosa, L. M., McNeill, K. L., González-Howard, M., & Loper, S. (2017). An exploration of teacher learning from an educative reform-oriented science curriculum: Case studies of teacher curriculum use. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(2), 141–168
- McConney, A., Oliver, M. C., Woods-McConney, A., Schibeci, R., & Maor, D. (2014). Inquiry, engagement, and literacy in science: A retrospective, cross-national analysis of PISA 2006. Science Education, 98(6).
- McNeill, K. L., & Berland, L. (2017). What is (or should be) scientific evidence use in k-12 classrooms? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(5), 672–689.
- McNeill, K. L., González-Howard, M., Katsh-Singer, R., & Loper, S. (2016). Pedagogical content knowledge of argumentation: Using classroom contexts to assess high-quality PCK rather than pseudoargumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(2), 261–290.
- McNeill, K. L., González-Howard, M., Katsh-Singer, R., & Loper, S. (2017). Moving beyond pseudoargumentation: Teachers' enactments of an educative science curriculum focused on argumentation. Science Education, 101(3), 426–457.
- Mesci, G., & Schwartz, R. S. (2017). Changing preservice science teachers' views of nature of science: Why some conceptions may be more easily altered than others. Research in Science Education, 47(2), 329–351.
- Mesci, G., Schwartz, R. S., & Pleasants, B. A. S. (2020). Enabling factors of preservice science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for nature of science and nature of scientific inquiry. Science & Education, 29(2), 263–297.
- Meyer, X. S., & Crawford, B. A. (2015). Multicultural inquiry toward demystifying scientific culture and learning science. Science Education, 99(4), 617–637.
- Miller, E., Manz, E., Russ, R., Stroupe, D., & Berland, L. (2018). Addressing the epistemic elephant in the room: Epistemic agency and the next generation science standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 1053–1075.
- 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: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 47(4), 474–496.
- Morrison, J. A., Raab, F., & Ingram, D. (2009). Factors influencing elementary and secondary teachers' views on the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46(4), 384–403.
- Mupira, P., & Ramnarain, U. (2018). The effect of inquiry-based learning on the achievement goal-orientation of grade 10 physical sciences learners at township schools in South Africa. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(6), 810–825.
- Murphy, P. K., Greene, J. A., Allen, E., Baszczewski, S., Swearingen, A., Wei, L., & Butler, A. M. (2018). Fostering high school students' conceptual understanding and argumentation performance in science through quality talk discussions. Science Education, 102(6), 1239–1264.
- National Research Council (NRC) . (2000). Inquiry and the national science education standards: A guide for teaching and learning. The National Academies Press.
- National Research Council (NRC) . (2012). A framework for k-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. The National Academy Press.
- Nehring, A. (2020). Naïve and informed views on the nature of scientific inquiry in large-scale assessments: Two sides of the same coin or different currencies? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(4), 510–535.
- Nehring, A., Nowak, K. H., zu Belzen, A. U., & Tiemann, R. (2015). Predicting students' skills in the context of scientific inquiry with cognitive, motivational, and sociodemographic variables. International Journal of Science Education, 37(9), 1343–1363.
- Neumann, I. , Neumann, K. , & Nehm, R. (2011). Evaluating instrument quality in science education: RAsch-based analyses of a nature of science teste. International Journal of Science Education, 33(10), 1373-1405.
- NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academy Press.
- Novak, A. M., & Treagust, D. F. (2018). Adjusting claims as new evidence emerges: Do students incorporate new evidence into their scientific explanations? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(4), 526–549.
- Osborne, J. (2014a). Scientific practices and inquiry in the science classroom. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 579–599). Routledge.
- Osborne, J. (2014b). Teaching scientific practices: Meeting the challenge of change. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(2), 177–196.
- Osborne, J. F., Henderson, J. B., MacPherson, A., Szu, E., Wild, A., & Yao, S. Y. (2016). The development and validation of a learning progression for argumentation in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(6), 821–846.
- Osterhaus, C., Koerber, S., & Sodian, B. (2020). The Science-P Reasoning Inventory (SPR-I): measuring emerging scientific-reasoning skills in primary school. International Journal of Science Education, 42(7), 1087–1107.

- Ö zdem Yilmaz, Y., Cakiroglu, J., Ertepinar, H., & Erduran, S. (2017). The pedagogy of argumentation in science education: Science teachers' instructional practices. International Journal of Science Education, 39(11), 1443–1464.
- Pabuccu, A., & Erduran, S. (2017). Beyond rote learning in organic chemistry: The infusion and impact of argumentation in tertiary education. International Journal of Science Education, 39(9), 1154–1172.
- Phillips, A. M., Watkins, J., & Hammer, D. (2018). Beyond "asking questions": Problematizing as a disciplinary activity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 982–998.
- Quinlan, C. L. (2020). Analysis of preservice teachers' lesson plans to determine the extent of transfer of argumentation. International Journal of Science Education, 42(7), 1207–1223.
- Rivera Maulucci, M. S., Brown, B. A., Grey, S. T., & Sullivan, S. (2014). Urban middle school students' reflections on authentic science inquiry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(9), 1119–1149.
- 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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Roberts, D. A., & Bybee, R. W. (2014). Scientific literacy, science literacy, and science education. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. II, pp. 559–572). Routledge.
- Robnett, R., Chemers, M., & Zurbriggen, E. (2015). Longitudinal associations among undergraduates research experience, self-efficacy, and identity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(6), 847–867.
- Roesch, F., Nerb, J., & Riess, W. (2015). Promoting experimental problem-solving ability in sixth-grade students through problem-oriented teaching of ecology: Findings of an intervention study in a complex domain. International Journal of Science Education, 37(4), 577–598.
- Rönnebeck, S., Bernholt, S., & Ropohl, M. (2016). Searching for a common ground: A literature review of empirical research on scientific inquiry activities. Studies in Science Education, 52(2), 161–197.
- 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: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 47(3), 235–256.
- Sandoval, W. A., Enyedy, N., Redman, E. H., & Xiao, S. (2019). Organising a culture of argumentation in elementary science. International Journal of Science Education, 41(13), 1848–1869.
- Schwab, J. J. (1962). The teaching of science as enquiry. Harvard University Press.
- Schwartz, R. S. (2004). Epistemological views in authentic science practice: A cross-discipline comparison of scientists' views of nature of science and scientific inquiry. Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University. Oregon State Library.
- 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: The Official Journal of the National Association for 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(4), 610–645.
- Schwartz, R. S., Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2008). An instrument to assess views of scientific inquiry: The VOSI questionnaire. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.519.2693
- Schwartz, R., Lederman, N., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2013). A series of misrepresentations: A response to Allchin's whole approach to assessing nature of science understandings. Science Education, 96(4), 685–692. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21013
- Schwichow, M., Christoph, S., Boone, W. J., & Härtig, H. (2016). The impact of sub-skills and item content on students' skills with regard to the control-of-variables strategy. International Journal of Science Education, 38(2), 216–237.
- Sengul, O., Enderle, P. J., & Schwartz, R. S. (2020). Science teachers' use of argumentation instructional model: Linking PCK of argumentation, epistemological beliefs, and practice. International Journal of Science Education, 42(7), 1068–1086.
- Sengul, O., Enderle, P. J., & Schwartz, R. S. (2021). Examining science teachers' enactment of argument-driven inquiry (ADI) instructional model. International Journal of Science Education, 43(8), 1273–1291.
- She, H-C., Lin, H-S., & Huang, L-Y. (2019). Reflections on and implications of the Programme for Interrnational Student Assessment 2015 (PISA 2015) performance of students in Taiwan: The role of epistemic beliefs about science in scientific literacy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(10), 1309–1134.
- Starr, C. R., Hunter, L., Dunkin, R., Honig, S., Palomino, R., & Leaper, C. (2020). Engaging in science practices in classrooms predicts increases in undergraduates' STEM motivation, identity, and achievement: A short-term longitudinal study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(7), 1093–1118.
- Stroupe, D. (2014). Examining classroom science practice communities: How teachers and students negotiate epistemic agency and learn science-as-practice. Science Education, 98(3), 487–516.
- Tang, K. S., Won, M., & Treagust, D. (2019). Analytical framework for student-generated drawings. International Journal of Science Education, 41(16), 2296–2322.
- Teig, N., Scherer, R., & Kjærnsli, M. (2020). Identifying patterns of students' performance on simulated inquiry tasks using PISA 2015 log-file data. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(9), 1400–1429.
- Tekkumru-Kisa, M., Stein, M. K., & Schunn, C. (2015). A framework for analyzing cognitive demand and content-practices integration: Task analysis guide in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(5), 659–685.
- van Schijndel, T. J., Jansen, B. R., & Raijmakers, M. E. (2018). Do individual differences in children's curiosity relate to their inquiry-based learning? International Journal of Science Education, 40(9), 996–1015.
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1993). Questions and answers about radical constructivism. The Practice of Constructivism in Science Education, 1, 23–38.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
- Waldrip, B., & Prain, V. (2017). Engaging students in learning science through promoting creative reasoning. International Journal of Science Education, 39(15), 2052–2072.
- Walker, J. P., Van Duzor, A. G., & Lower, M. A. (2019). Facilitating argumentation in the laboratory: The challenges of claim change and justification by theory. Journal of Chemical Education, 96(3), 435–444.
- Wang, J. (2020). Scrutinizing the positions of students and teacher engaged in argumentation in a high school physics classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 42(1), 25–49.

Wang, J., & Buck, G. A. (2016). Understanding a high school physics teacher's pedagogical content knowledge of argumentation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(5), 577–604.

Wei, B., & Li, X. (2017). Exploring science teachers' perceptions of experimentation: Implications for restructuring school practical work. International Journal of Science Education, 39(13), 1775–1794.

Wu, P. H., Kuo, C. Y., Wu, H. K., Jen, T. H., & Hsu, Y. S. (2018). Learning benefits of secondary school students' inquiry-related curiosity: A cross-grade comparison of the relationships among learning experiences, curiosity, engagement, and inquiry abilities. Science Education, 102(5), 917–950.

Yang, W. T., Lin, Y. R., She, H. C., & Huang, K. Y. (2015). The effects of prior-knowledge and online learning approaches on students' inquiry and argumentation abilities. International Journal of Science Education, 37(10), 1564–1589.

Yun, S. M., & Kim, H. B. (2015). Changes in students' participation and small group norms in scientific argumentation. Research in Science Education, 45(3), 465–484.

Zhang, L. (2018). Withholding answers during hands-on scientific investigations? Comparing effects on developing students' scientific knowledge, reasoning, and application. International Journal of Science Education, 40(4), 459–469.

Zimmerman, H. T., & Weible, J. L. (2018). Epistemic agency in an environmental sciences watershed investigation fostered by digital photography. International Journal of Science Education, 40(8), 894–918.

Zion, M., Schwartz, R. S., Rimerman-Shmueli, E., & Adler, I. (2020). Supporting teachers' understanding of nature of science and inquiry through personal experience and perception of inquiry as a dynamic process. Research in Science Education, 50(4), 1281–1304.

Science, Scientific Literacy, and Science Education

Adams, A. E., & Pegg, J. (2012). Teachers' enactment of content literacy strategies in secondary science and mathematics classes. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56(2), 151–161.

Aikenhead, G. (2005). Science education for everyday life: Evidence based practice. Teachers College Press.

Ainsworth, S., & Burcham, S. (2007). The impact of text coherence on learning by self-explanation. Learning and Instruction, 17(286–303).

Alexander, R. (2005). Towards dialogic teaching. Dialogos.

Alexander, R. (2020). A dialogic teaching companion. Routledge.

Allchin, D. (2012). Teaching the nature of science through scientific errors. Science Education, 96(5), 904–926.

https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21019

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. Handbook of reading research, 1, 255–291.

Atay, D., & Kurt, G. (2006). Elementary school EFL learners' vocabulary learning: The effects of post-reading activities. Canadian Modern Language Review, 63(2), 255–273.

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

Baker, D. (2014). The schooled society: The educational transformation of global culture. Stanford University Press.

Barnes, D. (1976). From communication to curriculum. Penguin.

Bauer, H. H. (1992). Scientific literacy and the myth of the scientific method. University of Illinois Press.

Bazerman, C. (1988). Shaping written knowledge. The University of Wisconsin Press.

Beck, I. L. , & McKeown, M. G. (2006). Improving comprehension with questioning the author: A fresh and expanded view of a powerful approach. Scholatic.

Bencze, L., Pouliot, C., Pedretti, E., Simonneaux, L., Simonneaux, J., & Zeidler, D. (2020). SAQ, SSI and STSE education: Defending and extending "science-in-context". Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09962-7

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). The psychology of written composition. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bergstrom, C. T., & West, J. D. (2020). Calling bullshit: the art of skepticism in a data-driven world. Random House.

Blachowicz, J. (2009). How science textbooks treat scientific method: A philosopher's perspective. The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 60(2), 303–344. http://bjps.oxfordjournals.org/content/60/2/303.abstractN2

Bowker, G. C., & Leigh Star, S. (1999). Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences. MIT Press.

Breakstone, J., McGrew, S., Smith, M., Ortega, T., & Wineburg, S. (2018). Why we need a new approach to teaching digital literacy. Phi Delta Kappan, 99, 27–32.

Breakstone, J., Smith, M., Wineburg, S., Rapaport, A., Carle, J., Garland, M., & Saavedra, A. (2021). Students' civic online reasoning: A national portrait. Educational Researcher, 50(8), 505–515. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x211017495

Bromme, R., & Goldman, S. R. (2014). The public's bounded understanding of science. Educational Psychologist, 49(2), 59–69.

Bunch, G. C. (2014). The language of ideas and the language of display: Reconceptualizing "academic language" in linguistically diverse classrooms. International Multilingual Research Journal, 8(1), 70–86.

Calkins, L. M. (1986). The art of teaching writing. ERIC.

Calkins, L. M., & Ehrenworth, M. (2016). Growing extraordinary writers: Leadership decisions to raise the level of writing across a school and a district. The Reading Teacher, 70(1), 7–18.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). Classroom Discourse (2nd ed.). Heinemann.

Cervetti, G. N., Pearson, P. D., Bravo, M. A., & Barber, J. (2006). Reading and writing in the service of inquiry-based science. In R. Douglas, M. M. Klentschy, & K. Worth (Eds.), Linking science and literacy in the K-8 classroom, NSTA.

Chi, M. (2009). Active-constructive-interactive: A conceptual framework for differentiating learning activities. Topics in Cognitive Science, 1, 73–105.

Chinn, C. A. , Barzilai, S. , & Duncan, R. G. (2020). Education for a "post-truth" world: New directions for research and practice. Educational Researcher, 0013189X20940683.

Collins, H. (2014). Are we all scientific experts now? Polity Press.

Committee to Enquire into the Position of Natural Science in the Educational System of Great Britain . (1918). Report of the committee appointed by the prime minister to enquire into the position of natural science in the educational system of Great Britain. His Majesty's Stationary Office.

Crease, R. P., & Selinger, E. (2006). The philosophy of expertise. Columbia University Press.

Crombie, A. C. (1994). Styles of scientific thinking in the European tradition: The history of argument and explanation especially in the mathematical and biomedical sciences and arts (Vol. 1). Duckworth.

Cromer, A. (1993). Uncommon sense: The heretical nature of science. Oxford University Press.

Crouch, C. H., & Mazur, E. (2001). Peer instruction: Ten years of experience and results. American Journal of Physics, 69, 970.

Dainton, F. S. (1968). The Dainton report: An inquiry into the flow of candidates into science and technology. Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Davies, F., & Greene, T. (1984). Reading for learning in the sciences. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.

Dawkins, R. (2000). Unweaving the rainbow: Science, delusion and the appetite for wonder: Mariner Books.

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.

DeHart Hurd, P. (1958). Science literacy: Its meaning for American Schools. Educational Leadership, 16, 13–16.

Delpit, L. D. (2006). Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom. The New Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. The MacMillan Company.

Duffelmeyer, F. A. (1994). Effective anticipation guide statements for learning from expository prose. Journal of Reading, 452–457.

Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). Common Knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom. Methuen.

Elgin, C. Z. (2017). True enough. Harvard University Press.

Fang, Z. (2008). Going beyond the fab five: Helping students cope with the unique linguistic challenges of expository reading in intermediate grades. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 51(6), 476–487.

Farrell, M. P., & Ventura, F. (1998). Words and understanding in physics. Language and Education, 12(4), 243–253.

Feinstein, N. (2011). Salvaging science literacy. Science Education, 95(1), 168-185. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20414

Fisher, M. (2021, July 25). Disinformation for hire, a shadow industry, is quietly booming. New York Times.

www.nytimes.com/2021/07/25/world/europe/disinformation-social-media.html?smid=em-share

Fuller, T. (Ed.) (1989). The voice of liberal learning: Michael oakshott on education. Yale University Press.

Gallas, K. (1995). Talking their way into Science. Teachers College Press.

Gardner, P. L. (1977). Logical connectives in science: A summary of the findings. Research in Science Education, 7, 9–25.

Gott, R., Duggan, S., & Roberts, R. (2008), Concepts of evidence, School of Education:

www.dur.ac.uk/rosalyn.roberts/Evidence/cofev.htm

Gottlieb, S., Keltner, D., & Lombrozo, T. (2018). Awe as a scientific emotion. Cognitive Science, 42(6), 2081–2094.

Guzetti, B., Williams, W. O., Skeels, S. A., & Ming Wu, S. (1997). Influence of text structure on learning counterintuitive physics concepts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34(7), 701–719.

Hacking, I. (1992), 'Style' for historians and philosophers, Studies in the History and Philosopy of Science, 23(1), 1–20.

Hacking, I. (2012). 'Language, truth and reason' 30 years later. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science, 43, 599-609.

Hadzigeorgiou, Y. P. (2012). Fostering a sense of wonder in the science classroom, Research in Science Education, 42(5), 985–1005.

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(1), 64–74. http://link.aip.org/link/?AJP/66/64/1

Hall, C. S. (2016). Inference instruction for struggling readers: A synthesis of intervention research. Educational Psychology Review, 28(1), 1–22.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1993). Writing science: Literacy and discursive power. Falmer Press.

Hanrahan, M. (1999). Rethinking science literacy: Enhancing communication and participation in school science through affirmational dialogue journal writing. Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 36(6), 699–717.

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Cornell University Press.

Hardwig, J. (1985). Epistemic dependence. The Journal of Philosophy, 82, 335–349.

Hargittai, E. (2010). Digital na (t) ives? Variation in internet skills and uses among members of the "net generation". Sociological Inquiry, 80(1), 92–113.

Harlen, W. E. (2010). Principles and big ideas of science education. Herts.

Harré, R. (1986). Varieties of realism: a rationale for the natural sciences. Basil Blackwell.

Hatano, G., & Inagaki, K. (1991). Sharing cognition through collective comprehension activity. In L. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), Perspectives on socially shared cognition (pp. 331–348). American Psychological Association.

Henley, J. (2020, 29 January). How Finland starts its fight against fake news in primary schools. Guardian.

www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/28/fact-from-fiction-finlands-new-lessons-in-combating-fake-news

Hertwig, R. (2017). When to consider boosting: some rules for policy-makers. Behavioural Public Policy, 1(2), 143–161. https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2016.14

Hodson, D. (2003). Time for action: science education for an alternative future. International Journal of Science Education, 25(6), 645–670.

Hodson, D. (2009). Putting your money where your mouth is: towards an action-oriented science curriculum. Journal of Activist Science and Technology Education, 1(1), 1–15. www.wepaste.org/jaste1.1.html

Holtz, M. (2009). Nominalisation in scientific discourse: A corpus-based study of abstract and research articles. In M. Mahlbert, V. González-Díaz, & C. Smith (Eds.), Proceedings of corpus linguistics conference (pp. 341–359). University of Liverpool.

Horton, P. B., McConney, A. A., Gallo, M., Woods, A. L., Senn, G. J., & Hamelin, D. (1993). An investigation of the effectiveness of concept mapping as an instructional tool. Science Education, 77(1), 95–111.

Höttecke, D., & Allchin, D. (2020). Reconceptualizing nature-of-science education in the age of social media. *Science Education, n/a* (n/a). https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21575

Hynd, C. R. (2001). Refutational texts and the change process. International Journal of Educational Research, 35(7), 699–714. Judge Jones, J. E. (2005). Memorandum opinion. Case No:04 cv2688. United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Kahan, D. M., Peters, E., Wittlin, M., Slovic, P., Ouellette, L. L., Braman, D., & Mandel, G. (2012). The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks. Nature Climate Change, 2(10), 732-735.

Keeley, P., Eberle, F., & Farrin, L. (2005). Uncovering student ideas in science, Vol. I: 25 formative assessment probes. NSTA Press.

Keogh, B., & Naylor, S. (1999). Concept cartoons, teaching and learning in science: an evaluation. International Journal of Science Education, 21(4), 431–446.

Keys, C. W. (1994). The development of scientific reasoning skills in conjunction with collaborative wrting assignment: An interpretive study of six ninth-grade students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 31(9), 1003–1022.

Kind, P. M., & Osborne, J. F. (2017). Styles of scientific reasoning: A cultural rationale for science education? Science Education, 101(1), 8–31. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21251

King, A. (1992a). Comparison of self-questioning, summarising and notetaking-review as strategies for learning from lectures. American Educational Research Journal, 29(2), 303–323.

King, A. (1992b). Comparsion of self questioning summarizing. American Educational Research Journal, 29(2), 303–323.

Kitcher, P. (1990). The division of cognitive labor. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 87(5-22).

Knight, J. K., Wise, S. B., & Southard, K. M. (2013). Understanding clicker discussions: student reasoning and the impact of instructional cues. CBE-Life Sciences Education, 12(4), 645–654. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.13-05-0090

Kozyreva, A., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2020). Citizens versus the internet: confronting digital challenges with cognitive tools. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 21(3), 103–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100620946707

Kress, G. R. , Jewitt, C. , Ogborn, J. , & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001). Multimodal teaching and learning: The rhetorics of the science classroom. Continuum Books.

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 University Press.

Langer, J. A., & Applebee, A. N. (1987). How writing shapes thinking: A study of teaching and learning. National Council of Teachers of English.

Lapsley, D., & Chaloner, D. (2020). Post-truth and science identity: A virtue-based approach to science education. Educational Psychologist, 55(3), 132–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1778480

Laugksch, R. (2000). Scientific literacy: A conceptual overview. Science Education, 84(1), 71-94.

Layton, D., Jenkins, E. W., McGill, S., & Davey, A. (1993). Inarticulate Science? Perspectives on the Public Understanding of Science. Driffield: Nafferton: Studies in Education.

Lee, C. D., White, G., & Dong, D. (2021). Educating for civic reasoning and discourse. National Academy of Education.

Lee, O. (2021). Asset-oriented framing of science and language learning with multilingual learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(7), 1073–1079. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21694

Lee, O., & Stephens, A. (2020). English learners in STEM subjects: Contemporary views on STEM subjects and language with English learners. Educational Researcher, 49(6), 426–432.

Lemke, J. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning and values. Ablex Publishing.

Lemke, J. (1998). Teaching all the languages of science: Words, symbols, images and actions.

http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/education/jlemke/papers/barcelon.htm

Lewis, M. , & Wray, D. (1995). Developing children's non-fiction writing. Scholastic.

Longino, H. E. (1990). Science as social knowledge. Princetown University Press.

Lunzer, E., & Gardner, K. (1979). The effective use of reading. Heinemann Educational.

Marshall, S. , Gilmour, M. , & Lewis, D. (1991). Words that matter in science and technology. Research in Science & Technological Education, 9(1), 5-16.

Martin, B. (1992). Scientific fraud and the power structure of science. Prometheus, 10(1), 83-98.

Martin, J. R. (1998). Discourses of science. In J. R. Martin & R. Veel (Eds.), Reading science (pp. 3-14). Routledge.

Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. Linguistics and Education, 20(1), 10-21.

Martin, N., D'Arcy, P., Newton, B., & Parker, R. (1976). Writing and learning across the curriculum 11–16: Schools council project. Ward Lock Educational.

McIntyre, L. (2018). Post-truth. MIT Press.

McKeown, M. G., Deane, P. D., & Lawless, R. R. (2017). Vocabulary assessment to support instruction: Building rich word-learning experiences. Guilford Publications.

Medin, D. L., & Bang, M. (2014). Who's asking?: Native science, western science, and science education. MIT Press.

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.

Merron, S., & Lock, R. (1998). Does knowledge about a balanced diet influence eating behaviour? School Science Review, 80(290), 43–48.

Merzyn, G. (1987). The language of school science. International Journal of Science Education, 9(4), 483–489.

Michaels, S., & O'Connor, C. (2012). Talk science primer. TERC.

Milkman, K. L., Chugh, D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). How can decision making be improved? Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4, 379–383.

Millar, R. (1991). Why is science hard to learn? Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 7, 66-74.

Millar, R. (1996). Towards a science curriculum for public understanding. School Science Review, 77(280), 7–18.

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

Miller, J. (2010). Adult science learning in the internet era. Curator, 53, 191-208.

Montgomery, S. L. (1996). The scientific voice. Guilford Press.

Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (2003). Meaning making in secondary science classrooms. Open University Press.

National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine . (2016). Science literacy: Concepts, contexts, and consequences. The National Academies Press.

National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine . (2018). English learners in STEM subjects: Transforming classrooms, schools, and lives. National Academies Press.

National Academy of Science . (1995). National science education standards. National Academy Press.

National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academies Press.

National Science Board . (2018). Science and engineering indicators. www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind08/front/letter.htm

Naylor, S., & Keogh, B. (2000). Concept cartoons in education. Millgate House Publishers.

Neuvonen, M., Kivinen, K., & Salo, M. (2018). Fact-checking for educators and future voters. Factbar EDU.

Newton, P., Driver, R., & Osborne, J. F. (1999). The place of argumentation in the pedagogy of school science. International Journal of Science Education, 21(5), 553–576.

NGSS Lead States. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. National Academies Press.

Nichols, T. (2017). The death of expertise: The campaign against established knowledge and why it matters. Oxford 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., & Burns, D. (2014). Conceptions of scientific literacy: Identifying and evaluating their programmatic elements. In M. Matthews (Ed.), International handbook of research in history, philosophy and science teaching (pp. 1317–1344). Springer.

Novak, J. D., & Gowin, D. B. (1984). Learning how to learn. Cambridge University Press.

O'Halloran, K. (2011). Multimodal discourse analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), Companion to discourse (pp. 120–137). Continuum.

O'Reilly, T., & McNamara, D. (2007). Reversing the reverse cohesion effect: Good texts can be better for strategic, high-knowledge readers. Discourse Processes, 43, 121–152.

O'Toole, M. (2004). What is difficult to read, why might this be so, and what could, or should, be done about it? An overview of section two. In P. A., & A. Cleghorn (Eds.), Missing the meaning (pp. 161–178). Palgrave Macmillan

OECD. (2006). The PISA 2006 Assessment framework for science, reading and mathematics. OECD.

OECD . (2012). The PISA 2015 assessment framework: Key competencies in reading, mathematics and science.

www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisa2015draftframeworks.htm

OECD . (2016). PISA 2015 assessment and analytical framework: Science, reading, mathematic and financial literacy. OECD.

Ogborn, J. (1988). A map of science personal submission to the national curriculum working group on science education.

Olson, D. R. (1994). The world on paper: The conceptual and cognitive implications of writing and reading. Cambridge University Press

Oreskes, N. (2019). Why trust science? Princeton University Press.

Oreskes, N., & Conway, E. M. (2010). Merchants of doubt. Bloomsbury Press.

Origgi, G. (2004). Is trust an epistemological notion? Episteme, 1, 61–72.

Origgi, G. (2019). Reputation: What it is and why it matters. Princeton University Press.

Osborne, J. F. (2002). Science without Literacy: A ship without a sail? Cambridge Journal of Education, 32(2), 203-215.

Osborne, J. F. (2010), Arguing to learn in science: The role of collaborative, critical discourse, Science, 328, 463–466.

Osborne, J. F. (2011). Science teaching methods: A rationale for practices. School Science Review, 93(343), 93-103.

Osborne, J. F. (2019). Not "hands on" but "minds on": A response to furtak and penuel. Science Education, 103(5), 1280–1283. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21543

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. F. , Donovan, B. , Henderson, B. , MacPherson, A. , & Wild, A. (2016). Arguing from evidence in middle school science: 24 activities for productive talk and deeper learning. Corwin Press.

Osborne, J. F., Pimentel, D., Alberts, B., Allchin, D., Barzilai, S., Bergstrom, C., Coffey, J., Donovan, B., Kivinen, K., Kozyreva, A., &Wineburg, S. (2022). Science education in an age of misinformation. Stanford University.

Osborne, J. F., Rafanelli, S., & Kind, P. (2018). Toward a more coherent model for science education than the crosscutting concepts of the next generation science standards: The affordances of styles of reasoning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 962–981.

Pearson, D., Hansen, J., & Gordon, C. (1979a). The effect of background knowledge on young children's comprehension of explicit and implicit information. Journal of reading behavior, 11(3), 201–209.

Pearson, D., Hansen, J., & Gordon, C. (1979b). The effect of background knowledge on young children's comprehension of explicit and implicit information. Journal of Literacy Research, 11(3), 201–209.

Pearson, D., Moje, E.B., & Greenleaf, C. (2010). Literacy and science: Each in the service of the other. Science, 328, 459–463.

 $Phillips, L.\ , Norris, S.\ , \&\ Macnab, J.\ (2010).\ Vizualization\ in\ mathematics,\ reading\ and\ science\ education.\ Heidelberg:\ Springer.$

Pickersgill, S. , & Lock, R. (1991). Students' understanding of selected non-technical words in science. Research in Science and Technological Education, 9(1), 71-79.

Pinker, S. (2018). Enlightenment now: The case for reason, science, humanism and progress. Allen Lane.

Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1971). Teaching as a subversive activity. Penguin.

Pressley, M., & Wharton-McDonald, R. (1997). Skilled comprehension and its development through instruction. School Psychology Review, 26(3), 448–466.

Radcliffe, R., Caverly, D., Hand, J., & Franke, D. (2008). Improving reading in a middle school science classroom. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 51(5), 398–408.

Ratcliffe, M., & Grace, M. (2003). Science education for citizenship. Open University Press.

Recht, D. R., & Leslie, L. (1988). Effect of prior knowledge on good and poor readers' memory of text. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(1), 16.

Reid, G., & Norris, S. P. (2016). Scientific media education in the classroom and beyond: a research agenda for the next decade. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(1), 147–166. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-015-9709-1

Rivard, L. P. (1994). A review of writing to learn in science: Implications for practice and research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 31(9), 969–983.

Roberts, D. A. (2007). Scientific literacy/science literacy. In S. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 729–780). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Roman, D. X., Briceño, A., Rohde, H., & Hironaka, S. (2006). Linguistic cohesion in middle-school texts: A comparison of logical connectives usage in science and social studies textbooks. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 20(1–19).

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., & Lee, S. (2002). Scientific literacy as collective praxis. Public Understanding of Science, 11, 33-56.

Rowell, P. (1998). The promises and practices of writing. Studies in Science Education, 30, 19–56.

Rudolph, J. L. (2020). The lost moral purpose of science education. Science Education, 104(5), 895–906. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21590

Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Li, M., Ayala, C., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). Evaluating students' science notebooks as an assessment tool. International Journal of Science Education, 26(12), 1477–1506.

Rychen, D. S., & Salganik, L. H. (Eds.). (2003). Definition and selection of key competencies: Executive summary. Hogrefe.

Ryder, J. (2001). Identifying science understanding for functional scientific literacy. Studies in Science Education, 36, 1–44.

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.

Schleppegrell, M. (2004). The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective. Erlbaum.

Shamos, M. H. (1995). The myth of scientific literacy. Rutgers University Press.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content area literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 78(1), 40–59.

Sharon, A. J., & Baram-Tsabari, A. (2020). Can science literacy help individuals identify misinformation in everyday life? Science Education, 104(5), 873–894. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21581

Shen, B. (1975). Scientific literacy and the public understanding of science. In S. B. Day (Ed.), Communication of Scientific Information. Karger.

Shortland, M. (1988). Advocating science: Literacy and public understanding. Impact of Science on Society, 38(4), 305–316.

Siegel, H. (1989). The rationality of science, critical thinking and science education. Synthese, 80(1), 9-42.

Simon, H. A. (1966). Scientific discovery and psychology of problem solving. In R. Colony (Ed.), Mind and cosmos (pp. 22–40). University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils. Oxford University Press.

Sizmur, S., & Osborne, J. F. (1997). Learning processes and collaborative concept mapping. International Journal of Science Education, 19(10), 1117–1135.

Sjöström, J., & Eilks, I. (2018). Reconsidering different visions of scientific literacy and science education based on the concept of Bildung. In Cognition, metacognition, and culture in STEM education (pp. 65–88). Springer.

Smith, M. K., Wood, W. B., Adams, W. K., Wieman, C., Knight, J. K., Guild, N., & Su, T. T. (2009). Why peer discussion improves student performance on in-class concept questions. Science, 323(5910), 122–124. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1165919

Snow, C. (2010). Academic language and the challenge of reading for learning about science. Science, 328, 450-452.

Snow, C. E., Lawrence, J. F., & White, C. (2009). Generating knowledge of academic language among urban middle school students. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2, 325–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345740903167042

Solomon, J., & Aikenhead, G. (Eds.). (1994). STS education: International perspectives on reform. Teachers College Press.

Spires, H. A., & Donley, J. (1998). Prior knowledge activation: Inducing engagement with informational texts. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90(2), 249.

Stolberg, T. L. (2008). W(h)ither the sense of wonder of pre-service primary teachers' when teaching science?: A preliminary study of their personal experiences. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(8), 1958–1964. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.05.005 Sutton, C. (1981). Communicating in the classroom. Hodder & Stoughton.

Sutton, C. (1996). Beliefs about science and beliefs about language. International Journal of Science Education, 18(1), 1-18. www.informaworld.com/10.1080/0950069960180101

Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. Learning and Instruction, 4(4), 295–312.

Tenopir, C., & King, D. W. (2004). Communication patterns of engineers. Wiley.

The Royal Society, (2014), Vision for science and mathematics education. The Royal Society,

Unsworth, L. (1999). Developing critical understanding of the specialised language of school science and history texts: A functional grammatical perspective. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42, 508–521.

Valdesolo, P., Park, J., & Gottlieb, S. (2016). Awe and scientific explanation. Emotion, 16(7), 937.

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

Voogt, J., & Roblin, N. P. (2012). A comparative analysis of international frameworks for 21st century competences: Implications for national curriculum policies. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 44(299–321).

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. Science, 359(6380), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

Vygotsky, L. S. I. J. V. W. E. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), The concept of activity in Soviet Psychology (pp. 144–188). Sharpe.

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.

Wellington, J., & Osborne, J. F. (2001). Language and literacy in science education. Open University Press.

Wells, G. (1999). Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural theory and practice of education. Cambridge University Press.

Willingham, D. T. (2008). Critical thinking: Why is it so hard to teach? Arts Education Policy Review, 109(4), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.3200/AEPR.109.4.21–32

Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2017). Lateral reading: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information.

Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2019). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. Teachers College Record, 121(11), 11.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). Philosophical Investigations. Blackwell.

Wolpert, L. (1992). The unnatural nature of science. Faber and Faber.

Wray, D., & Lewis, M. (1997). Extending literacy: Children reading and writing non-fiction. Routledge.

Wynne, B. (1996). May the sheep safely graze? In S. Lash , B. Szerszynski , & B. Wynne (Eds.), Risk, environment & modernity (pp. 44–83). SAGE Publications.

Yarden, A., Norris, S., & Phillips, L. (2015). Adapted primary literature: The use of authentic scientific texts in secondary schools. Springer.

Yore, L., Bisanz, G. L., & Hand, B. M. (2003). Examining the literacy component of science literacy. International Journal of Science Education, 25(6), 689–725.

Zeidler, D. L., & Nichols, B. H. (2009). Socioscientific issues: Theory and practice. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 21(2), 49.

Zhang, Z., & Linn, M. C. (2011). Can generating representations enhance learning with dynamic visualizations? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(10), 1177–1198.

Ziman, J. (1979). Reliable knowledge. Cambridge University Press.

The Use of Content Standards for Curriculum Reform in the United States

Achieve, Inc. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. National Academies Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1985). Project 2061: Education for a changing future. Project Report from October 28, 1985. AAAS Archives.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1989). Five project 2061 panel reports: Biological and health sciences; mathematics; physical and information sciences and engineering; Social and behavioral sciences; and technology. Author.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1997). Resources of science literacy. Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1990). Science for all Americans. Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Oxford University Press.

Anderson, C., de los Santos, E., Bodbyl, S., Covin, B., Edwards, K., Hancock, J., Lin, Q., Thomas, C., Penuel, W., & Welch, M. (2018). Designing educational systems to support enactment of the next generation science standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 1026–1054.

Ausubel, D. (1968). Educational psychology: a cognitive view. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Banilower, E., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I., Malzahn, K., Campbell, K., & Weis, A. (2013). Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education. Horizon Research, Inc.

Banilower, E., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I., Malzahn, K., Plumley, CI, Gordon, E., & Hayes, M. (2018). Report of the 2018 NSSME+. Horizon Research, Inc.

Brandt, R. S. (1988). Introduction: What should schools teach? In R. S. Brandt (Ed.), 1988 ASCD yearbook: Content of the curriculum (pp. 1–7). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, D., & Sadler, T. (2018). Conceptual framing and instructional enactment of the next generation science standards: A synthesis of the contributions to the special issue. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 1101–1107.

Bruner, J. (1960). The process of education. Vintage.

Bybee, R. (1997). Achieving science literacy. Heinemann.

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. Author.

CCSSO . (2004, September) Framework for transitioning from IASA to NCLB. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED484704.pdf.

Crombie, A. C. (1994). Styles of scientific thinking in the European tradition: The history of argument and explanation especially in the mathematical and biomedical sciences and arts (Vol. 1). Duckworth.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007, May 2). Evaluating 'no child left behind': The problems and promises of Bush's education policy. The Nation.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017, May). Developing and measuring higher order skills: Models for state performance assessment systems. CCSSO Learning Policy Institute Research Brief. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Models State Performance Assessment Systems BRIEF.pdf

DeBoer, G. E. (2006). History of the science standards movement in the United States. In D. Sunal & E. Wright (Eds.). The impact of state and national standards on K-12 science teaching (pp 7–49). Information Age Publishing, Inc.

DeBoer, G. E. (2014). The history of science curriculum reform in the United States. In S. K. Abell & N. K. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 559–578). Routledge.

Doyle, D., & Hartle, T. (1985). Excellence in education: The states take charge. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Duncan, R., Chinn, C., & Barzilai, S. (2018). Grasp of evidence: Problematizing and expanding the next generation science standards' conceptualization of evidence. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 907–937.

Educational Council Act of 1991. www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-105/pdf/STATUTE-105-Pg305.pdf#page=1

Elmore, R. (1998, November). The national goals panel: Purposes, progress, and prospects. Paper prepared for the National Education Goals Panel. https://govinfo.library.unt.edu/negp/reports/elmoref.htm

Every Student Succeeds Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015).

Exxon Education Foundation . (1984, January 17–24). Science education in the United States: Essential steps for achieving fundamental improvement: A report on a meeting of educational leaders. Exxon Corp.

https://eric.ed.gov/?q=current+issues+on+bullying&pg=960&id=ED247104

Ford, M., & Forman, E. (2006). Redefining disciplinary learning in classroom contexts. Review of Research in Education, 30, (1), 1–32.

Friedrichsen, P., & Barnett, E. (2018). Negotiating the meaning of next generation science standards in a secondary biology teacher professional learning community. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 999–1025.

Fulmer, G., Tanas, J., & Weiss, K. (2018). The challenges of alignment for the next generation science standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 1076–1100.

Fulp, S. (2002). 2000 National survey of science and mathematics education: Status of middle school science teaching. Horizon Research. Inc.

Gabel, C. (2006). Impact of the reform efforts on K-12 science inquiry: A paradigm shift. In D. Sunal & E. Wright (Eds.). The impact of state and national standards on K-12 science teaching (pp 215–256). Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Gagne, R. (1977). The conditions of learning. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Gardner, J. (1961). Excellence: Can we be equal and excellent too? Harper & Row.

Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 20 U.S.C. § 5801 et. seq . (1994). https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/1804/text

Goals 3 and 4 Technical Planning Group . (1993). Promises to keep: Creating high standards for American students. Report on the review of education standards to the National Goals Panel. Publication 94–01. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel. Gunckel, K., & Tolbert, S. (2018). The imperative to move toward a dimension of care in engineering education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 938–961.

Harris, J., & Baker, P. (1997, February 5). Clinton says he'll mount 'crusade' for education. Washington Post. www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/states/stories/sou020597.htm.

Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, 20 U.S.C. § 8001 *et. seq*. https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/6/text Jennings, J. (2020). Fatigued by school reform. Rowman & Littlefield.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education . (2019). Massachusetts curriculum framework: Science and technology/engineering, grades pre-kindergarten to 12. Author. www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/scitech/2016-04.pdf

Miller, E., Manz, E., Russ, R., Stroupe, D., & Berland, L. (2018). Addressing the epistemic elephant in the room: epistemic agency and the next generation science standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 1053–1075.

National Assessment Governing Board . (1999). Science framework for the 1996 and 2000 national assessment of educational progress. Author. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015043407017&view=1up&seq=11)

National Commission on Excellence in Education . (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. U.S. Department of Education.

National Council on Education Standards and Testing . (1992). Raising standards for American education. A report to Congress, the Secretary of Education, the National Education Goals Panel, and the American people. Washington, DC: National Council on Education Standards and Testing.

National Education Association . (1893). Report of the committee on secondary school studies. U.S. Government Printing Office. National Education Goals Panel . (1996). National education goals report: Building a nation of learners. National Education Goals Panel.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. National Academy Press.

National Research Council . (2000). Inquiry and the national science education standards: a guide for teaching and learning. National Academy Press.

National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: learning and teaching science in grades K-8. National Academy Press. National Research Council . (2012). Framework for K-12 science education. National Academy Press.

National Research Council . (2008). Common standards for K-12 Education?: Considering the evidence: Summary of a workshop series. Alexandra Beatty, Rapporteur. Committee on state standards in education: A workshop series. Center for Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. The National Academies Press.

National Science Board . (1983a). Educating Americans for the 21st century: A report to the American people and the national science board. Washington, DC: National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology.

National Science Board . (1983b). Educating Americans for the 21st century: Source materials, (Chapter 6: Research on cognition and behavior relevant to education in mathematics, science, and technology, pp. 107–140, a report from the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences prepared by James Greeno, University of Pittsburgh). Washington, DC: National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology.

National Science Teachers Association . (n.d.) NGSS@NSTA. https://ngss.nsta.org/About.aspx

Nelson, G. D. (1997). Benchmarks and standards as tools for science education reform. Paper commissioned by the National Education Goals Panel. www.project2061.org/publications/articles/nelson/nelson1.htm

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 et seq. (2002). https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/house-bill/1/text Osborne, J., Rafanelli, S., & Kind, P. (2018). Toward a more coherent model for science education than the crosscutting concepts of the next generation science standards: The affordances of styles of reasoning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 962–981.

PBS Frontline . (2002, March). Are we there yet? Business, politics, and the long (unfinished) road to national standards. www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/schools/standards/bp.html).

Phillips, A., Watkins, J., & Hammer, D. (2018). Beyond "asking questions": Problematizing as a disciplinary activity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 982–998.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade. Basic Books.

Rutherford, F. J. (1978a, February 13). Science in education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Washington, D.C.

Rutherford, F. J. (1978b, August 1). The implementation of socially relevant science education. Paper presented at Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.

Schwab, J. (1978). The nature of scientific knowledge as related to liberal education. In J. Schwab (Ed.), Science, curriculum, and liberal education (pp. 68–104). The University of Chicago Press.

Schwartz, R., & Robinson, M. (2000). Goals 2000 and the standards movement, brookings papers on educational policy. Brookings Institution Press.

Serino, L. (2017, April 7). What international test scores reveal about American education. Brookings Institution Brown Center Chalkboard. www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2017/04/07/what-international-test-scores-reveal-about-american-education/

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Education . (1991). America 2000: An education strategy sourcebook. Author.

Vinovskis, M. (1999). The road to charlottesville: The 1989 education summit. Paper prepared for the 1999 National Education Goals Panel. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

Research on Teaching, Learning, and Assessment of Nature of Science

TEA3>3.0.CO:2-C

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. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016720417219

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2002). Images of nature of science in middle grade science trade books. The New Advocate, 15(2), 121-127.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2003). Socioscientific issues in pre-college science classrooms: The primacy of learners' epistemological orientations and views of nature of science. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning in socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 41–61). Kluwer.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2004). 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). Kluwer. 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. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2011.629013

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, & McRobbie, C. (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1041–1060). Springer.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2014). The evolving landscape related to assessment of nature of science. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 635–664). Routledge.

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., Bell, R. L., & Lederman, N. G. (1998). The nature of science and instructional practice: Making the unnatural natural. Science Education, 82(4), 417–436. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(199807)82:4<417::AID-SCE1>3.0.CO;2-E 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. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690050044044 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2736(200012)37:10<1057::AID-

Abd-El-Khalick, F., Myers, J. Y., Summers, R., Brunner, J., Waight, N., Wahbeh, N., Zeineddin, A., & Belarmino, J. (2017). A longitudinal analysis of the extent and manner of representations of nature of science in U.S. high school biology and physics textbooks. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54, 82–120. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21339

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20226

Aflalo, E. (2014). Advancing the perceptions of the Nature of Science (NOS): Integrating teaching the NOS in a science content course. Research in Science & Technological Education, 32(3), 298–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2014.944492

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730710203

Aikenhead, G. S., Ryan, A., & Fleming, R. (1989). Views on science-technology-society (from CDN.mc.5). Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Saskatchewan.

Akerson, V. L., Erumit, B. A., & Kaynak, N. E. (2019). Teaching nature of science through children's literature: An early childhood preservice teacher study. International Journal of Science Education, 41(18), 2765–2787. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1698785

Akerson, V. L., Nargund-Joshi, V., Weiland, I., Pongsanon, K., & Avsar, B. (2014). What third-grade students of differing ability levels learn about nature of science after a year of instruction. International Journal of Science Education, 36(2), 244–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.761365

Akerson, V. L., Pongsanon, K., Park Rogers, M. A., Carter, I., & Galindo, E. (2017). Exploring the use of lesson study to develop elementary preservice teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching nature of science. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 15, 293–312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-015-9690-x

Akerson, V. L., Weiland, I., Park Rogers, M., Khemmawaddee, P., & Bilican, K. (2014). Exploring elementary science methods course contexts to improve preservice teachers' NOS of science conceptions and understandings of NOS teaching strategies. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 10(6), 647–665. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2014.1226a
Akgun, S., & Kaya, E. (2020). How do university students perceive the nature of science? Science & Education, 29, 299–330. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00105-x

Alan, U., & Erdoğan, S. (2018). Of course, scientists haven't seen dinosaurs on the beach: Turkish kindergartners' developing understanding of the nature of science through explicit-reflective instruction. Early Childhood Education Journal, 46, 695–706.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-018-0892-z

- American Association for the Advancement of Science [AAAS]. (1990). Science for all Americans. Oxford University Press.
- American Association for the Advancement of Science [AAAS] . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science [AAAS] . (2001). Atlas of scientific literacy: Volume I. Author.

- Anderson, D., & Moeed, A. (2017). Working alongside scientists: Impacts on primary teacher beliefs and knowledge about science and science education. Science & Education, 26, 271–298. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-017-9902-6
- Andersson-Bakken, E., Jegstad, K., & Bakken, J. (2020). Textbook tasks in the Norwegian school subject natural sciences: What views do they mediate? International Journal of Science Education, 42(8), 1320–1338. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1756516
- Aragón-Méndez, M. D., Acevedo-Díaz, J. A., & García-Carmona, A. (2019). Prospective biology teachers' understanding of the nature of science through an analysis of the historical case of Semmelweis and childbed fever. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14, 525–555. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-018-9868-y
- Aydeniz, M., & Bilican, K. (2014). What do scientists know about the nature of science? A case study of novice scientists' views of NOS. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 12, 1083–1115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-013-9449-1 Aydin, S. (2015). A science faculty's transformation of nature of science understanding into his teaching graduate level chemistry course. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 16, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.1039/c4rp00212a
- Bartos, S. A., & Lederman, N. G. (2014). Teachers' knowledge structures for nature of science and scientific inquiry: Conceptions and classroom practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(9), 1150–1184. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21168
- Bauer, M. W., & Falade, B. A. (2014). Public understanding of science: Survey research around the world. In M. Bucchi & B. Trench (Eds.), Routledge handbook of public communication of science and technology (2nd ed., pp. 140–159). New York: Routledge.
- Bautista, N. U., Schussler, E. E., & Rybczynski, S. M. (2014). Instructional experiences of graduate assistants implementing explicit and reflective introductory biology laboratories. International Journal of Science Education, 36(7), 1184–1209. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.853146
- Bilican, K., Akerson, V., & Nargund, V. (2020). Learning by teaching: A case study of co-teaching to enhance Nature of Science pedagogy, successes, and challenges. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-020-10094-6
- Bilican, K., Ozdem-Yilmaz, Y., & Oztekin, C. (2014). Tracking the footprints of nature of science in the path of learning how to teach it. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science, & Technology Education, 10(6), 595–608. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2014.1121a Brunner, J. L., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2020). Improving nature of science instruction in elementary classes with modified science trade books and educative curriculum materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(2), 154–183. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21588
- Burgin, S. R., & Sadler, T. D. (2013). Consistency of practical and formal epistemologies of science held by participants of a research apprenticeship. Research in Science Education, 43, 2179–2206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-013-9351-4
- Burgin, S. R., & Sadler, T. D. (2016). Learning nature of science concepts through a research apprenticeship program: A comparative study of three approaches. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53, 31–59. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21296
- Burke, L., Wessels, A., & McAvella, A. (2018). Using theater and drama to expose and expand the epistemic insights of youth regarding the nature of science. Research in Science Education, 48, 1151–1169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9782-z
- Burton, E. P. (2013). Student work products as a teaching tool for nature of science pedagogical knowledge: A professional development project with in-service secondary science teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 29, 156–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.09.005
- Campanile, M. F., Lederman, N. G., & Kampourakis, K. (2015). Mendelian genetics as a platform for teaching about nature of science and scientific inquiry: The value of textbooks. Science & Education, 24, 205–225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-013-9607-4 Capps, D., & Crawford, B. (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. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.760209
- Cetin, P., Erduran, S., & Kaya, E. (2010). Understanding the nature of chemistry and argumentation: The case of preservice chemistry teachers. KEFAD, 11, 41–59. http://kefad.ahievran.edu.tr/arsiv/114.htm
- Chen, S. (2006). Development of an instrument to assess views on nature of science and attitudes toward teaching science. Science Education, 90, 803–819. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20147
- Cheung, K. (2020). Exploring the inclusion of Nature of Science in biology curriculum and high stakes assessments in Hong Kong. Science & Education, 29, 491–512. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00113-x
- Chiappetta, E. L., Ganesh, T. G., Lee, Y. H., & Phillips, M. C. (2006, April). Examination of science textbook analysis research conducted on textbooks published over the past 100 years in the United States. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching.
- Chiappetta, E. L., Sethna, G. H., & Fillman, D. A. (1991). A quantitative analysis of high school chemistry textbooks for scientific literacy themes and expository learning aids. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 787–797. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660281005
- Chua, J., Tan, A., & Ramnarain, U. (2019). Representation of NOS aspects across chapters in Singapore grade 9 and 10 biology textbooks: Insights for improving NOS representation. Research in Science & Technological Education, 37(3), 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2018.1542377
- Cofré, H. L., Cuevas, E., & Becerra, E. (2017). The relationship between biology teachers' understanding of the nature of science and the understanding and acceptance of theory of evolution. International Journal of Science Education, 16, 2243–2260. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1373410
- Cofré, H. L. , Santibáñez, D. P. , Jiménez, J. P. , Spotorno, A. , Carmona, F. , Navarrete, K. , & Vergara, C. A. (2018). The effect of teaching the nature of science on students' acceptance and understanding of evolution: Myth or reality? Journal of Biological Education, 52(3), 248–261. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2017.1326968
- Coleman, J., Stears, M., & Dempster, E. (2015). Student teachers' understanding and acceptance of evolution and the nature of science. South African Journal of Education, 35(2). https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v35n2a1079
- Cooley, W. W., & Klopfer, L. E. (1961). TOUS: Test on understanding science. Education Testing Service.

- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) Pan-Canadian Science Project . (1997). The common framework of science learning outcomes K to 12 [Online]. https://science.cmec.ca/index.en.htm
- Das, P. M., Faikhamta, C., & Punsuvon, V. (2019). Bhutanese students' views of nature of science: A case study of a culturally rich country. Research in Science Education, 49, 391–412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9611-9
- DeBoer, G. E. (2000). Scientific literacy: Another look at its historical and contemporary means and its relationship to science education reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37(6), 582–601. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2736(200008)37:6<582::AID-TEA5>3.0.CO;2-L
- Demirdogen, B., & Uzuntiryaki-Kondakci, E. (2016). Closing the gap between beliefs and practice: Change of pre-service chemistry teachers' orientations during a PCK-based NOS course. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 17, 818–841. https://doi.org/10.1039/c6rp00062b
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20460
- Deniz, H., & Adibelli, E. (2015). Exploring how second grade elementary teachers translate their Nature of Science views into classroom practice after a graduate level nature of science course. Research in Science Education, 45, 867–888. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-014-9447-5
- Dibattista, L., & Morgese, F. (2013). Introducing history (and philosophy) of science in the classroom: A field research experience in Italy. Science & Education, 22, 543–576. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-012-9436-x
- DiGuiseppe, M. (2014). Representing nature of science in a science textbook: Exploring author-editor-publisher interactions. International Journal of Science Education, 36(7), 1061–1082. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.840405
- Dogan, N., Cakiroglu, J., Bilican, K., & Cavus, S. (2013). What NOS teaching practices tell us: A case of two science teachers. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 12(4), 424–439.
- Doig, B., & Groves, S. (2011). Japanese lesson study: Teacher professional development through communities of inquiry. Mathematics Teacher Education and Development, 13(1), 77–93.
- Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). Young people's images of science. Open University Press.
- Erduran, S., & Dagher, Z. (2014a). Reconceptualizing the nature of science for science education: Scientific knowledge, practices and other family categories. Springer.
- Erduran, S., & Dagher, Z. (2014b). Regaining focus in Irish junior cycle science: Potential new directions for curriculum and assessment on nature of science. Irish Educational Studies, 33(4), 335–350. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2014.984386 Eren-Şişman, E. N., Çiğdemoğlu, C., Kanlı, U., & Köseoğlu, F. (2020). Science teachers' professional development about science centers. Science & Education, 29, 1255–1290. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00136-4
- Eshach, H., Hwang, F., Wu, H., & Hsu, Y. (2013). Introducing Taiwanese undergraduate students to the nature of science through Nobel Prize stories. Physics Review Special Topics-Physics Education and Research, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.9.010116
- Eymur, G. (2019). The influence of the explicit nature of science instruction embedded in the argument-driven inquiry method in chemistry laboratories on high school students' conceptions about the nature of science. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 20, 17–29. https://doi.org/10.1039/c8rp00135a
- Faikhamta, C. (2013). The development of in-service science teachers' understandings of and orientations to teaching the nature of science within a PCK-based NOS course. Research in Science Education, 43, 847–869. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-012-9283-4 Ferreira, S., & Morais, A. M. (2013). The Nature of Science in science curricula: Methods and concepts of analysis. International Journal of Science Education, 35(16), 2670–2691. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2011.621982
- Fleener, M. J. (1996). Scientific world building on the edge of chaos: High school students' beliefs about mathematics and science. School Science and Mathematics, 96(6), 312–320. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.1996.tb15841.x
- Ford, D. J. (2006). Representations of science within children's trade books. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 214–235. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20095
- Gandolfi, H. (2020). "I didn't know how that could come to this curriculum": Teacher's growth through the development of materials about nature of science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(6), 610–630. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1730049 García-Carmona, A., & Acevedo-Díaz, J. A. (2017). Understanding the nature of science through a critical and reflective analysis of the controversy between Pasteur and Liebig on fermentation. Science & Education, 26, 65–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-017-9876-4
- Gencer, A. (2014). Analysing Vee diagram reflections to explore pre-service science teachers' understanding the nature of science in biology. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education, 10(5), 437–446. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2014.1141a
- Giere, R. N. (1988). Explaining science: A cognitive approach. The University of Chicago Press.
- Good, R., & Shymansky, J. (2001). Nature-of-science literacy in *Benchmarks* and *Standards*: Post-modern/relativist or modern/relist? Science & Education, 10, 173–185. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008789610357
- Griffard, P. , Mosleh, T. , & Kubba, S. (2013). Developing the inner scientist: Book club participation and the nature of science. CBE-Life Sciences Education, 12(1), 80-91. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.12-02-0020
- Hanuscin, D. L. , Lee, M. H. , & Akerson, V. L. (2011). Elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching the nature of science. Science Education, 95(1), 145–167. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20404
- Harrison, G., Seraphin, K., Philippoff, J., Vallin, L., & Brandon, P. (2015). Comparing models of nature of science dimensionality based on the Next Generation Science Standards. International Journal of Science Education, 37(8), 1321–1342. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1035357
- Hashweh, M. (1987). Effects of subject-matter knowledge in the teaching of biology and physics. Teaching and Teacher Education, 3(2), 109–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(87)90012-6
- Herman, B. (2018). Students' environmental NOS views, compassion, intent, and action: Impact of place-based socioscientific issues instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 600–638. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21433
- Herman, B., & Clough, M. (2016). Teachers' longitudinal NOS understanding after having completed a science teacher education program. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 14, 207–227. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-014-9594-1 Herman, B., Clough, M., & Olson, J. (2013). Teachers' nature of science implementation practices 2–5 years after having completed
- Herman, B., Clough, M., & Olson, J. (2013). Teachers' nature of science implementation practices 2–5 years after having completed an intensive science education program. Science Education, 97, 271–309. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21048

- Herman, B., Clough, M., & Olson, J. (2017). Pedagogical reflections by secondary science teachers at different NOS implementation levels. Research in Science Education, 47, 161–184. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-015-9494-6
- Herman, B., Olson, J., & Clough, M. (2019). The role of informal support networks in teaching the nature of science. Research in Science Education, 49, 191–218. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9610-2
- Herman, B., Owens, D., Oertli, R., Zangori, L., & Newton, M. (2019). Exploring the complexity of students' scientific explanations and associated nature of science views within a place-based socioscientific context. Science & Education, 28, 329–366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00034-4
- Herman, B., Zeidler, D. L., & Newton, M. (2021). Impact of place-based socioscientific issues instruction on students' contextualization of socioscientific orientations. Science Education, 105(4), 585–627. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21618
- Hodson, D. (1991). Philosophy of science and science education. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.), History, philosophy, and science teaching: Selected readings (pp. 19–32). Teachers College Press.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067001088
- Hwang, S. (2015). Making sense of scientific biographies: Scientific achievement, nature of science, and storylines in college students' essays. Journal of Biological Education, 49(3), 288–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2014.943791
- Irzik, G., & Nola, R. (2011). A family resemblance approach to the nature of science for science education. Science & education, 20(7), 591–607.
- Kampourakis, K. (2016). The "general aspects" conceptualization as a pragmatic and effective means to introducing students to nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(5), 667–682.
- Kartal, E. E., Cobern, W., Dogan, N., Irez, S., Cakmakci, G., & Yalaki, Y. (2018). Improving science teachers' nature of science views through an innovative continuing professional development program. International Journal of STEM Education, 5, 30. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0125-4
- Kaya, E., & Erduran, S. (2016). From FRA to RFN, or how the Family Resemblance Approach can be transformed for science curriculum analysis on nature of science. Science & Education, 25, 1115–1133. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-016-9861-3
- Kaya, E., Erduran, S., Aksoz, B., & Akgun, S. (2019). Reconceptualised family resemblance approach to the nature of science in pre-service science teacher education. International Journal of Science Education, 41(1), 21–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1529447
- Kelly, L. (2018). An analysis of award-winning science trade books for children: Who are the scientists, and what is science? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 1188–1210. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21447
- Kelly, R., & Erduran, S. (2019). Understanding aims and values of science: Developments in the junior cycle specifications on nature of science and pre-service science teachers' views in Ireland. Irish Educational Studies, 38(1), 43–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2018.1512886
- Khishfe, R. (2013). Transfer of nature of science understandings into similar contexts: Promises and possibilities of an explicit reflective approach. International Journal of Science Education, 35(17), 2928–2953. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.672774 Khishfe, R. (2014). Explicit nature of science and argumentation instruction in the context of socioscientific issues: An effect on student learning and transfer. International Journal of Science Education, 36(6), 974–1016. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.832004
- Khishfe, R. (2015). A look into students' retention of acquired nature of science understandings. International Journal of Science Education, 37(10), 1639–1667. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1049241
- Khishfe, R. (2017). Consistency of nature of science views across scientific and socio-scientific contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 39(4), 403–432. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1287976
- Khishfe, R. (2019). The transfer of nature of science understandings: A question of similarity and familiarity of contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 41(9), 1159–1180. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1596329
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.10036
- Khishfe, R., Alshaya, F., BouJaoude, S., Mansour, N., & Alrudiyan, K. (2017). Students' understandings of nature of science and their arguments in the context of four socio-scientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 39(3), 299–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1280741
- Kimball, M. E. (1967–68). Understanding the nature of science: A comparison of scientists and science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 110–120. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660050204
- Koerber, S., Osterhaus, C., & Sodian, B. (2015). Testing primary-school children's understanding of nature of science. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 33(1), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12067
- Kohut, M. (2019). Changing minds or rhetoric? How students use their many natures of science to talk about evolution. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14(4), 839–862. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-018-9865-1
- Koskal, M. S., & Cakiroglu, J. (2010). Examining science teacher's understandings of the NOS aspects through the use of knowledge test and open-ended questions. Science Education International, 21(3), 197–211.
- Krell, M., Koska, J., Penning, F., & Kruger, D. (2015). Fostering pre-service teachers' views about nature of science: Evaluation of a new STEM curriculum. Research in Science & Technological Education, 33(3), 344–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2015.1060411
- Kremer, K., Specht, C., Urhahne, D., & Mayer, J. (2014). The relationship in biology between the nature of science and scientific inquiry. Journal of Biological Education, 48(1), 1–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2013.788541
- Kruse, J. , Easter, J. , Edgerly, H. , Seebach, C. , & Patel, N. (2017). The impact of a course on nature of science pedagogical views and rationales. Science & Education, 26, 613-636. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-017-9916-0
- Kruse, J., Kent-Schneider, I., Voss, S., Zacharski, K., & Rockefeller, M. (2019). Investigating the effect of NOS question type on students' NOS responses. Research in Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09923-z
- Kutluca, A., & Aydin, A. (2017). Changes in pre-service teachers' understandings after being involved in explicit nature of science and socioscientific argumentation processes. Science & Education, 26, 637–668. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-017-9919-x
- Leden, L., & Hansson, L. (2019). Nature of science progression in school year 1–9: A case study of teachers' suggestions and rationales. Research in Science Education, 49, 591–611. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9628-0

- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660290404
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199910)36:8<916::AID-TEA2>3.0.CO;2-A
- 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). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lederman, N. G. (2019). Contextualizing the relationship between nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry. Science & Education, 28, 249–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00030-8
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.10034
- Lederman, N. G., & Abell, S. K. (Eds.). (2014). Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2). Routledge.
- Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2010). Developing and sustaining leadership in science education. In J. Rhoton (Ed.), Science education leadership: Best practices for the new century (pp. 129–141). National Science Teacher Association (NSTA) Press.
- Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2014). Research on teaching and learning of nature of science. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 600–620). Routledge.
- Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2019). Teaching and learning nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry: Building capacity through systematic research-based professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(7), 737–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1625572
- Lederman, N. G., & O'Malley, M. (1990). Students' perceptions of tentativeness in science: Development, use, and sources of change. Science Education, 74, 225–239. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730740207
- Leonhardt, D. (2021, May 24). The vaccine class gap. New York Times: The Morning Newsletter.
- www.nytimes.com/2021/05/24/briefing/vaccination-class-gap-us.html
- Leung, J. S. C. (2020). A practice-based approach to learning nature of science through socioscientific issues. Research in Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09942-w
- Lewis, G. N. (1916). The atom and the molecule. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 38(4), 762–785.
- Li, X., Tan, Z., Shen, J., Hu, W., Chen, Y., & Wang, J. (2020). Analysis of five junior high school physics textbooks used in China for representations of nature of science. Research in Science Education, 50, 833–844. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9713-z
- 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.
- Lin, T., Goh, A., Chai, C., & Tsai, C. (2013). An initial examination of Singaporean seventh and eighth graders' views of nature of science. Research in Science & Technological Education, 31(2), 117–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2013.811073
- Lorsbach, A., Meyer, A., & Arias, A. (2019). The correspondence of Charles Darwin as a tool for reflecting on nature of science. Science & Education, 28, 1085–1103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00080-y
- Maeng, J., Bell, R., St. Clair, T., Gonczi, A., & Whitworth, B. (2018). Supporting elementary teachers' enactment of nature of science instruction: A randomized control trial. International Journal of Science Education, 40(18), 2245–2264. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1528643
- Maeng, J. , Whitworth, B. , Bell, R. , & Sterling, D. (2020). The effect of professional development on elementary science teachers' understanding, confidence, and classroom implementation of reform-based science instruction. Science Education, 104, 326–353. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21562
- Mansour, N., Wegerif, R., Skinner, N., Postlewaite, K., & Hetherington, L. (2016). Investigating and promoting trainee science teachers' conceptual change of the nature of science with digital dialogue games "InterLoc". Research in Science Education, 46, 667–668. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-015-9475-9
- McComas, W. F. (1996). Ten myths of science: Reexamining what we think we know about the nature of science. School Science and Mathematics, 96(1), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.1996.tb10205.x
- McComas, W. F. (2020a). Considering a consensus view of nature of science content for school science programs. In W. F.
- McComas (Ed.), Nature of science in science instruction: Rationales and strategies (pp. 23–34). Springer.
- McComas, W. F. (2020b). Principal elements of nature of science: Informing science teaching while dispelling the myths. In W. F.
- McComas (Ed.), Nature of science in science instruction: Rationales and strategies (pp. 35–66). Springer.
- McComas, W. F., & Nouri, N. (2016). The nature of science and the next generation science standards: Analysis and critique. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27, 555–576. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-016-9474-3
- 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). Kluwer.
- Meichtry, Y. J. (1993). The impact of science curricula on student views about the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30(5), 429–443. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660300503
- Melo, E., & Bachtold, M. (2018). A theater-based device for training teachers on the nature of science. Science & Education, 27, 963–986. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-0009-5
- Mesci, G. (2020). The influence of PCK-based NOS teaching on pre-service science teachers' NOS views. Science & Education, 29(3), 743–769. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00117-7
- Meyer, X., & Crawford, B. (2015). Multicultural inquiry toward demystifying scientific culture and learning science. Science Education, 99(4), 617–637. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21162
- Michel, H., & Neumann, I. (2016). Nature of science and science content learning. Science & Education, 25, 951–975. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-016-9860-4
- Miller, J. (2021, February 25). Education is a bigger factor than race in desire for COVID-19 vaccine. USC News.
- https://news.usc.edu/182848/education-covid-19-vaccine-safety-risks-usc-study/
- Miller, M. C. , 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(1), 45–54. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.09-05-0029

- Millar, R., & Osborne, J. F. (Eds.). (1998). Beyond 2000: Science education for the future. King's College London.
- Mulvey, B., Chiu, J., Ghosh, R., & Bell, R. (2016). Special education teachers' nature of science instructional experiences. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(4), 554–578. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21311
- Myers, J. Y., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2016). A ton of faith in science! Nature and role of assumptions in, and ideas about, science and epistemology generated upon watching a sci-fi film. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(8), 1143–1171. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21324
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine . (2016). Science literacy: Concepts, contexts, and consequences. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/23595
- National Research Council [NRC] . (1996). National science education standards. National Academic Press.
- National Science Board . (2016). Science and engineering indicators, 2016. National Science Foundation.
- National Science Board . (2020). The state of U.S. science and engineering, 2020. National Science Foundation.
- National Science Teachers Association [NSTA] . (1982). Science-technology-society: Science education for the 1980s (An NSTA position statement). Author.
- Neumann, I. (2011). Beyond physics content knowledge: Modeling competence regarding nature of scientific inquiry and nature of scientific knowledge. Logos.
- NGSS Lead States . (2013a). Next generation science standards: For states, by states volume 1: The standards. The National Academies Press.
- NGSS Lead States . (2013b). Next generation science standards: For states, by states volume 2: Appendices. The National Academies Press.
- Niaz, M. (1998). From cathode rays to alpha particles to quantum of action: A rational reconstruction of structure of the atom and its implications for chemistry textbooks. Science Education, 82, 527–552. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(199809)82:5<527::AID-SCE1>3.0.CO;2-B
- Nylehn, J., & Odegaard, M. (2018). The "species" concept as a gateway to nature of science. Science & Education, 27, 685–714. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-0007-7
- Nott, M., & Wellington, J. (1993). Your nature of science profile: An activity for science teachers. School Science Review, 75, 109–112.
- Olson, J. (2018). The inclusion of the nature of science in nine recent international science education standards documents. Science & Education, 27, 637–660. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-9993-8
- Ortaliza, J., Orgera, K., Amin, K., & Cox, C. (2021, December 10). COVID-19 preventable mortality and leading cause of death ranking. Health System Tracker. www.healthsystemtracker.org/brief/covid19-and-other-leading-causes-of-death-in-the-us/
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.10105
- Ozgelen, S., Yilmaz-Tuzun, O., & Hanuscin, D. (2013). Exploring the development of preservice science teachers' views on the nature of science in inquiry-based laboratory instruction. Research in Science Education, 43, 1551–1570. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-012-9321-2
- Papadouris, N., & Constantinou, C. (2014). An exploratory investigation of 12-year-old students' ability to appreciate certain aspects of the nature of science through a specially designed approach in the context of energy. International Journal of Science Education, 36(5), 755–782. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.827816
- Park, H., Nielsen, W., & Woodruff, E. (2014). Students' conceptions of the nature of science: Perspectives from Canadian and Korean middle school students. Science & Education, 23, 1169–1196. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-013-9613-6
- Park, W., Wu, J., & Erduran, S. (2020). The nature of STEM disciplines in the science education standards documents from the USA, Korea, and Taiwan. Science & Education, 29, 899–927. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00139-1
- Park, W. , Yang, S. , & Song, J. (2019). When modern physics meets nature of science. Science & Education, 28, 1055–1083. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00075-9
- Park, W., Yang, S., & Song, J. (2020). Eliciting students' understanding of nature of science with text-based tasks: Insights from new Korean high school textbooks. International Journal of Science Education, 42(3), 426–450. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1714094
- Pavez, J., Vergara, C., Santibanez, D., & Cofré, H. L. (2016). Using a professional development program for enhancing Chilean biology teachers' understanding of Nature of Science (NOS) and their perceptions about using history of science to teach NOS. Science & Education, 25, 383–405. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-016-9817-7
- Peoples, S. M., & O'Dwyer, L. M. (2012). The Nature of Science Instrument-Elementary (NOSI-E): The end of the road? Journal of Applied Measurement, 15(4), 338–358.
- Peters-Burton, E. (2015). Outcomes of a self-regulated learning curriculum model. Science & Education, 24, 855–885. https://doiorg.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1007/s11191-015-9769-3
- Peters-Burton, E., & Baynard, L. (2013). Network analysis of beliefs about the scientific enterprise: A comparison of scientists, middle school science teachers and eighth-grade science students. International Journal of Science Education, 35(16), 2801–2837. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.662609
- Peters-Burton, E., Parrish, J., & Mulvey, B. (2019). Extending the utility of the views of nature of science assessment through epistemic network analysis. Science & Education, 28, 1027–1053. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00081-x
- Piliouras, P., Plakitsi, K., Seroglou, F., & Papantoniou, G. (2018). Teaching explicitly and reflecting on elements of nature of science: A discourse-focused professional development program with four fifth-grade teachers. Research in Science Education, 48, 1221–1246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9600-4
- Popper, K. R. (1992). The logic of scientific discovery (reprint ed.). Routledge. (First published 1959 by Hutchinson Education, first appeared 1934).
- Preidt, R. (2021, February 26). Education level now prime driver of COVID vaccine hesitancy: Poll. US News & World Report. www.usnews.com/news/health-news/articles/2021-02-26/education-level-now-prime-driver-of-covid-vaccine-hesitancy-poll Price, C., & Lee, H. (2013). Changes in participants' scientific attitudes and epistemological beliefs during an astronomical citizen science project. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(7), 773–801. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21090

- Ramnarain, U., & Chanetsa, T. (2016). An analysis of South African grade 9 natural sciences textbooks for their representation of nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 38(6), 922–933. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1167985
- Ramnarain, U., & Padayachee, K. (2015). A comparative analysis of South African life sciences and biology textbooks for inclusion of the nature of science. South African Journal of Education, 35(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.15700/201503062358
- Rebull, L., French, D., Laurence, W., Roberts, T., Fitzgerald, M., Gorjian, V., & Squires, G. (2018). Major outcomes of an authentic astronomy research experience professional development program: An analysis of 8 years of data from a teacher research program. Physics Review Physics Education Research, 14(2). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.14.020102
- Reinisch, B. , & Kruger, D. (2018). Preservice biology teachers' conceptions about the tentative nature of theories and models in biology. Research in Science Education, 48, 71-103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9559-1
- Rodriguez, M. A., & Niaz, M. (2002). How in spite of the rhetoric, history of chemistry has been ignored in presenting atomic structure in textbooks. Science and Education, 11, 423–441. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016599623871
- Rubba, P. A. (1976). Nature of scientific knowledge scale. School of Education, Indiana University.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730620404
- Rudolph, J. L. (2000). Reconsidering the "nature of science" as a curriculum component. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32(3), 403–419. https://doi.org/10.1080/002202700182628
- Russell, T., & Aydeniz, M. (2013). Traversing the divide between high school science students and sophisticated nature of science understandings: A multi-pronged approach. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 22, 529–547. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-012-9412-x
- Rutledge, M. L., & Warden, M. A. (1999). The development and validation of the measure of acceptance of the theory of evolution instrument. School Science and Mathematics, 99(1), 13–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.1999.tb17441.x
- Rutledge, M. L., & Warden, M. A. (2000). Evolutionary theory, the nature of science & high school biology teachers: Critical relationships. The American Biology Teacher, 62(1), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.2307/4450822
- Schellinger, J., Mendenhall, A., Alemanne, N., Southerland, S., Sampson, V., & Marty, P. (2019). Using technology-enhanced inquiry-based instruction to foster the development of elementary students' views on the nature of science. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 28(4), 341–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-019-09771-1
- Schiffer, H., & Guerra, A. (2015). Electricity and vital force: Discussing the nature of science through a historical narrative. Science & Education, 24, 409–434. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-014-9718-6
- Schroeder, M., McKeough, A., Graham, S., & Norris, S. (2019). Students' views of uncertainty in formal and personal science.
- Research in Science & Technological Education, 37(2), 239–257. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2018.1541878
- Schussler, E., Bautista, N., Link-Perez, M., Solomon, N., & Steinly, B. (2013). Instruction matters for nature of science understanding in college biology laboratories. Bioscience, 63(5), 380–389. https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.11
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.10021 Shamos, M. (1995). The myth of scientific literacy. Rutgers University Press.
- Shultz, G., & Gere, A. (2015). Writing-to-learn the nature of science in the context of the Lewis dot structure model. Journal of Chemical Education, 92, 1325–1329. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.5b00064
- Šorgo, A., Usak, M., Kubiatko, M., Fančovičova, J., Prokop, P., Puhek, M., Skoda, J., & Bahar, M. (2014). A cross-cultural study on freshmen's knowledge of genetics, evolution, and the nature of science. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 13(1), 6–18.
- Soucheray, S. (2021, June 25). Nearly all US COVID-19 deaths now preventable. Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy. www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2021/06/nearly-all-us-covid-19-deaths-now-preventable
- Stott, A., & Hattingh, A. (2020). Pre-service teachers' views about the nature of science and scientific inquiry: The South African case. South African Journal of Education, 40(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v40n1a1573
- Sturgis, P., Brunton-Smith, I., & Jackson, J. (2021). Trust in science, social consensus and vaccine confidence. Nature Human Behavior, 5, 1528–1534. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01115-7
- Summers, R., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2019). Examining the representations of NOS in educational resources. Science & Education, 28, 269–289. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-0018-4
- Summers, R., Alameh, S., Brunner, J., Maddux, J., Wallon, R., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2019). Representations of nature of science in US science standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(9), 1234–1268. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21551
- Supprakob, S., Faikhamta, & Suwanruji, P. (2016). Using the lens of pedagogical content knowledge for teaching the nature of science to portray novice chemistry teachers' transforming NOS in early years of teaching profession. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 17, 1067–1080. https://doi.org/10.1039/c6rp00158k
- Tala, S., & Vesterinen, V. (2015). Nature of science contextualized: Studying nature of science with scientists. Science & Education, 24, 435–457. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-014-9738-2
- Temel, S., Sen, S., & Ozcan, O. (2017). Validity and reliability analyses for the Nature of Science Instrument Secondary (NOSI-S). Journal of Baltic Science Education, 16(3), 429–437.
- Tsybulsky, D. (2018). Comparing the impact of two science-as-inquiry methods on the NOS understanding of high-school biology students. Science & Education, 27, 661–683. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-0001-0
- Tsybulsky, D. , Dodick, J. , & Camhi, J. (2018). High-school students in university research labs? Implementing an outreach model based on the "science as inquiry" approach. Journal of Biological Education, 52(4), 415-428. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2017.1403360
- United States Census Bureau . (2021). Educational attainment in the United States: 2020.
- www.census.gov/data/tables/2020/demo/educational-attainment/cps-detailed-tables.html
- Upahi, J. , Ramnarain, U. , & Ishola, I. (2020). The nature of science as represented in chemistry textbooks in Nigeria. Research in Science Education, 50, 1321-1339. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9734-7
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-010-9233-4
- Uyar, M., Demirel, T., & Doganay, A. (2018). Development of pre-service teachers' understanding of the nature of science through an interdisciplinary curriculum: A case study. Journal of Baltic Education, 17(4), 728–740. https://doi.org/10.33225/jbse/18.17.728

- Valente, B., Mauricio, P., & Faria, C. (2018). Understanding the process and conditions that improve preservice teachers' conceptions of nature of science in real contexts. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(7), 620–643. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1485399
- Valverde, G. A., Bianchi, L. J., Schmidt, W. H., McKnight, C. C., & Wolfe, R. G. (2002). According to the book: Using TIMSS to investigate the translation of policy into practice in the world of textbooks. Kluwer.
- Vesterinen, V., Aksela, M., & Lavonen, J. (2013). Quantitative analysis of representations of nature of science in Nordic upper secondary school textbooks using framework of analysis based on philosophy of chemistry. Science & Education, 22, 1839–1855. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-011-9400-1
- Wahbeh, N., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2014). Revisiting the translation of nature of science understandings into instructional practice: Teachers' nature of science pedagogical content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 36(3), 425–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.786852
- Wan, D., Zhang, H., & Wei, B. (2018). Impact of Chinese culture on pre-service science teachers' views of the nature of science. Science & Education, 321–355. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-9968-9
- Wan, Z. , & Wong, S. (2016). Views from the chalkface. Science & Education, 25, 1089–1114. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-016-9866-y
- Wan, Z., Wong, S., Wei, B., & Zhan, Y. (2013). Focusing on the classical or contemporary? Chinese teacher educators' conceptions of nature of science content to be taught to pre-service science teachers. Research in Science Education, 43, 2541–2566. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-013-9372-z
- Weiss, I. R., Banilower, E. R., McMahon, K. C., & Smith, P. S. (2001). Report of the 2000 national survey of science and mathematics education. Horizon Research.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730380209
- Wittgenstein, L. (1973). Philosophical investigations (3rd ed., G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Pearson (Original work published 1953). Woitkowski, D., & Wurmbach, N. (2019). Assessing German professors' views of nature of science. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 15. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.15.010108
- Yeh, Y., Erduran, S., & Hsu, Y. (2019). Investigating coherence about nature of science in science curriculum documents. Science & Education, 28, 291–310. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00053-1
- Zeidler, D. L. (2014). Socioscientific issues as a curriculum emphasis: Theory, research, and practice. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 697–726). Routledge.
- Zion, M., Schwartz, R., Rimmerman-Shmueli, E., & Adler, I. (2020). Supporting teachers' understanding of nature of science and inquiry through personal experience and perception of inquiry as a dynamic process. Research in Science Education, 50, 1281–1304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-018-9732-9

Exploring and Expanding the Frontiers of Socioscientific Issues

Aikenhead, G. S. (1996). Science education: Border crossing into the subculture of science. Studies in Science Education, 27, 1–52. Akbas, M., & Cetin, P. S. (2018). The investigation of gifted students' argumenation level and informal reasoning related to socioscientific issues. Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 12(1), 339–360. Alcaraz-Dominguez, S., & Barajas, M. (2021). Conceptualization of socioscientific issues in educational practice from a review of research in science education. International Journal of Information and education Technology, 11(6), 297–302. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2021.11.6.1526

- Alsop, S., & Bencze, L. (2014). Activism! Toward a more radical science and technology education. In L. Bencze & S. Alsop (Eds.), Activist science and technology education (pp. 1–19). Springer.
- Amos, R., Knippels, M.-C., & Levinson, R. (2020). Socio-scientific inquiry-based learning: Possibilities and challenges for teacher education. In M. Evagorou, J. A. Nielsen, & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science teacher education for responsible citizenship: Toward a pedagogy for relevance through socioscientific issues (pp. 41–61). Springer.
- Amos, R., & Levinson, R. (2019). Socio-scientific inquiry-based learning: An approach for engaging with the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals through school science. International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 11(1), 29–49. Anker-Hansen, J., & Andreé, M. (2019). In pursuit of authenticity in science education. NorDiNa, Nordic Studies in Science Education, 15(1), 498–510.
- Anwar, N. P., & Ali, M. A. (2020). The effect of Socio-Scientific Issue (SSI) based discussion: A student-centered approach to the teaching of argumentation. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the South, 4(2), 35–62.
- Atabey, N., & Topcu, M. (2018). The effects of socioscientific issues based instruction on middle school students' argumentation quality. Journal of Education and Practice, 8, 61–71.
- Barzilai, S., & Chinn, C. A. (2018). On the goals of epistemic education: Promoting apt epistemic performance. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 27(3), 353–389.
- Bayram-Jacobs, D., Henze, I., Evagorou, M., Shwartz, Y., Aschim, E. L., Alcaraz-Dominguez, S., Barajas, M., & Dagan, E. (2019). Science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge development during enactment of socioscientific curriculum materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(9), 1207–1233.
- Baytelman, A., lordanou, K., & Constantinou, C. P. (2020). Epistemic beliefs and prior knowledge as predictors of the construction of different types of arguments on socioscientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(8), 1199–1227. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21627
- Belland, B. R., Gu, J., Armbrust, S., & Cook, B. (2015). Scaffolding argumentation about water quality: A mixed-method study in a rural middle school. Educational Technology Research and Development, 63, 325–353.
- Bencze, J. L., & Alsop, S. (Eds.). (2014). Activist science & technology education. Springer.
- Bencze, J. L., El Hawany, S., & Zouda, M. (2020). Critical and active public engagement in addressing socioscientific problems through science teacher education. In M. Evagorou, J. A. Nielsen, & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science teacher education for responsible citizenship: Toward a pedagogy for relevance through socioscientific issues (pp. 62–83). Springer.

- Bencze, J. L., & Krstovic, M. (2017). Science students' ethical technology designs as solutions to socio-scientific problems. In Science and technology education promoting wellbeing for individuals, societies and environments (pp. 201–226). Springer.
- Bencze, J. L., Pouliot, C., Pedretti, E., Simonneaux, L., Simonneaux, J., & Zeidler, D. L. (2020). SAQ, SSI & STSE education: Defending and extending "science-in-context". Cultural Studies in Science Education, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09962-7
- Bencze, J. L., Reiss, M. J., Sharma, A., & Weinstein, M. (2018). STEM education as "Trojan Horse": Deconstructed and reinvented for all. In L. Bryan & K. Tobin (Eds.), 13 questions: Reframing education's conversation: Science (pp. 69–87). Peter Lang.
- Bencze, J. L., Sperling, E., & Carter, L. (2012). Students' research-informed socioscientific activism: Re/Visions for a sustainable future. Research in Science Education, 42(1), 129–148.
- Berland, L. K., Schwarz, C. V., Krist, C., Kenyon, L., Lo, A. S., & Reiser, B. J. (2016). Epistemologies in practice: Making scientific practices meaningful for students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(7), 1082–1112. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21257 Bernstein, B. (2003). Class, codes & control, Vol. 4: The structuring of pedagogic discourse. Routledge.
- Bossér, U. (2018). Exploring the complexities of integrating socioscientific issues in science teaching [Linnaeus University Dissertations], No 304/2018, ISBN: 978-91-88761-06-4.
- Bossér, U., & Lindahl, M. (2019). Students' positioning in the classroom: A study of teacher-student interactions in a socioscientific issue context. Research in Science Education, 49(2), 371–390. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9627-1
- Bossér, U., & Lindahl, M. (2020). Teachers' coordination of dialogic and authoritative discourses promoting specific goals in socioscientific issue-based teaching. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 1–22.
- Bossér, U., Lundin, M., Lindahl, M., & Linder, C. (2015). Challenges faced by teachers implementing socio-scientific issues as core elements in their classroom practices. European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 3(2), 159–176.
- Buckingham, B. L. E. (2017). Middle school students' use of epistemological resources while reasoning about science performance tasks and media reports of socioscientific issues. Northwestern University.
- Callewaert, S. (2007). Foucault's concept of dispositive. Praktiske Grunde: Nordisk tidsskrift for kultur- och samfundsvidenskab nr, 1–2, 29–52.
- Carson, K., & Dawson, V. (2016). A teacher professional development model for teaching socioscientific issues. Teaching Science: The Journal of the Australian Science Teachers Association, 62(1), 30–37.
- Center for Biodiversity . (2020). Dispersants.
- www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/public_lands/energy/dirty_energy_development/oil_and_gas/gulf_oil_spill/dispersants.html Chang Rundgren, S. N., & Rundgren, C. J. (2010). SEE-SEP: From a separate to a holistic view of socioscientific issues. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 11(1), Article 2.
- Chen, L., & Xiao, S. (2020). Perceptions, challenges and coping strategies of science teachers in teaching socioscientific issues: A systematic review. Educational Research Review. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100377
- Christenson, N., Chang-Rundgren, S.-N., & Zeidler, D. L. (2014). The relationship of discipline background to upper secondary students' argumentation of socioscientific issues. Research in Science Education, 44(4), 581–601.
- Christenson, N., Gericke, N., Rundgren, S. N. (2017). Science and language teachers' assessment of upper secondary students' socioscientific argumentation. International Journal of Science & Mathematics Education, 15(8), 1403–1422. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-016-9746-6
- Cook, K. L., & Buck, G. A. (2013). Pre-service teachers' understanding of the nature of science through socio-scientific inquiry. The Electronic Journal for Research in Science & Mathematics Education, 17(1). https://ejrsme.icrsme.com/article/view/11294
- Cornut, J. (2015). Practice turn in international relations theory. In R. A. Denemark (Ed.), The international studies encyclopedia. International Studies Association. Onlilne.
- https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-113
- Cress, U., & Kimmerle, J. (2017). The interrelations of individual learning and collective knowledge construction: A cognitive-systemic framework. In S. Schwan & U. Cress (Eds.), The psychology of digital learning: Constructing, exchanging, and acquiring knowledge with digital media (pp. 123–145). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49077-9_7
- Cunningham, C. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2017). Epistemic practices of engineering for education. Science Education, 101(3), 486–505. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21271
- Dawson, V., & Carson, K. (2017). Using climate change scenarios to assess high school students' argumentation skills. Research in Science & Technological Education, 35(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2016.1174932
- Delaney, K. K. (2018). Negotiating calendar time: "Best practices" and teacher sense-making in a public pre-Kindergarten classroom. Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 39(2), 150–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2018.1441927 Dewey, J. (1908). Moral principles in education. Houghton-Mifflin.
- Dole, J. A., & Sinatra, G. M. (1998). Reconceptualizing change in the cognitive construction of knowledge. Educational Psychologist, 33(2–3), 109–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1998.9653294
- Durkheim, E. (1893). The division of labour in society (W. Halls, Trans.). Free Press.
- Eggert, S., Nitsch, A., Boone, W. J., Nückles, M., & Bögeholz, S. (2017). Supporting students' learning and socioscientific reasoning about climate change: The effect of computer-based concept mapping scaffolds. Research in Science Education, 47(1), 137–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-015-9493-7
- Ellison, S., & Allen, B. (2018). Disruptive innovation, labor markets, and Big Valley STEM School: Network analysis in STEM education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 13, 267–298.
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. Journal of Education and Work, 14(1), 133–156.
- Evagorou, M., Nielsen, J. A., & Dillon, J. (2020). Science teacher education for responsible citizenship: Toward a pedagogy for relevance through socioscientific issues. Springer.
- Evagorou, M., & Osborne, J. (2013). Exploring young students' collaborative argumentation within a socioscientific issue. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(2), 209–237. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21076
- Fensham, P. J., & Montana, J. (2018). The challenges and opportunities for embracing complex socio-scientific Issues as important in learning science: The Murray-Darling River basin as an example. In D. Corrigan, C. Buntting, & J. Loughran (Eds.), Navigating the changing landscape of formal and informal science learning opportunities. Springer.

- Flanagan, O., & Oksenberg-Rorty . (1993). Identity, character, and morality: Essays in moral psychology (Vol. 1). MIT Press, A Bradford Book.
- Foong, C.-C., & Daniel, E. G. S. (2013). Students' argumentation skills across two socio-scientific issues in a confucian classroom: Is transfer possible? International Journal of Science Education, 35(14), 2331–2355. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.697209
- Friedrichsen, P., Sadler, T. D., & Zangori, L. (2020). Supporting teachers in the design and enactment of socio-scientific issue-based teaching in the USA. In M. Evagorou, J. A. Nielsen, & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science teacher education for responsible citizenship:
- Towards a pedagogy for relevance through socioscientific issues (pp. 85–99). Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Frost, T. (2019). The dispositive between Foucault and Agamben. Law, Culture and the Humanities, 15(1), 151-171.
- Genel, A., & Topçu, M. S. (2016). Turkish preservice science teachers' socioscientific issues-based teaching practices in middle school science classrooms. Research in Science & Technological Education, 34(1), 105–123.
- Gkargkavouzi, A., Halkos, G., & Matsiori, S. (2018). A multi-dimensional measure of environmental behavior: Exploring the predictive power of connectedness to nature, ecological worldview and environmental concern. Social Indicators Research. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-018-1999-8
- Greene, J. A., & Yu, S. B. (2016). Educating critical thinkers: The role of epistemic cognition. Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3(1), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732215622223
- Gresch, H., Hasselhorn, M., & Bögeholz, S. (2017). Enhancing decision-making in STSE education by inducing reflection and self-regulated learning. Research in Science Education, 47(1), 95–118.
- Guérin, L. (2019). Socio-scientific issues and citizenship education: From theory to the classroom. Inter- Und Transdisziplinäre Bildung, 1, 57–64.
- Haglund, J., & Hultén, M. (2017). Tension between visions of science education: The case of energy quality in Swedish secondary science curricula. Science & Education, 26, 323–344. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-017-9895-1
- Hallström, J., & Schönborn, K. J. (2019). Models and modelling for authentic STEM education: Reinforcing the argument. International Journal of STEM Education, 6(22). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-019-0178-z
- Hancock, T. S., Friedrichsen, P. J., Kinslow, A. T., & Sadler, T. D. (2019). Selecting socio-scientific issues for teaching. Science & Education, 28(6), 639–667. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00065-x
- Han-Tosunoglu, C., & Lederman, N. G. (2021). Developing an instrument to assess pedagogical content knowledge for biological socioscientific issues. Teaching and Teacher Education, 97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103217
- Herman, B. C. (2013). Convergence of postman and Vygotsky's perspectives regarding contemporary media's impact on learning and teaching. Chapter 15 in M. P. Clough , J. K. Olson , & D. S. Niederhausers (Eds.), The nature of technology: Implications for teaching and learning (pp. 293–328), Sense Publishers.
- Herman, B. C. (2018). Students' environmental NOS views, compassion, intent, and action: Impact of place-based socioscientific issues instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(4), 600–638. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21433
- Herman, B. C., Newton, M., & Zeidler, D. L. (2021). Impact of place-based socioscientific issues instruction on students' contextualization of socioscientific orientations. Science Education. (In Press). https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21618
- Herman, B. C., Olson, J. K., & Holtz, J. T. (2013). The relationship between environmental free-choice learning and students' learning attitudes, and policy views about waterways. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11(6), 1327–1350.
- Herman, B. C., Sadler, T. D., Zeidler, D. L., & Newton, M. (2018). A socioscientific issues approach to environmental education. In G. Reis & J. Scott (Eds.), International perspectives on the theory and practice of environmental education: A reader (pp. 145–161). Springer International Publishers.
- Herman, B. C., Zeidler, D. L., & Newton, M. (2020). Students' emotive reasoning through place-based environmental socioscientific issues. Research in Science Education, 50(3), 2081–2109.
- Hodson, D. (2011). Looking to the future: Building a curriculum for social activism. Sense Publishers.
- Hodson, D. (2014). Becoming part of the solution: Learning about activism, learning through activism, learning from activism. In L. Bencze (Ed.), Activist science and technology education (pp. 67–98). Springer.
- Irez, S., Han-Tosunoglu, C., Dogan, N., Cakmakci, G., Yalaki, Y., & Erdas-Kartal, E. (2018). Assessing teachers' competencies in identifying aspects of nature of science in educational critical scenarios. Science Education International, 29(4), 274–283.
- lordanou, K., & Constantinou, C. P. (2014). Developing pre-service teachers' evidence-based argumentation skills on socio-scientific issues. Learning and Instruction, 34, 42–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.07.004
- Isaacs, T. (2011). Moral responsibility in collective contexts. Oxford University Press.
- Isbilir, E. , Cakiroglu, J. , & Ertepinar, H. (2014). Pre-service science teachers' written argumentation qualities: From the perspectives of socio-scientific issues, epistemic belief levels and online discussion environment. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 10(5), 371–381. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2014.1110a
- Kahn, S. (2015). Another "M" for STEM? Moral considerations for advancing STEM literacy. K-12 STEM Education, 1(4), 149–156.
- Kahn, S. (2021). No child too young: A teacher research study of socioscientific issues implementation at the elementary level. In W. A. Powell (Ed.), Socioscientific issues-based instruction for scientific literacy development (pp. 1–30). IGI Global.
- Kahn, S., & Zeidler, D. L. (2016). Using our heads and HARTSS*: Developing perspective-taking skills for socioscientific reasoning (*humanities, arts, and social sciences). Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(3), 261–281.
- Kahn, S., & Zeidler, D. L. (2017). A case for the use of conceptual analysis in science education research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(4), 538–551.
- Kahn, S., & Zeidler, D. L. (2019). A conceptual analysis of perspective taking: Positioning a tangled construct within science education and beyond. Science & Education, 28, 605–638.
- Karahan, E. (2015). Case studies of secondary school teachers designing socioscientific issues-based instruction and their students' socioscientific reasoning [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Minnesota.
- Karisan, D., & Cebesoy, U. B. (2021). Use of the SEE-SEP model in preservice science teacher education: The case of genetics dilemmas. In W. A. Powell (Ed.), Socioscientific issues-based instruction for scientific literacy development (pp. 223–254). IGI Global. Karisan, D., & Yilmaz-Tuzun, O. (2017). Adaptation of character and values as global citizens assessment questionnaire into Turkish:
- Validity and reliability study. Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 42, 74–85.

 Karisan, D., Yilmaz-Tuzun, O., & Zeidler, D. L. (2018). Pre-service teachers' reflective judgment skills in the context of socio-scientific
- Karisan, D., Yilmaz-Tuzun, O., & Zeidler, D. L. (2018). Pre-service teachers' reflective judgment skills in the context of socio-scientific issues-based inquiry laboratory course. Turkish Journal of Education, 7(2), 99–116.

- Ke, L., Sadler, T. D., Zengori, L., & Friedrichsen, P. J. (2020). Students' perceptions of socio-scientific issue-based learning and their appropriation of epistemic tools for systems thinking. International Journal of Science Education, 42, 1339–1361. DOI: 10.1080/09500693.2020.1759843
- Kelly, G. J., & Licona, P. (2018). Epistemic practices and science education. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.), History, philosophy and science teaching (pp. 139–187). Springer.
- Khishfe, R. (2014). Explicit nature of science and argumentation instruction in the context of socioscientific issues: An effect on student learning and transfer. International Journal of Science Education, 36(6), 974–1016. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.832004
- Khishfe, R., Alshaya, F. S., BouJaoude, S., Mansour, N., & Alrudiyan, K. I. (2017). Students' understandings of nature of science and their arguments in the context of four socio-scientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 39(3), 299–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1280741
- Kilinc, A., Demiral, U., & Kartal, T. (2017). Resistance to dialogic discourse in SSI teaching: The effects of an argumentation-based workshop, teaching practicum, and induction on a preservice science teacher. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(6), 764–789. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21385
- Kilinc, A., Kelly, T., Eroglu, B., Demiral, U., Kartal, T., Sonmez, A., & Demirbag, M. (2017). Stickers to facts, imposers, democracy advocators, and committed impartialists: Preservice science teachers' beliefs about teacher's roles in socioscientific discourses. International Journal of Science & Mathematics Education, 15(2), 195–213. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763–015–9682-x
- Kim, G., Ko, Y., & Lee, H. (2020). The effects of community-based socioscientific issues program (SSI-COMM) on promoting students' sense of place and character as citizens. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 18(3), 399–418.
- Kim, G., & Lee, H. (2017). Effects of community-based SSI programs on promoting middle school students' understanding of issues and character and values as citizens: Focused on fine dust issues. Journal of the Korean Association for Science Education, 37(6), 911–920.
- Kinskey, M. (2020). Developing and facilitating socioscientific issues-based science lessons: Elementary preservice teachers' experiences [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of South Florida.
- Kinskey, M., & Zeidler, D. L. (2020). Elementary preservice teachers' challenges in designing and implementing socioscientific issues-based lessons. Journal of Science Teacher Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1826079 (Early View).
- Kinslow, A. T. (2018). The development and implementation of a heuristic for teaching reflective scientific skepticism within a socioscientific issue instructional framework [Unpublished dissertation]. University of Missouri.
- Kinslow, A. T., Sadler, T. D., & Nguyen, H. T. (2019). Socio-scientific reasoning and environmental literacy in a field-based ecology class. Environmental Education Research, 25(3), 388–410.
- Klosterman, M. L., Sadler, T. D., & Brown, J. (2012). Science teachers' use of mass media to address socio-scientific and sustainability issues. Research in Science Education, 42(1), 51–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-011-9256-z
- Kutluca, A. Y., & Aydin, A. (2017). Changes in pre-service science teachers' understandings after being involved in explicit nature of science and socioscientific argumentation processes. Science & Education, 26(6), 637–668. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-017-9919-
- Lapsley, D., & Yeager, D. (2013). Moral-character education. In W. M. Reynolds & G. E. Miller (Eds.), Handbook of psychology, Vol 7: Educational psychology (pp. 147–277). John Wiley & Sons.
- Leden, L., Hansson, L., & Redfors, A. (2017). From black and white to shades of grey: A longitudinal study of teachers' perceptions on teaching sociocultural and subjective aspects of science. Science & Education, 26(5), 483–511. https://doi.org/10.14527/pegegog.2017.020
- Lee, H., Chang, H., Choi, K., Kim, S. W., & Zeidler, D. L. (2012). Developing character and values for global citizens: Analysis of pre-service science teachers' moral reasoning on socioscientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 34(6), 925–953.
- Lee, H., & Lee, H. (2021). Enhancing socioscientific reasoning through nature of technology. In W. Powell (Ed.), An introduction to socioscientific issues-based instruction for scientific literacy development (pp. 162–190). IGI Global.
- Lee, H., Lee, H., & Zeidler, D. L. (2019). Examining tensions in the socioscientific classroom: Students' border crossings into a new culture of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21600
- Lee, H., & Yang, J. (2019). Science teachers taking their first steps toward teaching socioscientific issues through collaborative action research. Research in Science Education, 49(1), 51–71, 21p. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9614-6
- 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, Y. C. (2017). Hong Kong students' decision-making about ecological and health issues. In L. L. Liang, Xiufeng Liu, & Faven W. Fulmer (Eds.), Chinese science education in the 21st century: Policy, practice, and research (pp. 179–200). Springer.
- Leung, J. S. C. (2020). Promoting students' use of epistemic understanding in the evaluation of socioscientific issues through a practice-based approach. Instructional Science, 48(5), 591–622. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-020-09522-5
- Levinson, R. (2013). Practice and theory of socio-scientific issues: An authentic model? Studies in Science Education, 49(10), 99–116.
- Levinson, R. (2018). Introducing socio-scientific inquiry-based learning (SSIBL). School Science Review, 100(371), 31–35. Lindahl, M. G., & Folkesson, A. M. (2016). Attitudes and language use in group discussions on socio-scientific issues. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 12(2), 283–301.
- Lindahl, M. G. , Folkesson, A. M. , & Zeidler, D. L. (2019). Students' recognition of educational demands in the context of a socioscientific issues curriculum. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(9), 1155–1182. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21548 Malmberg, C. , & Urbas, A. (2019). Health in school: Stress, individual responsibility and democratic politics. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 14, 863, s. 863–878, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-018-9882-0
- Malmberg, C., & Urbas, A. (2021). The Virtue of citizenship: The deficit of democratic politics in science education. In D. Kerr & W. Melville (Eds.), Virtues, science and science education. Routledge.
- Martin, J., Sokol, B. W., & Elfers, T. (2008). Taking and coordinating perspectives: From prereflective interactivity, through reflective intersubjectivity, to metareflective sociality. Human Development, 51, 294–317. https://doi.org/10.1159/000170892
- McComas, W. F. , & Burgin, S. R. (2020). A critique or "STEM" education: Revolution-in-the-making, passing fad, or instructional imperative? Science & Education, 29(5), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00138-2

Mueller, M. P., & Tippins, D. J. (2015). EcoJustice, citizen science and youth activism: Situated tensions for science education. Springer.

National Research Council . (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school: Expanded edition. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K – 8. National Academy Press.

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

Newton, M. , & Zeidler, D. L. (2020). Developing socioscientific perspective taking. International Journal of Science Education, 42(8), 1302-1319. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1756515

NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.

Nicolaou, C., Evagorou, M., & Lymbouridou, C. (2015). Elementary school students' emotions when exploring an authentic socioscientific issue through the use of models. Science Education International, 26(2), 240–259.

Nielsen, J. A. (2020). Teachers and socioscientific issues: An overview of recent empirical research. In M. Evagorou, J. A. Nielsen, & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science teacher education for responsible citizenship: Towards a pedagogy for relevance through socioscientific issues (pp. 13–20). Springer Nature Switzerland.

Nielsen, J. A., Evagorou, M., & Dillon, J. (2020). New perspectives for addressing socioscientific issues in teacher education. In M. Evagorou, J. A. Nielsen, & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science teacher education for responsible citizenship: Towards a pedagogy for relevance through socioscientific issues (pp. 193–199). Springer Nature Switzerland.

Nuhoğlu, H. (2014). Evaluation of student models on current socio-scientific topics based on system dynamics. Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 14(5), 1969–1975.

Ogawa, M. (1995). Science education in a multiscience perspective. Science Education., 79, 583–593.

Olsson, M. (2016). Making sense of the past: The embodied information practices of field archaeologists. Journal of Information Science, 42(3), 410–419. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551515621839

Ortiz-Revilla, J., Adúriz-Bravo, A., & Greca, I. M. (2020). A framework for epistemological discussion on integrated STEM education. Science & Education, 29, 857–880. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00131-9

Ozturk, N., & Yilmaz-Tuzun, O. (2017). Preservice science teachers' epistemological beliefs and informal reasoning regarding socioscientific issues. Research in Science Education, 47(6), 1275–1304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9548-4

Owens, D. C., Herman, B. C., Oertli, R. T., Lannin, A. A., & Sadler, T. D. (2019). Secondary science and mathematics teachers' environmental issues engagement through socioscientific reasoning. EURASIAN Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education, 15(6), Article No: em1693.

Owens, D. C., Petitt, D. N., Lally, D., & Forbes, C. T. (2020). Cultivating water literacy in STEM education: Undergraduates' socioscientific reasoning about socio-hydrologic issues. Water, 12(10), 2857. https://doi.org/10.3390/w12102857

Owens, D. C., Sadler, T. D., & Zeidler, D. L. (2017). Controversial issues in the science classroom. Phi Delta Kappan, 99(4), 45–49. Park, W., & Erduran, S. (2020). The nature of STEM disciplines in the science education standards documents from the USA, Korea and Taiwan focusing on disciplinary aims, values and practices. Science & Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00139-1 Peel, A., Zangori, L., Friedrichsen, P., Hayes, E., & Sadler, T. (2019). Students' model-based explanations about natural selection and antibiotic resistance through socio-scientific issues-based learning. International Journal of Science Education, 41(4), 510–532. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1564084

Pitiporntapin, S., Yutakom, N., & Sadler, T. D. (2016). Thai pre-service science teachers' struggles in using Socio-scientific Issues (SSIs) during practicum. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning & Teaching, 17(2), 1–20.

Pitpiorntapin, S., & Topcu, M. S. (2016). Teaching based on socioscientific issues in science classrooms: A review study. KKU International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 6(1), 119–136.

Powell, W. A., Newton, M. H., & Zeidler, D. L. (2021). Impact of socioscientific issues on middle school students' character and values for global citizenship. In W. Powell (Ed.), An introduction to socioscientific issues-based instruction for scientific literacy development (pp. 56–91). IGI Global.

Raffnsøe, S., Gudmand-Høyer, M. T., & Thaning, M. S. (2016). Foucaults dispositive: The perspicacity of dispositive analytics in organizational research. Organization, 23(2), 272–298. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508414549885

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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roberts, D. A., & Bybee, R. W. (2014). Scientific literacy, science literacy, and science education. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 545–558). Routledge.

Roehrig, G., Keratithamkul, K., & Hiwatig, B. M. R. (2021). Intersections of integrated STEM and socio-scientific issues. In W. Powell (Ed.), An introduction to socioscientific issues-based instruction for scientific literacy development (pp. 256–278). IGI Global.

Romine, W. L., Sadler, T. D., & Kinslow, A. T. (2017). Assessment of scientific literacy: Development and validation of the quantitative assessment of socio-scientific reasoning (QuASSR). Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54, 274–295. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21368

Rudsberg, K., Östman, L., & Aaro Östman, E. (2017). Students' meaning making in classroom discussions: The importance of peer interaction. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(3), 709–738. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-015-9721-5

Rundgren, C.-J., & Chang Rundgren, S.-N. (2018, December). Aiming for responsible and competent citizenship through teacher professional development on teaching socioscientific inquiry-based learning (SSIBL). Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 19(2).

Sadler, T. D. (2009). Situated learning in science education: Socio-scientific issues as contexts for practice. Studies in Science Education, 45, 1–42.

Sadler, T. D. , Barab, S. A. , & Scott, B. (2007). What do students gain by engaging in socioscientific inquiry? Research in Science Education, 37, 371-391.

Sadler, T. D., Friedrichsen, P., & Zangori, L. (2019). A framework for teaching for socio-scientific issue and model-based learning (SIMBL). Educação e Fronteiras/Education and Borders, 9(25), 8–26.

- Sadler, T. D., & Zeidler, D. L. (2005). Patterns of informal reasoning in the context of socioscientific decision-making. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42(1), 112–138.
- Saxena, A. (2019). Ethics in science: Pedagogic issues and concerns. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
- Schatzki, T. R., Knorr Cetina, K., & Von Savigny, E. (Eds.). (2000). The practice turn in contemporary theory. Routledge.
- Selman, R. L. (1977). A structural: Developmental model of social cognition: Implications for intervention research. The Counseling Psychologist, 6(4), 3–6. https://doi.org/10.1177/001100007700600403
- Sjöström, J. (2015). Vision III of scientific literacy: Science education for sustainability. http://muep.mau.se/handle/2043/19283.
- Sjöström, J., & Eilks, I. (2016). Reconsidering different visions of scientific literacy and science education based on the concept of Bildung. In J. Dori, Z. Mevarech, & D. Bake (Eds.), Cognition, metacognition, and culture in STEM education. Springer.
- Sjöström, J., Eilks, I., & Zuin, V. G. (2016). Towards eco-reflexive science education: A critical reflection about educational implications of green chemistry. Science & Education, 25, 321–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-016-9818-6
- Sjöström, J., Frerichs, N., Zin, V. G., & Eilks, I. (2017). Use of the concept of Bildung in the international science education literature, its potential, and implications for teaching and learning. Studies in Science Education, 53, 165–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2017.1384649
- Sjöström, J., & Rydberg, C. (2018). Towards transdisciplinary Didaktik: Didactic modelling of complex controversial issues teaching for reflexive Bildung and sustainability. In Building bridges across disciplines for transformative education and a sustainable future. Shaker Verlag.
- Song, Y., Kim, A. Y., Martin-Hansen, L. M., & Bernal, E. V. (2020). Switching lanes or exiting? STEM experiences, perceptions, and identify construction among college STEM switchers. In V. Ackerson & G. A. Buck (Eds.), Critical questions in STEM education (pp. 227–249). Springer.
- Sorensen, A. E., Jordan, R. C., Shwom, R., Ebert-May, D., Isenhour, C., McCright, A. M., & Robinson, J. M. (2016). Model-based reasoning to foster environmental and socio-scientific literacy in higher education. Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences, 6(2), 287–294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-015-0352-7
- Steele, A. (2016). Troubling STEM: Making a case for an ethics/STEM partnership. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(4), 357–371.
- Takeuchi, M. A., Sengupta, P., Shanahan, M.-C., Adams, J. D., & Hachem, M. (2020). Transdisciplinarity in STEM education: A critical review. Studies in Science Education, 56(2), 213–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2020.1755802
- Tidemand, S., & Nielsen, J. A. (2017). The role of socioscientific issues in biology teaching: From the perspective of teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 39(1), 44–61.
- Tytler, R., Symington, D., & Clark, J. C. (2017). Community-school collaborations in science: Towards improved outcomes through better understanding of boundary issues. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 15(4), 643–661.
- UNESCO. (2021). Local and Indigenous Knowledge Systems (LINKS). https://en.unesco.org/links
- van Oorschot, I. (2020). Culture, milieu, phenotype: Articulating race in judicial sense-making practices. Social & Legal Studies, 29(6), 790–811. https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663920907992/
- Vesterinen, V. M., Tolppanen, S., & Aksela, M. (2016). Toward citizenship science education: What students do to make the world a better place? International Journal of Science Education, 38(1), 30–50.
- Wang, H. H., Hong, Z. R., Liu, S. C., & Lin, H. S. (2018). The impact of socio-scientific issue discussions on student environmentalism. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 14(12), 1–15.
- Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., & Braaten, M. (2020). Ambitious science teaching. Harvard Education Press.
- Yakob, N., Yunus, H. M., & May, C. Y. (2015). Knowledge and practices in teaching socio-scientific issues among Malaysian primary school science teachers. US-China Education Review, 5(9), 634–640.
- Yang, F.-Y., Chen, Y.-H., & Tsai, M.-J. (2013). How university students evaluate online information about a socio-scientific issue and the relationship with their epistemic beliefs. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 16(3), 385–399.
- Yap, S. F. (2014). Beliefs, values, ethics and moral reasoning in socio-scientific education. Issues in Educational Research, 24(3), 299–319.
- Yip, W. Y. V. (2020). Developing undergraduate student teachers' competence in integrative STEM teaching. Frontiers in Education, 5(44), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00044
- Zangori, L., Ke, L., Sadler, T. D., & Peel, A. (2020). Exploring primary students causal reasoning about ecosystems. International Journal of Science Education, 42(11), 1799–1817. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1783718
- Zangori, L., Peel, A., Kinslow, A., Friedrichsen, P., & Sadler, T. D. (2017). Student development of model-based reasoning about carbon cycling and climate change in a socio-scientific issues unit. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(10), 1249–1273. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21404
- 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. (2014). Socioscientific issues as a curriculum emphasis: Theory, research and practice. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol 2, pp. 697–726). Routledge.
- Zeidler, D. L. (2016). STEM education: A deficit framework for the 21st century? A sociocultural socioscientific response. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 11(1), 11–26.
- Zeidler, D. L. (2020). STEM: Unrequited dreams in a material world. In V. Ackerson & G. A. Buck (Eds.), Critical questions in STEM education (pp. 257–260). Springer.
- Zeidler, D. L., Applebaum, S. M., & Sadler, T. D. (2011). Enacting a socioscientific issues classroom: Transformative transformations. In T. D. Sadler (Ed.), Socioscientific issues in the classroom (pp. 277–305). 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). Springer.
- Zeidler, D. L., Herman, B. C., Clough, M. P., Olson, J. K., Kahn, S., & Newton, M. (2016). Humanitas Emptor: Reconsidering recent trends and policy in science teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(5), 465–476.
- Zeidler, D. L., Herman, B. C., Kinskey, M., Mitchell, M., Wikman, K., Nkrumah, T., Willis, S., & Applebaum, S. (2020). Students' social and moral compassion through socioscientific issues. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Science Teacher Education.

- Zeidler, D. L., Herman, B. C., 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., Herman, B. C., & Sadler, T. D. (2019). New directions in socioscientific issues research. Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research, 1(11), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-019-0008-7
- Zeidler, D. L., & Kahn, S. (2014). It's debatable: Using socioscientific issues to develop scientific literacy, K-12. National Science Teachers Association Press.
- Zeidler, D. L., & Newton, M. (2017). Using a socioscientific issues framework for climate change education: An ecojustice approach. In D. Shepardson & R. Roychoudhury (Eds.), Teaching and learning about climate change: A framework of educators (pp. 56–65). Routledge.
- Zeidler, D. L., & Sadler, T. D. (2011). An inclusive view of scientific literacy: Core issues and future directions. In C. Linder, L. Ostman, D. A. Roberts, P. O. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 176–192). Routledge.
- 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., 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.10025
- Zidny, R., & Eilks, I. (2018). Indigenous knowledge as a socio-cultural context of science to promote transformative education for sustainable development: A case study on the baduy community (Indonesia). In I. Eilks, S. Markic, & B. Ralle (Eds.), Building bridges across disciplines for transformative education and a sustainable future (pp. 249–256). Shaker.
- Zidny, R., Solfarina, S., Aisyah, R. S. S., & Eilks, I. (2021). Exploring indigenous science to identify contents and contexts for science learning in order to promote education for sustainable development. Education Sciences, 11, 114. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11030114
- Zimmerman, H. T., Reeve, S., & Bell, P. (2010). Family sense-making practices in science center conversations. Science Education, 94(3), 478–505. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20374

Project Evaluation

- Abma, T. A., & Widdershoven, G. A. M. (2008). Evaluation and/as social relation. Evaluation, 14, 209-225.
- Altschuld, J. W., & Watkins, R. (2014). A primer on needs assessment: More than 40 years of research and practice: Needs assessment: Trends and a view toward the future. New Directions for Evaluation, 144(5), 18. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20099 American Association for the Advancement of Science. (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Oxford University Press. Anderson, K. (2011). Science education and test-based accountability: Reviewing their relationship and exploring implications for future policy. Science Education, 96(1), 104–129.
- Aschbacher, P. R., Li, E., & Roth, E. J. (2010). Is science me? High school students' identities, participation and aspirations in science, engineering, and medicine. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47(5), 564–582. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20353 Banilower, E. R., Boyd, S. E., Pasley, J. D., & Weiss, I. R. (2006). Lessons from a decade of mathematics and science reform: A capstone report for the local systemic change through teacher enhancement initiative. Horizon Research, Inc.
- 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. Horizon Research, Inc.
- Bequette, M., Cardiel, C. L. B., Cohn, S., Kollmann, E. K., & Lawrenz, F. (2019). Evaluation capacity building for informal STEM education: Working for success across the field. In A. C. Fu, A. Kannan, & R. J. Shavelson (Eds.), Evaluation in informal dcience, technology, engineering, and mathematics education. New Directions for Evaluation, 161, 107–123.
- Blank, R. K., & De Las Alas, N. (2009). The effects of teacher professional development on gains in student achievement: How metaanalysis provides scientific evidence useful to education leaders. Report prepared under a grant to the Council of Chief State School Officers from the National Science Foundation (Grant #REC-0635409). Council of Chief State School Officers. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544700.pdf
- Blomeke, S., Olsen, R., & Suhl, U. (2016). Relation of student achievement to the quality of their teachers and instructional quality. In T. Nilson & J. Gustafsson (Eds.), Teacher quality, instructional quality and student outcomes (Vol. 2, pp. 21–50). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-41252-8 2
- Boyle, R., Lemaire, D., & Rist, R. C. (1999). Introduction: Building evaluation capacity. In R. Boyle & D. Lemaire (Eds.), Building effective evaluation capacity: Lessons from practice, 1–19. Transaction Publishers.
- Brunner, C., Fasca, C., Heinze, J., Honey, M., Light, D., Mandinach, E., & Wexler, D. (2005). Linking data and learning: The grow network study. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 10(3), 241–267. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327671espr1003 2
- Buck, G., Cook, K., Quigley, C., Prince, P., & Lucas, Y. (2014). Seeking to improve African American girls' attitudes toward science: A participatory action research project. The Elementary School Journal, 114(3), 431–453. https://doi.org/10.1086/674419
- Burroughs, N., Gardner, J., Lee, Y., Guo, S., Touitou, I., Jansen, K., & Schmidt, W. (2019). Teaching for excellence and equity: Analyzing teacher characteristics, behaviors and student outcomes with TIMSS (Vol. 6). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16151-4 2
- Bybee, R. W. (2010). Advancing STEM education: A 2020 vision. Technology and Engineering Teacher, 70, 30–35.
- 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(4), 349–352.
- Bybee, R. W., & McCrae, B. (2011). Scientific literacy and student attitudes: Perspectives from PISA 2006 science. International Journal of Science Education, 33(1), 7–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.518644
- Carpenter, T. P., Blanton, M. L., Cobb, P., Franke, M. L., Kaput, J., & McClain, K. (2004). Scaling up innovative practices in mathematics and science. University of Wisconsin-Madison, National Center for Improving Student Learning and Achievement in Mathematics and Science. www.wcer.wisc.edu/ncisla/publications/reports/NCISLAReport1.pdf
 Chen. Huev-tvsh. (1990). Theory-driven evaluations. Sage.

- Chingos, M., & Peterson, P. (2011). It's easier to pick a good teacher than to train one: Familiar and new results on the correlates of teacher effectiveness. Economics of Education Review, 30(3), 449–465.
- Clark, Q. M., & Esters, L. T. (2018, July 24). Federally funded programs are not enough to diversify the STEM workforce. https://diverseeducation.com/article/120618/
- Clewell, B., & Fortenberry, N. (Eds.). (2009, June). Framework for evaluating impacts of broadening participation projects: Report for a National Science Foundation workshop.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2006). Teacher-student matching and the assessment of teacher effectiveness. Journal of Human Resources, 41(4), 778–820.
- Clune, W. H. (1998, December). Research monograph No. 16, toward a theory of systemic reform: The case of nine NSF statewide systemic initiatives. National Institute for Science Education.
- http://archive.wceruw.org/nise/Publications/Research Monographs/vol16.pdf
- 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. 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.
- Coburn, C. E., Penuel, W. R., & Geil, K. E. (2013). Research-practice partnerships: A strategy for leveraging research for educational improvement in school districts. William T. Grant Foundation.
- Connolly, M. R., & Seymour, E. (2015). Why theories of change matter (WCER working paper no. 2015–2). University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research. www.wcer.wisc.edu/publications/workingPapers/papers.php
- Cousins, J. B., Goh, S., Clark, S., & Lee, L. (2004). Integrating evaluative enquiry into the organizational culture: A review and synthesis of the knowledge base. Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 19, 99–141.
- Cox, C., & Nian, Q. (2018). Annual Dayton Public Schools teacher survey in Spring 2018. Dayton Public Schools District Meeting. Cunningham, P. (2016, July). Cunningham: Democrats rewrite education platform behind closed doors, and abandon core party values. The 74. www.the74million.or/article/cunningham-democrats-rewrite-education-platform-behind-closed-doors-and-abandon-core-party-values/
- Curriculum Associates Development Inc. (1971). Man, A course of study (MACOS).
- www.macosonline.org/guides/MACOS%20brochure.pdf
- Davidson, E., Reback, R., Rockoff, J., & Schwartz, H. L. (2015). Fifty ways to leave a child behind: Idiosyncrasies and discrepancies in states' implementation of NCLB. Educational Researcher, 44(6), 347–358. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X15601426
- 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., 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.
- Donovan, M. S. (2013). Generating improvement through research and development in educational systems. Science, 340, 317–319. Donovan, M. S., Wigdor, A. K., & Snow, C. E. (2003). Strategic education research partnership: Committee on a strategic education
- research partnership. The National Academies Press.
- Dow, P. B. (1999). Schoolhouse politics: Lessons from the Sputnik era. Harvard University Press.
- Duffy, J. L., & Wandersman, A. (2007). A review of research on evaluation capacity-building strategies. Annual Conference of the American Evaluation Association.
- 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? Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Finn, C. E. (2016, July 15). The end of education reform? Thomas B. Fordham Institute.
- https://fordhaminstitute.org/national/commentary/end-education-reform
- Fishman, B. J., Penuel, W. R., Allen, A.-R., & Cheng, B. H. (Eds.). (2013). Design-based implementation research: Theories, methods, and exemplars. National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook. Teachers College Press.
- Floden, R., Goertz, M., & O'Day, J. (1995, September). Capacity building in systemic reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 19-21.
- Ford, K. S. , Rosinger, K. O. , Choi, J. , & Pulido, G. (2021). Toward gender-inclusive postsecondary data collection. Educational Researcher, 50(2), 127–131.
- Fretchling, J., Stevens, F., Lawrenz, F., & Sharp, L. (1993). The user-friendly handbook for project evaluation: Science mathematics and technology education (NSF 93–152). The National Science Foundation.
- Fuhrman, S. H. (1994). Politics and systemic education reform. CPRE Policy Brief. Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Furtak, E. M., & Penuel, W. R. (2019). Coming to terms: Addressing the persistence of "hands-on" and other reform terminology in the era of science as practice. Science Education, 103, 167-186.
- Furtak, E. M., Shavelson, R. J., Shemwell, J. T., & Figueroa, M. (2012). To teach or not to teach through inquiry: Is that the question? In S. M. Carver & J. Shrager (Eds.), The journey from child to scientist: Integrating cognitive development and the education sciences (pp. 227–244). American Psychological Association.
- Ghosh, S., Krishnan, J. V., Borges, R. S., & Kapila, V. (2019, June). Middle school teacher professional development in creating a NGSS-plus-5E robotics curriculum (fundamental). 2019 ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition. https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2-22108 Glossary of Statistical Terms . (n.d.). Outcomes. https://stats.oecd.org/
- Goertz, M. E. , Floden, R. E. , & O'Day, J. A. (1996). Systemic reform. [Volume I: Findings and conclusions.] Studies of education reform. (ED397553). ERIC. National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.
- Goldstein, D. (2019, December). "It just isn't working": PISA test scores cast doubt on U.S. education efforts. The New York Times. www.nytimes.com/2019/12/03/us/us-students-international-test-scores.html
- Government Accountability Office . (2012). Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education: Strategic planning needed to better manage overlapping programs across multiple agencies (GAO-12–108). www.gao.gov/products/gao-12-108
- Granovskiy, B. (2018, June). Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education: An overview. Congressional Research Service Report prepared for Members and Committees of Congress. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED593605

- 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.
- Hallinen, J. (2020, July 15). STEM: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. www.britannica.com/topic/STEM-education
- Hannah, J. (1996). What NSF expects in project evaluations for educational innovations. Journal of Geoscience Education, 44(4), 412–416. https://doi.org/10.5408/1089-9995-44.4.412
- 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.
- Hershberg, T. (2005). Value-added assessment and systemic reform: Response to America's human capital development challenge. The Challenge of Education Reform: Standards, Accountability, Resources and Policy.
- Huffman, D., Thomas, K., & Lawrenz, F. (2008). A collaborative immersion approach to evaluation capacity building. American Journal of Evaluation, 29(3), 358–368.
- Institute of Education Sciences (ED), & National Science Foundation . (2013). Common guidelines for education research and development. Institute of Education Sciences. www.nsf.gov/pubs/2013/nsf13126/nsf13126.pdf
- Kahle, J. B. (2004). Will girls be left behind? Gender differences and accountability. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41(10), 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. 911–941). Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 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(9), 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: The role of public policy in k-12 science education (Vol. 5, pp. 47–75). Information Age Publishing.
- Katzenmeyer, C., & Lawrenz, F. (2006). National science foundation perspectives on the nature of STEM program evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 2006(109), 7–18.
- King, J. A. (2002). Building the evaluation capacity of a school district. New Directions for Evaluation, 93, 63-80.
- Knapp, M. S. (1997). Between systemic reforms and the mathematics and science classroom: The dynamics of innovation, implementation, and professional learning. Review of Educational Research, 67, 227–266.
- Koretz, D. (2019, December 18). American students aren't getting smarter and test-based "reform" initiatives are to blame. http://nbcnews.com/think/opinion-ncna1103366
- Krajcik, J. S., & Shin, N. (2014). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (2nd ed., pp. 275–297). Cambridge University Press.
- Kroger, L. E., Campbell, H. L., Thacker, B., & Wise, L. L. (2007). Behind the numbers: Interviews in 22 states about achievement data and the No Child Left Behind Act policies. www.cepdc.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.
- 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, 307–338.
- Laguarda, K. (1998). Assessing the SSI's impacts on student achievement: An imperfect science. SRI International.
- Lawrenz, F., Thomas, K., Huffman, D., & Clarkson, L. C. (2008). Evaluation capacity building in the schools: Administrator-led and teacher-led perspectives. The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 23, 61–82.
- Li, Y., Kahle, J. B., Scantlebury, K., Blasie, C., & Woodruff, S. B. (2009, April). Sustaining change: Are booster shots needed? Annual International Conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching.
- Marchant, G. J., Paulson, S. E., & Shunk, A. (2006). Relationships between high stakes testing policies and student achievement after controlling for demographic factors in aggregated data. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 14(30). http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n30/
- Marsh, J. A., & Farrell, C. C. (2015). How leaders can support teachers with data-driven decision making: A framework for understanding capacity building. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 43(2), 269–289. https://doiorg.proxy.lib.miamioh.edu/10.1177/1741143214537229
- McFarland, J., Hussar, B., de Brey, C., Snyder, T., Wang, X., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Gebrekristos, S., Zhang, J., Rathbun, A., Barmer, A., Bullock Mann, F., & Hinz, S. (2017). The condition of education 2017 (NCES 2017–144). U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2017144
- McLaughlin, M. (1990). The RAND change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19, 11–16.
- Mertens, D. M. (2013). What does a transformative lens bring to credible evidence in mixed methods evaluations? New Directions for Evaluation, 138, 27–35. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20055
- Metzler, J., & Woessman, L. (2012). The impact of teacher subject knowledge on student achievement: Evidence from within-teacher within-student variation. Journal of Development Economics, 99(2), 486–496.
- Milstein, B., & Cotton, D. (2000, March). Defining concepts for the presidential strand on building evaluation capacity. American Evaluation Association.
- Moon, J., & Rundell Singer, S. (2012, February). Bringing STEM into focus. Education Week. www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-bringing-stem-into-focus/2012/01
- Morgan, I., & Amerikaner, A. (2018). Funding gaps 2018: An analysis of school funding equity across the U.S. and within each state. The Education Trust.
- Morris, M. (2015). Research on evaluation ethics: Reflections and an agenda. In P. R. Brandon (Ed.). Research on evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 148, 31–42.
- National Academies Press . (2019). K12 science education past and present: The changing role and Focus of investigations: National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, Science and Engineering for grades 6–12: Investigation and design at the center. https://doi.org/10.17226/25216
- National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. (2007). Rising above the gathering storm: Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11463

National Center for Education Statistics . (2016). National assessment of educational progress (NAEP), 2009, 2011, and 2015 science assessment, NAEP data. Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/science/

National Center for Education Statistics . (2017). State of education practices (Table 5.5. State high school exit exams, by exam characteristics and state: 2017). Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/statereform/tab5 5.asp

National Commission on Excellence in Education . (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. U.S. Department of Education.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, & Council of Chief State School Officers . (2010). Common core state standards. National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. National Academy Press.

National Research Council . (2010). Rising above the gathering storm, revisited: Rapidly approaching category 5. National Academies Press

National Research Council . (2011). Successful K-12 STEM education: Identifying effective approaches in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012a). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academies Press.

National Research Council. (2012b). Using science as evidence in public policy. National Academies Press.

National Science Board . (2018). Science and engineering indicators 2018 (NSB-2018–1). National Science Foundation. www.nsf.gov/statistics/indicators/

National Science Foundation . (n.d.). *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (important notice 131). National Science Foundation, Document Library. https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/issuances/in131.jsp

National Science Foundation . (1993). Presentation on mid-point review. www.nsf.gov/pubs/1993/1993-NSF-Annual-Report.pdf

National Science Foundation . (2002). Math and Science Partnership (MSP) program solicitation (NSF-02-061).

www.nsf.gov/pubs/2002/nsf02061/nsf02061.html

National Science Foundation . (2004). A more synergistic whole: Education lessons about learning.

www.nsf.gov/about/history/nsf0050/education/moresynergistic.htm

National Science Foundation. (2009). Math and science partnership (MSP): Program solicitation (NSF 09-507).

www.nsf.gov/pubs/2009/nsf09507/nsf09507.htm

National Science Foundation. (2012a). Math and science partnership (MSP) program solicitation (NSF 12-518).

www.nsf.gov/pubs/2012/nsf12518/nsf12518.htm

National Science Foundation . (2012b). Directorate for education and human resources. www.nsf.gov/ehr/about.jsp

National Science Foundation . (2020). National science foundation evaluation policy.

www.nsf.gov/od/oia/eac/PDFs/nsf evaluation policy september 2020.pdf

National Science Foundation . (2021a). NSF-AISL: Developing the processes and potential to engage historically underrepresented communities in public participation in STEM research through authentic and impactful collaboration. www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD ID=1811234

National Science Foundation . (2021b). Next generation science standards, current and expired awards.

www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/simpleSearchResult?queryText=NGSS&ActiveAwards=true&ExpiredAwards=true

Nelkin, D. (1977). Science textbook controversies and the politics of equal time. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Newell, A. D., Zientek, L. R., Tharp, B. Z., Vogt, G. L., & Moreno, N. P. (2015). Students' attitudes toward science as predictors of gains on student content knowledge: Benefits of an after-school program. School Science and Mathematics, 115(5), 216–225. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12125.

NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press. www.nextgenscience.org/need-standards

Nian, Q., & Cox, C. (2017). Enhancing school district evaluation practices by establishing a successful student profile. 2017 American Evaluation Association Annual Conference.

Office of Technology Assessment . (1988). Elementary and secondary education for science and engineering-A technical memorandum (OTA-TM-SET-41). U. S. Government Printing Office.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2019a). PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2019b). PISA 2018 assessment and analytical framework. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/b25efab8-en

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/0950069032000032199

Owen, S. V., Toepperwein, M. M., Marshall, C. E., Lichtenstein, M. J., Blalock, C. L., Liu, Y., & Grimes, K. (2008). Finding pearls: Psychometric reevaluation of the Simpson-Troost Attitude Questionnaire (STAQ). Science Education, 92, 1076–1095. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20296

Patton, M. O. (1994). Developmental evaluation. Evaluation Practice, 15(3), 311–320.

Patton, M. Q. (2008). Utilization-focused evaluation (4th ed.). Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2011). Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use. The Guilford Press.

Patton, M. Q. , McKegg, K. , & Wehipeihana, N. (2016). Developmental evaluation exemplars: Principles in practice. The Guilford Press.

Penuel, W. R., & Means, B. (2011). Using large-scale databases in evaluation: Advances, opportunities, and challenges. American Journal of Evaluation, 32(1), 188–133. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098214010388268

Petersen, D., & Alexander, G. R. (2001). Needs assessment in public health: A practical guide for students and professionals. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Petrilli, M. J. (2018, July 12). Where education reform goes from here. Standard University Hoover Institution.

www.educationnext.org/where-education-goes-from-here/

Preskill, H. S., & Boyle, S. (2008). A multidisciplinary model of evaluation capacity building. American Journal of Evaluation, 29(4), 443–459. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214008324182

- Preskill, H. S., & Torres, R. T. (1999). Building capacity for organizational learning through evaluative inquiry. Evaluation, 5(1), 42.
- Pringle, R. M., & Martin, S. C. (2005). The potential impacts of upcoming high-stakes testing on the teaching of science in elementary classrooms. Research in Science Education, 35, 347–361. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-004-5599-z
- Robinson, T. T., & Cousins, J. B. (2004). Internal participatory evaluation as organizational learning: A longitudinal case study. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 30, 1–22.
- Rockoff, J. E., Jacob, B. A., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2011). Can you recognize an effective teacher when you recruit one? Education Finance and Policy, 6(1), 43–74.
- Roderick, M., Easton, J. Q., Sebring, P. B. (2009). The consortium on Chicago school research: A new model for the role of research in supporting urban school reform. University of Chicago, Consortium on School Research.
- Rudolph, J. L. (2019). How we teach science: What's changed, and why it matters. Harvard University Press.
- Sahlberg, P. (2006). Education reform for raising economic competitiveness. Journal of Educational Change, 7(4), 259–287.
- Sahlberg, P., & Oldroyd, D. (2010). Pedagogy for economic competitiveness and sustainable development. European Journal of Education, Part I, 45, 280–299. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2010.01429.x
- Schneider, B. L., & Keesler, V. A. (2007). School reform 2007: Transforming education into a scientific enterprise. Annual Review of Sociology, 33, 197–217.
- Schoales, V. (2019, April). Education reform as we know it is over: What have we learned? Education Week. www.edweek.org/policy-politics/opinion-education-reform-as-we-know-it-is-over-what-have-we-learned/2019/04
- Seelig, M. (2020, June 18). How 20 years of education reform has created greater inequality Stanford social innovation review. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/how_20_years_of_education_reform_has_created_greater_inequality#
- Shavelson, R. J., & Towne, L. (2002). Scientific research in education. National Research Council, National Academies Press.
- Simpson, R. D., & Troost, K. M. (1982). Influences on commitment to and learning of science among adolescent students. Science Education, 66, 763–781.
- Smith, M., & O'Day, J. (1991). Putting the pieces together: Systemic school reform: CPRE Policy Brief (ED343215). ERIC. Eagleton Institute of Politics.
- Stockdill, S. H., Baizerman, M., & Compton, D. W. (2002). Toward a definition of the ECB process: A conversation with the ECB literature. New Directions for Evaluation, 93, 7–25.
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2015). Designing for learning: Creating campus environments for student success (2nd ed.). Jossey Bass.
- Strutchens, M., & Martin, W. G. (2013). Making explicit the commonalities of MSP projects: Learning from doing. Mathematics Enthusiast, 10(3), 777–791.
- Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Taylor-Ritzler, T., Garcia-Iriarte, E., Keys, C., Kinney, L., Rush-Ross, H., & Curtin, G. (2010). Evaluation capacity building: A cultural and contextual framework. In F. Balcazar, Y. SuarezBalcazar, T. Taylor-Ritzler, & C. B. Keys (Eds.), Race, culture and disability: Rehabilitation science and practice. Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Supovitz, J. (1996, December). The impact over time of Project Discovery on teachers' attitudes, preparation, and teaching practice, Final report. Horizon Research, Inc.
- Taylor-Powell, E., & Boyd, H. H. (2008). Evaluation capacity building in complex organizations. New Directions for Evaluation, 120, 55–69. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.276
- Toch, T. (1991). In the name of excellence. Oxford University Press.
- Toh, L. P. E., Causo, A., Tzuo, P.-W., Chen, I.-M., & Yeo, S. H. (2016). A review on the use of robots in education and young children. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 19(2), 148–163.
- Tseng, V. (2012). The uses of research in policy and practice. SRCD Social Policy Report, 26(2), 1–24.
- U.S. Department of Education . (2001). Preliminary overview of programs and changes included in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Title II Mathematics and Science Partnerships (Title II, Part B). https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oii/nonpublic/nclb/edlite-slide020.html
- U.S. Department of Education . (2002). No child left behind act of 2001. https://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml
- U.S. Department of Education . (2008a, August). New race and ethnicity guidance for the collection of federal education data. https://www2.ed.gov/policy/rschstat/guid/raceethnicity/index.html
- U.S. Department of Education . (2008b, September). ESEA: Mathematics and science partnerships (OESE), FY 2008 program performance report. https://www2.ed.gov/programs/mathsci/mspperfreport.pdf
- U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Research, Committee on Science . (2005). National science foundation budget and management challenges, hearing before the subcommittee on research, committee on science. Earing U.S. Government Printing Office. http://www.house.gov/science
- Ushomirsky, N., & Williams, D. (2015). Funding gaps: Too many states still spend less on educating students who need the most. https://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/FundingGaps2015_TheEducationTrust1.pdf
- Weinburgh, M. H. (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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660320407.
- Weinburgh, M. H., & Steele, D. (2000). The modified attitudes toward science inventory: Developing an instrument to be used with fifth grade urban students. Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 6(1), 87–94.
- Weiss, C. H. (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. In J. P. Connell , A. C. Kubisch , L. B. Schorr , & C. H. Weiss (Eds.), New approaches to evaluating community initiatives: Concepts, methods, and contexts (Vol. 1, pp. 65–92). Aspen Institute.
- Weiss, C. H. (2000). Which links to which theories shall we evaluate? New Directions for Evaluation, 87, 35–45.
- Weiss, I. R., & Webb, N. (2003). Study of the impact of the statewide systemic initiatives program: Lessons learned. Horizon Research Inc.
- Wexler, N. (2019, December 28). The end of education reform: Or a new beginning? Forbes.
- www.forbes.com/sites/nataliewexler/2019/12/28/the-end-of-education-reform-or-a-new-beginning/?sh=e6882dd2d7c7
- $\hbox{W. K. Kellogg Foundation . (1998). W. K. Kellogg Foundation evaluation handbook.}\\$
- www.wkkf.org/~/media/62EF77BD5792454B807085B1AD044FE7.ashx
- Wong, K. K., Yin, R. K., Moyer-Packenham, P. S., & Scherer, J. (2008). Introduction to the MSP-PE special issue on math and science partnership program: A first comprehensive evaluation. Peabody Journal of Education, 83(4), 479–485.

Woodruff, S. B., Dixon, M. L., & Li, Y. (2019). Evaluation of Biology Meets Engineering (BmE): Trans-disciplinary Education in Biology and Engineering Technology: Annual report 2019. Miami University, Discovery Center for Evaluation, Research, and Professional Learning.

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.

Woodruff, S. B., & Kahle, J. B. (2014). Project assessment: Its history, evolution, and current practice. In N. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research in science education: Volume 2. Routledge.

Woodruff, S. B., Li, Y., & Harrison, K. (2018). Summative evaluation of University at Buffalo and Buffalo Public Schools (UB/BPS) Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Partnership (ISEP) Project. Miami University, Discovery Center for Evaluation, Research, and Professional Learning.

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. Miami University, Ohio's Evaluation & Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education.

Zohar, A. (2013). Challenges in wide scale implementation efforts to foster higher order thinking (HOT) in science education across a whole school system. Thinking Skills and Creativity, 10, 233–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2013.06.002

Zucker, A. A., & Shields, P. M. (1997). SSI strategies for reform: Preliminary findings from the evaluation of NSF's SSI program. SRI International.

Precollege Engineering Education

Aguirre-Muñoz, Z., & Pantoya, M. L. (2016). Engineering literacy and engagement in kindergarten classrooms. Journal of Engineering Education, 105(4), 630–654. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20151

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Oxford University Press.

Anderson, K. J. B., Courter, S. S., McGlamery, T., Nathans-Kelly, T. M., & Nicometo, C. G. (2010). Understanding engineering work and identity: A cross-case analysis of engineers within six firms. Engineering Studies, 2(3), 153–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2010.519772

Arik, M. , & Topçu, M. S. (2020). Implementation of engineering design process in the K-12 science classrooms: Trends and issues. Research in Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-09912-x

Arthur, W. B. (2009). The nature of technology: What it is and how it evolves. Simon & Schuster.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Malzahn, K. A., Plumley, C. L., Gordon, E. M., & Hayes, M. L. (2018). Report of the 2018 national survey of science and mathematics education (NSSME+). Horizon Research, Inc.

Berland, L. K. (2013). Designing for STEM integration. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1078

Berland, L. K., Martin, T., Ko, P., Peacock, S., Rudolph, J., & Golubski, C. (2013). Student learning in challenge-based engineering curricula. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1080

Berland, L. K., & Steingut, R. (2016). Explaining variation in student efforts towards using math and science knowledge in engineering contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 38(18), 2742–2761. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1260179

Blanchard, S., Judy, J., Muller, C., Crawford, R., Petrosino, A., White, C., Lin, F.-A., & Wood, K. (2015). Beyond blackboards: Engaging underserved middle school students in engineering. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1084

Brophy, S., Klein, S., Portsmore, M., & Rogers, C. (2008). Advancing engineering education in P-12 classrooms. Journal of Engineering Education, 97(3), 369–387. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2008.tb00985.x

Bystydzienski, J. M., Eisenhart, M., & Bruning, M. (2015). High school is not too late: Developing girls' interest and engagement in engineering careers. The Career Development Quarterly, 63(1), 88–95. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2015.00097.x

Capobianco, B. M., Deemer, E. D., & Lin, C. (2017). Analyzing predictors of children's formative engineering identity development. International Journal of Engineering Education, 33(1(A)), 44–54.

Capobianco, B. M., DeLisi, J., & Radloff, J. (2018). Characterizing elementary teachers' enactment of high-leverage practices through engineering design-based science instruction. Science Education, 102(2), 342–376. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21325 Capobianco, B. M., Radloff, J., & Lehman, J. D. (2021). Elementary science teachers' sense-making with learning to implement engineering design and its impact on students' science achievement. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 32(1), 39–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1789267

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. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02461641

Carr, R. L., Bennett, L. D., & Strobel, J. (2012). Engineering in the K-12 STEM standards of the 50 U.S. states: An analysis of presence and extent. Journal of Engineering Education, 101(3), 539–564.

Chu, L., Sampson, V., Hutner, T., Rivale, S., Crawford, R., Baze, C., & Brooks, H. (2019). Argument-driven engineering in middle school science: An exploratory study of changes in engineering identity over an academic year. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1249

Cowan, R. L. (1997). A social history of American technology. Oxford University Press.

Crismond, D. P. , & Adams, R. S. (2012). The informed design teaching and learning matrix. Journal of Engineering Education, 101(4), 738-797. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2012.tb01127.x

Cunningham, C. M. (2016). Engineering education for elementary students. In M. J. de Vries , L. Gumaelius , & I.-B. Skogh (Eds.), Pre-university engineering education (pp. 81–99). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-621-7_6

Cunningham, C. M. (2018). Engineering in elementary STEM education: Curriculum design, instruction, learning, and assessment. Teachers College Press.

Cunningham, C. M., & Carlsen, W. S. (2014). Precollege engineering education. In Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2, pp. 747–758). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Cunningham, C. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2017a). Epistemic practices of engineering for education. Science Education, 101(3), 486–505. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21271
- Cunningham, C. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2017b). Framing engineering practices in elementary school classrooms. International Journal of Engineering Education, 33(1), 295–307.
- Cunningham, C. M., Kelly, G. J., & Meyer, N. (2021). Affordances of engineering with English learners. Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21606
- Cunningham, C. M., Lachapelle, C. P., Brennan, R. T., Kelly, G. J., Tunis, C. S. A., & Gentry, C. A. (2020). The impact of engineering curriculum design principles on elementary students' engineering and science learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(3), 423–453. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21601
- Dasgupta, C. (2019). Improvable models as scaffolds for promoting productive disciplinary engagement in an engineering design activity. Journal of Engineering Education, 108(3), 394–417. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20282
- Davis, L. A., & Gibbin, R. D. (Eds.). (2002). Raising public awareness of engineering. The National Academies Press.
- De Vries, M. J. (2016). A philosophical basis for pre-university engineering education. In M. J. De Vries, L. Gumaelius, & I.-B. Skogh (Eds.), Pre-university engineering education (pp. 13–25). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-621-7 2
- DiGironimo, N. (2011). What is technology? Investigating student conceptions about the nature of technology. International Journal of Science Education, 33(10), 1337–1352. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2010.495400
- Dohn, N. B. (2013). Situational interest in engineering design activities. International Journal of Science Education, 35(12), 2057–2078. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.757670
- Donahue, D. M. (1993). Serving students, science, or society? The secondary school physics curriculum in the United States, 1930–65. History of Education Quarterly, 33(3), 321–352. https://doi.org/10.2307/368196
- Donnelly, J. F. (1989). The origins of the technical curriculum in England during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Studies in Science Education, 16(1), 123–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057268908559962
- Dyrenfurth, M. (1994). Technology education in the United States. In D. Layton (Ed.), Innovations in science and technology education (Vol. 5). Unesco Publishing.
- Fortus, D., Dershimer, R. C., Krajcik, J., Marx, R. W., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2004). Design-based science and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41(10), 1081–1110. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20040
- Gale, J., Koval, J., Ryan, M., Usselman, M., & Wind, S. (2018). Implementing NGSS engineering disciplinary core ideas in middle school science classrooms: Results from the field. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1185
- Glancy, A., Moore, T., Guzey, S., & Smith, K. (2017). Students' successes and challenges applying data analysis and measurement skills in a fifth-grade integrated STEM unit. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1159
- Godwin, A., Sonnert, G., & Sadler, P. M. (2016). Disciplinary differences in out-of-school high school science experiences and influence on students' engineering choices. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 6(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1131
- Gottfried, M. A., & Plasman, J. S. (2018). From secondary to postsecondary: Charting an engineering career and technical education pathway. Journal of Engineering Education, 107(4), 531–555. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20236
- Gunckel, K. L., & Tolbert, S. (2018). The imperative to move toward a dimension of care in engineering education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(7), 938–961. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21458
- Hammack, R., & Ivey, T. (2019). Elementary teachers' perceptions of K-5 engineering education and perceived barriers to implementation. Journal of Engineering Education, 108(4), 503–522. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20289
- Hertel, J. D., Cunningham, C. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2017). The roles of engineering notebooks in shaping elementary engineering student discourse and practice. International Journal of Science Education, 39(9), 1194–1217. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1317864
- Hoeg, D. G., & Bencze, J. L. (2017). Values underpinning STEM education in the USA: An analysis of the Next Generation Science Standards. Science Education, 101(2), 278–301. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21260
- Honey, M., & Kanter, D. (Eds.). (2013). Design, make, play: Growing the next generation of STEM innovators. Routledge. Hurd, P. D. (1998). Linking science education to the workplace. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 7(4), 329–335. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021871209239
- Hynes, M., & Swenson, J. (2013). The humanistic side of engineering: Considering social science and humanities dimensions of engineering in education and research. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 3(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1070
- Ing, M., Aschbacher, P., & Tsai, S. (2014). Gender differences in the consistency of middle school students' interest in engineering and science careers. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1090 International Technology and Engineering Education Association . (2020). Standards for technological literacy: Content for the study of technology. ITEEA.
- Johnson, A., Wendell, K., & Watkins, J. (2017). Examining experienced teachers' noticing of and responses to students' engineering. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1162
- Johnston, A. C., Akarsu, M., Moore, T. J., & Guzey, S. S. (2019). Engineering as the integrator: A case study of one middle school science teacher's talk. Journal of Engineering Education, 108(3), 418–440. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20286
- Jordan, M. E., & McDaniel Jr., R. R. (2014). Managing uncertainty during collaborative problem solving in elementary school teams: The role of peer influence in robotics engineering activity. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 23(4), 490–536. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2014.896254
- Kelley, T. R. (2010). Optimization, an important stage of engineering design. The Technology Teacher, 69(5), 18-23.
- 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). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789460911453_009
- 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). Routledge.
- Kelly, G. J., & Cunningham, C. M. (2019). Epistemic tools in engineering design for K-12 education. Science Education, 103(4), 1080–1111. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21513

- Kelly, G. J., Cunningham, C. M., & Ricketts, A. (2017). Engaging in identity work through engineering practices in elementary classrooms. Linguistics and Education, 39, 48–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.05.003
- Koehler, C., Giblin, D., Moss, D. M., Faraclas, E., & Kazerounian, K. (2006, June). Are concepts of technical & engineering literacy included in state curriculum standards? A regional overview of the nexus between technical & engineering literacy and state science frameworks [Paper]. American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition. https://peer.asee.org/877
- 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 DesignTM into practice. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12(4), 495–547.
- Lachapelle, C. P., & Cunningham, C. M. (2014). Engineering in elementary schools. In S. Purzer, J. Strobel, & M. Cardella (Eds.), Engineering in pre-college settings: Synthesizing research, policy, and practices (pp. 61–88). Purdue University Press.
- Lachapelle, C. P., Cunningham, C. M., & Oh, Y. (2019). What is technology? Development and evaluation of a simple instrument for measuring children's conceptions of technology. International Journal of Science Education, 41(2), 188–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1545101
- Lammi, M., Denson, C., & Asunda, P. (2018). Search and review of the literature on engineering design challenges in secondary school settings. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 8(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1172
- Langman, C., Zawojewski, J., McNicholas, P., Cinar, A., Brey, E., Bilgic, M., & Mehdizadeh, H. (2019). Disciplinary learning from an authentic engineering context. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288 1178
- Lederman, N. G., & Abell, S. K. (Eds.). (2014). Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Liou, P.-Y. (2015). Developing an instrument for assessing students' concepts of the nature of technology. Research in Science & Technological Education, 33(2), 162–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2014.996542
- Lippard, C. N., Lamm, M. H., & Riley, K. L. (2017). Engineering thinking in prekindergarten children: A systematic literature review. Journal of Engineering Education, 106(3), 454–474. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20174
- Lottero-Perdue, P., & Parry, E. (2017a). Elementary teachers' reflections on design failures and use of fail words after teaching engineering for two years. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1160 Lottero-Perdue, P., & Parry, E. (2017b). Perspectives on failure in the classroom by elementary teachers new to teaching engineering. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1158 Madhavan, G. (2015). Applied minds: How engineers think (1st ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.
- Marks, J., & Chase, C. C. (2019). Impact of a prototyping intervention on middle school students' iterative practices and reactions to failure. Journal of Engineering Education, 108(4), 547–573. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20294
- Martinez, S. L. , & Stager, G. (2013). Invent to learn: Making, tinkering, and engineering in the classroom. Constructing Modern Knowledge Press.
- Martinez Ortiz, A., Amaya, L. R., Warshauer, H. K., Torres, S. G., Scanlon, E., & Pruett, M. (2018). They choose to attend academic summer camps? A mixed methods study exploring the impact of a NASA academic summer pre-engineering camp on middle school students in a Latino community. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 8(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1196
- Matusovich, H. M., Carrico, C. A., Paretti, M. C., & Boynton, M. A. (2017). Engineering as a career choice in rural Appalachia: Sparking and sustaining interest. International Journal of Engineering Education, 33(1(B)), 463–475.
- McCormick, M. , & Hammer, D. (2016). Stable beginnings in engineering design. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1123
- McGowan, V. C., & Bell, P. (2020). Engineering education as the development of critical sociotechnical literacy. Science & Education, 29(4), 981–1005. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-020-00151-5
- McLean, M., Nation, J., Spina, A., Susko, T., Harlow, D., & Bianchini, J. (2020). The importance of collaborative design for narrowing the gender gap in engineering: An analysis of engineering identity development in elementary students. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 10(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1210
- Mildenhall, P., Cowie, B., & Sherriff, B. (2019). A STEM extended learning project to raise awareness of social justice in a Year 3 primary classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 41(4), 471–489. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1560514 Miller, K., Sonnert, G., & Sadler, P. (2020). The influence of student enrollment in pre-college engineering courses on their interest in engineering careers. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1235
- Moote, J., Archer, L., DeWitt, J., & MacLeod, E. (2020). Comparing students' engineering and science aspirations from age 10 to 16: Investigating the role of gender, ethnicity, cultural capital, and attitudinal factors. Journal of Engineering Education, 109(1), 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20302
- Nair, I. (1998). Life cycle analysis and green design: A context for teaching design, environment, and ethics. Journal of Engineering Education, 87(4), 489.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine . (2018). English learners in STEM subjects: Transforming classrooms, schools, and lives. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/25182
- National Academy of Engineering . (2008). Changing the conversation: Messages for improving public understanding of engineering. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/12187
- National Academy of Engineering . (2013). Messaging for engineering: From research to action. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/13463
- National Academy of Engineering, & National Research Council . (2002). Technically speaking: Why all Americans need to know more about technology. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/10250
- National Academy of Engineering, & National Research Council . (2009). Engineering in K-12 education: Understanding the status and improving the prospects. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/12635
- National Academy of Engineering, & National Research Council . (2014). STEM integration in K-12 education: Status, prospects, and an agenda for research. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18612
- National Education Association of the United States . (1893). Report of the committee of ten on secondary school studies. U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/4962

National Research Council . (2008). Common standards for K-12 education?: Considering the evidence: Summary of a workshop series. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/12462

National Research Council . (2010). Standards for K-12 engineering education? The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/12990

National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/13165

National Research Council . (2013a). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18290

National Research Council . (2013b). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. Volume 2: Appendixes (Vol. 2). The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18290

National Science Teaching Association . (2020). NGSS Hub. https://ngss.nsta.org/About.aspx

Nazar, C. R., Barton, A. C., Morris, C., & Tan, E. (2019). Critically engaging engineering in place by localizing counternarratives in engineering design. Science Education, 103(3), 638–664. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21500

Norström, P. (2016). The nature of pre-university engineering education. In M. J. de Vries, L. Gumaelius, & I.-B. Skogh (Eds.), Pre-university engineering education (pp. 27–46). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-621-7 3

Ozis, F., Pektas, A., Akca, M., & DeVoss, D. A. (2018). How to shape attitudes toward STEM careers: The search for the most impactful extracurricular clubs. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1192

Ozogul, G. , Miller, C. , & Reisslein, M. (2017). Latinx and Caucasian elementary school children's knowledge of and interest in engineering activities. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1122

Pattison, S. A., Gontan, I., Ramos-Montañez, S., & Moreno, L. (2018). Identity negotiation within peer groups during an informal engineering education program: The central role of leadership-oriented youth. Science Education, 102(5), 978–1006. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21459

Pattison, S. A., Svarovsky, G., Ramos-Montañez, S., Gontan, I., Weiss, S., Núñez, V., Corrie, P., Smith, C., & Benne, M. (2020). Understanding early childhood engineering interest development as a family-level systems phenomenon: Findings from the Head Start on engineering project. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1234 Peterman, K., Daugherty, J. L., Custer, R. L., & Ross, J. M. (2017). Analysing the integration of engineering in science lessons with the Engineering-Infused Lesson Rubric. International Journal of Science Education, 39(14), 1913–1931. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1359431

Petroski, H. (1996). Invention by design: How engineers get from thought to thing. Harvard University Press.

Petroski, H. (2006). Success through failure: The paradox of design. Princeton University Press.

Pleasants, J., & Olson, J. K. (2019a). Refining an instrument and studying elementary teachers' understanding of the scope of engineering. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1207

Pleasants, J., & Olson, J. K. (2019b). What is engineering? Elaborating the nature of engineering for K-12 education. Science Education, 103(1), 145–166. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21483

Pleasants, J., Olson, J. K., & De La Cruz, I. (2020). Accuracy of elementary teachers' representations of the projects and processes of engineering: Results of a professional development program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(4), 362–383. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1709295

Pleasants, J., Olson, J. K., & Tank, K. M. (2019). What students learn from engineering instruction: Perspectives from elementary teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(7), 691–715. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1595306

Pool, R. (1997). Beyond engineering: How society shapes technology. Oxford University Press.

Porter, T., West, M., Kajfez, R., Malone, K., & Irving, K. (2019). The effect of teacher professional development on implementing engineering in elementary schools. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1246

Radloff, J., Capobianco, B., & Dooley, A. (2019). Elementary teachers' positive and practical risk-taking when teaching science through engineering design. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1208 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02357383

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730790502

Rouse, A. G., & Rouse, R. (2019). Third graders' use of writing to facilitate learning of engineering concepts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(10), 1406–1430. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21581

Rutherford, F. J., & Ahlgren, A. (1990). Science for all Americans. Oxford University Press.

Samuelson Commission . (1884). Report of the royal commission on technical instruction.

Sargent Jr., J. F. (2017). The U.S. science and engineering workforce: Recent, current, and projected employment, wages, and unemployment. Congressional Research Service. https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R43061.pdf

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660280910

Sengupta-Irving, T., & Mercado, J. (2017). Anticipating change: An exploratory analysis of teachers' conceptions of engineering in an era of science education reform. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1138

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.

Singer, J., Ross, J., & Jackson-Lee, Y. (2016). Professional development for the integration of engineering in high school STEM classrooms. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1130

Sneider, C. I., & Ravel, M. K. (2021). The landscape of elementary and secondary engineering education in the 21st century: An overview of two decades of research. Journal of PreK-12 Engineering Education Research (J-PEER), 11(2), Article 5. https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1277

Solomonidou, C., & Tassios, A. (2007). A phenomenographic study of Greek primary school students' representations concerning technology in daily life. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 17(2), 113–133. http://dx.doi.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1007/s10798-006-0007-9

Tan, E., Barton, A. C., & Benavides, A. (2019). Engineering for sustainable communities: Epistemic tools in support of equitable and consequential middle school engineering. Science Education, 103(4), 1011–1046. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21515

Valtorta, C., & Berland, L. (2015). Math, science, and engineering integration in a high school engineering course: A qualitative study. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1087

Verdín, D., Godwin, A., & Ross, M. (2018). STEM roles: How students' ontological perspectives facilitate STEM identities. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 8(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1167

Vossoughi, S., & Bevan, B. (2014). Making and tinkering: A review of the literature. National Research Council Committee on Out of School Time STEM, 1–55.

Watkins, J., McCormick, M., Wendell, K. B., Spencer, K., Milto, E., Portsmore, M., & Hammer, D. (2018). Data-based conjectures for supporting responsive teaching in engineering design with elementary teachers. Science Education, 102(3), 548–570. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21334

Watkins, J., Spencer, K., & Hammer, D. (2014). Examining young students' problem scoping in engineering design. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1082

Wendell, K. B. (2014). Design practices of preservice elementary teachers in an integrated engineering and literature experience. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1085

Wendell, K. B., Andrews, C. J., & Paugh, P. (2019). Supporting knowledge construction in elementary engineering design. Science Education, 103(4), 952–978. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21518

Wendell, K. B., & Rogers, C. (2013). Engineering Design-Based Science, Science content performance, and science attitudes in Eeementary school. Journal of Engineering Education, 102(4), 513–540. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20026

Wendell, K. B., Swenson, J. E. S., & Dalvi, T. S. (2019). Epistemological framing and novice elementary teachers' approaches to learning and teaching engineering design. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(7), 956–982. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21541

Wendell, K. B., Wright, C. G., & Paugh, P. (2017). Reflective decision-making in elementary students' engineering design. Journal of Engineering Education, 106(3), 356–397. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20173

Wilson-Lopez, A., Gregory, S., & Larsen, V. (2017). Reading and engineering: Elementary students' co-application of comprehension Strategies and engineering design processes. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1116

Wilson-Lopez, A., Mejia, J. A., Hasbún, I. M., & Kasun, G. S. (2016). Latina/o adolescents' funds of knowledge related to engineering. Journal of Engineering Education, 105(2), 278–311. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20117

Wilson-Lopez, A., Sias, C., Smithee, A., & Hasbún, I. M. (2018). Forms of science capital mobilized in adolescents' engineering projects. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(2), 246–270. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21418

Worsley, M., & Blikstein, P. (2017). Reasoning strategies in the context of engineering design with everyday materials. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2157-9288.1126

Wulf, W. (1998). The urgency of engineering education reform. Engineering Crossroads, 28(1).

https://nae.edu/7580/TheUrgencyofEngineeringEducationReform

Review of Research About Science Education Program Evaluation

Allen, S. , & Peterman, K. (2019). Evaluating informal STEM education: Issues and challenges in context. New Directions for Evaluation, Spring, 161, 17-33.

Bequette, M., Cardiel, C., Cohn, S., Kunz Kollman, E., & Lawrenz, F. (2019). Evaluation capacity building for informal STEM education: Working for success across the field. New Directions for Evaluation, Spring, 161, 107–123.

Bledsoe, K. (2018). Introduction to the section on race and evaluation. American Journal of Evaluation, 39(4), 511–513.

Coryn, C., Wilson, L., & Westine, C. (2017). A decade of research on evaluation: A systematic review of research on evaluation published between 2005 and 2014. American Journal of Evaluation, 38(3), 329–347.

Davies, P. , Morris, S. , & Fox, C. (2018). The evaluation market and its industry in England. New Directions in Evaluation, 160, 29-43. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20347

Donaldson, S. (2019). Where do we stand? Recent AEA member views on professionalization. Evaluation and Program Planning, 72, 152–161.

Fischer, C., Eisenkraft, A., Fishman, B., Hübner, N., & Lawrenz, F. (2018). Adapting to the large-scale Advanced Placement Chemistry reform: An examination of teachers' challenges and instructional practices. Journal of Chemical Education, 95(10), 1701–1710. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.8b00151

Fu, A. C., Kannan, A., & Shavelson, R. J. (2019). Synthesis of issues and future directions. New Directions for Evaluation, 2019(161), 125–131.

Garibay, C., & Teasdale, R. (2019). Equity and evaluation in informal STEM education. New Directions for Evaluation, Spring, 161, 87–106.

Goodyear, L., Mansori, S., McMahon, T., & Ambat, E. (2019). Building a STEM evaluation community: Evaluation and evaluation capacity building resource landscape study. Unpublished Project Report.

Grack Nelson, A., Goeke, M., Auster, R., Peterman, K., & Lussenhop, A. (2019). Shared measures for evaluating common outcomes of informal STEM education experiences. New Directions for Evaluation, Spring, 161, 59–86.

Grack Nelson, A., King, J., Lawrenz, F., Kunz Kollmann, E., Bequette, M., Reich, C., Pattison, S., Iacovelli, S., Cardiel, C., Eliou, G., Beyer, M., Causey, L., Sinkey, A., Francisco, M. Cohn, S., & Goss, J. (2018). Using a complex adaptive systems perspective to illuminate the concept of evaluation capacity building in a network. American Journal of Evaluation, 40(2), 214–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214018773877

- Hoeg, D., & Bencze, J. (2017). Values underpinning STEM education in the USA: An analysis of the Next Generation Science Standards. Science Education, 101(2), 278–301. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21260
- Lawrenz, F., Kunz Kollmann, E., King, J., Bequette, M., Pattison, S., Grack Nelson, A., Cohn, S., Cardiel, C., Iacovelli, S., Eliou, G., Gross, J., Causey, L., Sinkey, A., Beyer, M., & Francisco, M. (2018). Promoting evaluation capacity building in a complex adaptive system. Evaluation and Program Planning, 69, 53–60.
- Martin-Paez, T., Aguilera, D., Perales-Palacios, F., & Vilchez-Gonzalez, J. (2019). What are we talking about when we talk about STEM education? A review of the literature. Science Education, 103(4), 799–822. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21522
- Medina-Jerez, W. (2018). Science education research trends in Latin America. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 16(3), 465–485.
- Namdar, B., & Shen, J. (2015). Modeling-oriented assessment in K-12 science education: A synthesis of research from 1980 to 2013 and new directions. International Journal of Science Education, 37(7), 993–1023.
- Nielsen, S., Lemire, S., & Christie, C. (2018). Editors notes. New Directions for Evaluation, 160, 7–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20345
- [NRC], N. R. C. (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. The National Academies Press.
- Şahin, M. G., & Öztürk, N. B. (2018). How classroom assessment affects science and mathematics achievement: Findings from TIMSS 2015. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 10(5), 559–569.
- She, H., Lin, H., & Huang, L. (2019). Reflections on and implications of the Programme for International Student Assessment 2015 (PISA 2015) performance of students in Taiwan: The role of epistemic beliefs about science in scientific. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(10), 1309–1340. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21553
- Taylor, J., Furtak, E., Kowalski, S., Martinez, A., Slavin, R., Stuhlsatz, M., & Wilson, C. (2016). Emergent themes from recent research syntheses in science education and their implications for research design, replication, and reporting practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(8), 1216–1231. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21327
- Thomas, V. G., & Campbell, P. B. (2020). Evaluation in today's world: Respecting diversity, improving quality, and promoting usability (1st ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Vo, A., & Christie, C. (2018). Where impact measurement meets evaluation: Tensions, challenges, and opportunities. American Journal of Evaluation, 39(3), 383–388. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214018778813

An Al-Based Teacher Dashboard to Support Students' Inquiry

- Abel, T. D., & Evans, M. (2013). Cross-disciplinary participatory & contextual design research: Creating a teacher dashboard application. IxD&A, 19, 63–76.
- Acosta, A., & Slotta, J. D. (2018). CKBiology: An active learning curriculum design for secondary biology. Frontiers in Education, 3, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00052
- Adair, A., Dickler, R., & Gobert, J. (2020). Supporting teachers supporting students: Evidence-based TIPS in a dashboard to guide inquiry scaffolding. Presented at the International Conference of the Learning Sciences.
- Aleven, V., Xhakaj, F., Holstein, K., & McLaren, B. M. (2010). Developing a teacher dashboard for use with intelligent tutoring systems. technology, 34, 44American Association of College and Universities. (2009). Valid assessment of learning in undergraduate education (VALUE). www.aacu.org/initiatives/value
- Arnold, K. E., & Pistilli, M. D. (2012, April). Course signals at Purdue: Using learning analytics to increase student success. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge (pp. 267–270).
- Atkin, J. J. (1980). The government in the classroom. Daedalus, 109(3), 85-97.
- Baker, R., & Siemens, G. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (2nd ed., pp. 253–274). Cambridge University Press.
- Basu, S., Sengupta, P., & Biswas, G. (2015). A scaffolding framework to support learning of emergent phenomena using multi-agent-based simulation environments. Research in Science Education, 45(2), 293–324.
- Bell, P., & Linn, M. C. (2000). Scientific arguments as learning artifacts: Designing for learning from the web with KIE. International Journal of Science Education, 22(8), 797–817.
- Black, P. J., & Atkin, J. M. (2014). The central role of assessment in pedagogy. In N. G. Lederman, & S. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (vol. 2). Routledge.
- Black, P. J., & Wiliam, D. (1998a). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. School of Education, King's College.
- Black, P. J., & Wiliam, D. (1998b). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles Policy and Practice, 5(1), 7–73.
- Boston, C. (2002). The concept of formative assessment. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 8(1), 9.
- Brooke, J. (1996). SUS-A quick and dirty usability scale. Usability Evaluation in Industry, 189(194), 4–7.
- Buckley, B., Gobert, J., Horwitz, P., & Mansfield, A. (2006). Using log files to track students' model-based inquiry. In the Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS) (pp. 57–63). Erlbaum.
- Chinn, C. A., & Brewer, W. F. (1993). The role of anomalous data in knowledge acquisition: A theoretical framework and implications for science instruction. Review of Educational Research, 63(1), 1–49.
- Chounta, I. A., & Avouris, N. (2016). Towards the real-time evaluation of collaborative activities: Integration of an automatic rater of collaboration quality in the classroom from the teacher's perspective. Education and Information Technologies, 21(4), 815–835. Christensen, C., Horn, M., & Johnson, C. (2008). Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns. McGraw-Hill.
- Clarke-Midura, J., Code, J., Dede, C., Mayrath, M., & Zap, N. (2012). Thinking outside the bubble: Virtual performance assessments for measuring complex learning. In Technology-based assessments for 21st century skills: Theoretical and practical implications from modern research (pp. 125–148). Information Age Publishers.

- Crawford, V. M., Schlager, M., Penuel, W. R., & Toyama, Y. (2008). Supporting the art of teaching in a data-rich, high performance learning environment. Linking data and learning, 109–129.
- Dede, C. (2005). Planning for neomillennial learning styles. Educause Quarterly, 28(1), 7–12.
- DiCerbo, K. E., & Behrens, J. T. (2012). Implications of the digital ocean on current and future assessment. In R. Lissitz & H. Jiao (Eds.), Computers and their impact on state assessment: Recent history and predictions for the future. Information Age Publishing. Dickler, R. (2021). An intelligent tutoring system and teacher dashboard to support students on mathematics in science inquiry [Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey, School of Graduate Studies].
- Dickler, R., Adair, A., Gobert, J., Hussain-Abidi, H., Olsen, J., O'Brien, M., & Sao Pedro, M. (2021). Examining the use of a teacher alerting dashboard during remote learning. In I. Roll, D. McNamara, S. Sosnovsky, R. Luckin, V. Dimitrova (Eds.), Artificial intelligence in education. AIED 2021. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12749. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78270-2 24
- Dickler, R., Gobert, J., & Sao Pedro, M. (2019). Using epistemic network analysis to characterize teacher discourse in response to an alerting dashboard. Presented at Society for text and discourse.
- Dickler, R., Gobert, J., & Sao Pedro, M. (2021). Using innovative methods to explore the potential of an alerting dashboard for science inquiry. Journal of Learning Analytics, 8(2), 105–122.
- Dickler, R., Li, H., & Gobert, J. (2018). False positives and false negatives in inquiry assessment: Investigating log and open response data. Presented at the European Association of Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI) Sig 20 and Sig 26 2018 Meeting, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel.
- Ducrest, D. (2014). SBIR Phase II: Skills- and Assessments-Based Learning Environments. (NSF # 1430187).
- Dunbar, R. I. (1993). Coevolution of neocortical size, group size and language in humans. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 16(4), 681–694.
- Duschl, R. A., & Gitomer, D. H. (1997). Strategies and challenges to changing the focus of assessment and instruction in science classrooms. Educational Assessment, 4(1), 37–73. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326977ea0401_2
- Educational Testing Service (ETS). (2002). Digital transformation: A framework for ICT.
- Florida Department of Education . (2008). Science. www.fldoe.org/academics/standards/subject-areas/math-science/science/Foote, N. (2016). Personal communication.
- Glaser, R., Schauble, L., Raghavan, K., & Zeitz, C. (1992). Scientific reasoning across different domains. In E. DeCorte, M. Linn, H. Mandl, & L. Verschaffel (Eds.), Computer-based learning environments and problem-solving (pp. 345–371). Springer-Verlag.
- Gobert, J. D. (May 13, 2016). US news & world report. www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016–05–13/op-ed-educational-data-mining-can-enhance-science-education
- Gobert, J. D. (2019). Inq-Blotter: Designing supports for teachers' real time instruction (NSF-IIS-1902647). Awarded July 17, 2019 from the National Science Foundation.
- Gobert, J. D., Baker, R. S., & Sao Pedro, M. A. (June, 2016). Inquiry skills tutoring system. US Patent no. 9,373,082 (issued).
- Gobert, J. D., Baker, R. S., & Wixon, M. B. (2015). Operationalizing and detecting disengagement within online science microworlds. Educational Psychologist, 50(1), 43–57.
- Gobert, J. D. , & Sao Pedro, M. (2016). A real time alerting tool to transform teachers' assessment of science inquiry practices (NSF-IIS-1629045). Awarded by the National Science Foundation.
- Gobert, J. D., & Sao Pedro, M. A. (2017). Inq-ITS: Design decisions used for an inquiry intelligent system that both assesses and scaffolds students as they learn. In A. A. Rupp & J. Leighton (Co-Eds.), Handbook of cognition and assessment. Wiley/Blackwell.
- Gobert, J. D., Sao Pedro, M. A., Baker, R. S., Toto, E., & Montalvo, O. (2012). Leveraging educational data mining for real-time performance assessment of scientific inquiry skills within microworlds. JEDM-Journal of Educational Data Mining, 4(1), 111–143.
- Gobert, J. D., Sao Pedro, M. A., Betts, C., & Baker, R. S. (February, 2017). Inquiry skills tutoring system (child patent for alerting system). US Patent no. 9,564,057 (issued).
- Gobert, J. D. , Sao Pedro, M. A. , Betts, C. , & Baker, R. S. (January, 2019). Inquiry skills tutoring system (child patent for additional claims to Inq-ITS). US Patent no. 10,186,168 (issued).
- Gobert, J. D., Sao Pedro, M. A., Li, H., & Lott, C., & the Inq-ITS Development Team (in press). Intelligent tutoring systems: A history and an example of an ITS for science inquiry science inquiry ITS. To appear in R. Tierney, F. Rizvi, K. Ercikan, & G. Smith (Eds.), International encyclopaedia of education (vol. 4). ELSEVIER.
- Gobert, J. D., Sao Pedro, M. A., Raziuddin, J., & Baker, R. S. (2013). From log files to assessment metrics: Measuring students' science inquiry skills using educational data mining. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 22(4), 521–563.
- Gotwals, A. W., & Songer, N. B. (2010). Reasoning up and down a food chain: Using an assessment framework to investigate students' middle knowledge. Science Education, 94(2), 259–281.
- Govaerts, S., Verbert, K., Duval, E., & Pardo, A. (2012). The student activity meter for awareness and self-reflection. In CHI'12 Extended abstracts on human factors in computing systems (pp. 869–884).
- Havnes, A., Smith, K., Dysthe, O., & Ludvigsen, K. (2012). Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 38(1), 21–27.
- Holstein, K., McLaren, B. M., & Aleven, V. (2018a). Student learning benefits of a mixed-reality teacher awareness tool in Alenhanced classrooms. In Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED 2018), 27–30 June 2018, London, UK (pp. 154–168). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319–93843–1_12
- Holstein, K., McLaren, B. M., & Aleven, V. (2018b). Informing the design of teacher awareness tools through causal alignment analysis. Proceedings of the 13th International Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS 2018), 23–27 June 2018, London, UK (pp. 104–111).
- Holstein, K., McLaren, B. M., & Aleven, V. (2019). Co-designing a real-time classroom orchestration tool to support teacher—Al complementarity. Journal of Learning Analytics, 6(2), 27–52. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2019.62.3
- International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) . (n.d.). The ISTE standards. www.iste.org/iste-standards
- Johnson, M. A., & Lawson, A. E. (1998). What are the relative effects of reasoning ability and prior knowledge on biology achievement in expository and inquiry classes? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35(1), 89–103.
- Kali, Y., Goodyear, P., & Markauskaite, L. (2011). Researching design practices and design cognition: Contexts, experiences and pedagogical knowledge-in-pieces. Learning, Media and Technology, 36(2), 129–149.

- Ketelhut, D. J. (2011). Assessing gaming, computer and scientific inquiry self-efficacy in a virtual environment. In L. Annetta & S. Bronack (Eds.), Serious educational game assessment: Practical methods and models for educational games, simulations and virtual worlds (pp. 1–18). Sense Publisers.
- Klahr, D., & Dunbar, K. (1988). Dual space search during scientific reasoning. Cognitive science, 12(1), 1–48.
- Klayman, J., & Ha, Y.-W. (1987). Confirmation, disconfirmation, and information in hypothesis testing. Psychological Review, 94(2), 211–228. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.2.211
- Koedinger, K. R., & Corbett, A. T. (2006). Cognitive tutors: Technology bringing learning sciences to the classroom. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences. Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhn, D. (2005). Education for thinking. Harvard University Press.
- Kuhn, D. (1991). The skills of argument. Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhn, D., Garcia-Mila, M., Zohar, A., & Andersen, C. (1995). Strategies of knowledge acquisition. Society for Research in Child Development Monographs, 60, 1–127.
- Kuhn, D., Schauble, L., and Garcia-Mila, M. (1992). Cross-domain development of scientific reasoning. Cognition and Instruction, 9(4), 285–327.
- Laney, D. (2001). 3D data management: Controlling data volume, velocity and variety. META Group Research Note, 6, 70–73. Laurillard, D. (2008). The teacher as action researcher: Using technology to capture pedagogic form. Studies in Higher Education, 33(2), 139–154.
- Lee, H., Chung, H. Q., Zhang, Y., Abedi, J., & Warschauer, M. (2020). The effectiveness and features of formative assessment in US K-12 education: A systematic review. Applied Measurement in Education, 33(2), 124–140.
- Lee, O., Llosa, L., Grapin, S., Haas, A., & Goggins, M. (2019). Science and language integration with English learners: A conceptual framework guiding instructional materials development. Science Education, 103(2), 317–337.
- Li, H., Gobert, J., & Dickler, R. (2018). The relationship between scientific explanations and the proficiencies of content, inquiry, and writing. In Proceedings of the Fifth Annual ACM Conference on Learning at Scale (pp. 12–22). ACM.
- Li, H., Gobert, J., & Dickler, R. (2019). Evaluating the transfer of scaffolded inquiry: What sticks and does it last? In S. Isotani, E. Millán, A. Ogan, P. Hastings, B. McLaren, & R. Luckin (Eds.), Artificial intelligence in education (pp. 163–168). Springer.
- Linn, M. C., & Hsi, S. (2000). Computers, teachers, peers: Science learning partners. Routledge.
- Macfadyen, L. P., & Dawson, S. (2010). Mining LMS data to develop an "early warning system" for educators: A proof of concept. Computers & Education, 54(2), 588–599.
- Mansell, J., & The Assessment Reform Group. (2009). Assessment in Schools. Fit for purpose? A commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme. ESRC TLRP, Institute of Education London.
- Martinez-Maldonado, R., Clayphan, A., Yacef, K., & Kay, J. (2015). MTFeedback: Providing notifications to enhance teacher awareness of small group work in the classroom. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 8(2), 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2014.2365027
- Martinez-Maldonado, R., Kay, J., Yacef, K., Edbauer, M. T., & Dimitriadis, Y. (2013). MTClassroom and MTDashboard: Supporting analysis of teacher attention in an orchestrated multi-tabletop classroom. Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL 2013), 15–19 June 2013, Madison, WI, USA. (pp. 320–327).
- Martinez-Maldonado, R., Kay, J., Yacef, K., & Schwendimann, B. (2012). An interactive teacher's dashboard for monitoring groups in a multi-tabletop learning environment. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS 2012), 14–18 June 2012, Chania, Greece (pp. 482–492). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30950-2_62
- Matuk, C., Gerard, L., Lim-Breitbart, J., & Linn, M. (2017). Gathering requirements for teacher tools: Empowering teachers through co-design. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(1), 79–110. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-016-9459-2
- McCallum, S., & Milner, M. M. (2021). The effectiveness of formative assessment: Student views and staff reflections. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46(1), 1–16.
- McDonald, K. S., & Waite, A. M. (2019). Future directions: Challenges and solutions facing career readiness and development in STEM fields. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 21(1), 133–138.
- McElhaney, K., & Linn, M. (2008). Impacts of Students' Experimentation Using a Dynamic Visualization on their Understanding of Motion. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference of the Learning Sciences, ICLS 2008, Volume 2 (pp. 51–58). International Society of the Learning Sciences, Inc.
- McElhaney, K., & Linn, M. (2010). Helping students make controlled experiments more informative. In K. Gomez, L. Lyons, & J. Radinsky (Ed.), Learning in the disciplines: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS 2010) Volume 1, full papers (pp. 786–793). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- McNeill, K. L., & Krajcik, J. S. (2011). Supporting Grade 5–8 Students in Constructing Explanations in Science: The Claim, Evidence, and Reasoning Framework for Talk and Writing. 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. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15(2), 153–191.
- Mislevy, R., Yan, D., Gobert, J., & Sao Pedro, M. (2020). Automated scoring with intelligent tutoring systems. In D. Yan, A. Rupp, & P. Foltz (Eds.), Handbook of automated scoring: Theory into practice. Chapman and Hall.
- Mislevy, R. J., Behrens, J. T., DiCerbo, K. E., & Levy, R. (2012). Design and discovery in educational assessment: Evidence centered design, psychometrics, and data mining. Journal of Educational Data Mining, 4(1), 11–48.
- Mislevy, R. J., Riconscente, M. M., & Rutstein, D. W. (2009). Design patterns for assessing model-based reasoning (Large-Scale Assessment Technical Report 6). SRI International. http://ecd.sri.com/downloads/ECD_TR6_Model-Based_Reasoning.pdf Molenaar, I., & van Knoop Campen, C. (2017, September). Teacher dashboards in practice: Usage and impact. In European conference on technology enhanced learning (pp. 125–138). Springer.
- Molenaar, I., &. van Knoop Campen, C. (2018). Experience matters: The impact of dashboards on teachers' feedback. Proceedings of the 13th International Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS '18), 23–27 June 2018, London, UK (pp. 1231–1232).
- Myford, C., & Wolfe, E. (2009, December). Monitoring rater performance over time: A framework for detecting differential accuracy and differential scale category use. J. Educ. Meas. 46, 31–389. Meas. 46, 371–389.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (NEAP) . (2019). The nation's report card. www.nationsreportcard.gov National Governors Association . (2010). Common core state standards. Washington, DC.

National Research Council . (2001). Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment. National Academy Press.

National Research Council . (2011). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Committee on a Conceptual Framework for New K-12 Science Education Standards. Board on Science Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. The National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/13398.

National Science Board . (2016). National science board: Science and engineering indicators digest 2016 (NSB-2016–2). National Science Foundation.

NGSS Lead States. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.

Nixon, R. S., Godfrey, T. J., Mayhew, N. T., & Wiegert, C. C. (2016). Undergraduate student construction and interpretation of graphs in physics lab activities. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(1), 010104.

Njoo, M., & de Jong, T. (1993). Exploratory learning with a computer simulations for control theory: Learning processes and instructional support. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 821–844.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory . (2003). enGauge 21st century skills: For 21st century learners. www.cwasd.k12.wi.us/highschl/newsfile1062 1.pdf

O'Donnell, C. (2008). Defining, conceptualizing, and measuring fidelity of implementation and its relationship to outcomes in K–12 curriculum intervention research. Review of Educational Research, 78(1), 33–84. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313793 writing (current)

Partnership for 21st Century Skills . (2019). Framework for 21st century learning.

https://static.battelleforkids.org/documents/p21/P21 Framework Brief.pdf

Pellegrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (2001). Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Pellegrino, J. W., Gane, B. D., Zaidi, S. Z., Harris, C. J., McElhaney, K. W., Alozie, N., Pennock, P. H., Severance, S., Neumann, K., Fortus, D., Krajcik, J., Nordine, J., Furtak, E. M., Briggs, D., Chattergoon, R., Penuel, B., Wingert, K., & Van Horne, K. (2018). The challenge of assessing "knowledge in use": Examples from three-dimensional science learning and instruction. Rethinking learning in the digital age: Making the learning sciences count, 13th International Conference of the Learning Sciences (*ICLS*; vol. 2). International Society of the Learning Sciences.

Prieto, L. P., Holenko Dlab, M., Gutiérrez, I., Abdulwahed, M., & Balid, W. (2011). Orchestrating technology enhanced learning: A literature review and a conceptual framework. Int. J. Technology Enhanced Learning, 3(6), 583–598.

Pruitt, S. (2014). The next generation science standards: The features and challenges. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25, 145–156. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9385-0

Quellmalz, E. S., Silberglitt, M. D., Buckley, B. C., Loveland, M. T., & Brenner, D. G. (2020). Simulations for supporting and assessing science literacy. In Learning and performance assessment: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications (pp. 760–799). IGI Global.

Quinn, J., & Alessi, S. (1994). The effects of simulation complexity and hypothesis-generation strategy on learning. Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 27, 75–91.

Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. Behavioral Science, 28(1), 4-13.

Roschelle, J. , Martin, W. , Ahn, J. , & Schank, P. (2017). Cyberlearning community report: The state of cyberlearning and the future of learning with technology. SRI International.

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.

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science, 18(2), 119-144.

Sadler, T. D. (2004). Informal reasoning regarding socioscientific issues: A critical review of research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 41(5), 513–536.

Sandoval, W. A., & Millwood, K. A. (2005). The quality of students' use of evidence in written scientific explanations. Cognition and Instruction, 23(1), 23–55.

Sao Pedro, M., Gobert, J., & Betts, C. (2018). Inq-Blotter: A dashboard that alerts teachers when students struggle during investigations with Inq-ITS online labs. Poster presented at the US Department of Education IES PI Meeting, Washington, DC.

Sao Pedro, M. A. (2015). Inq-blotter: Revolutionizing how teachers identify and support students needing help during inquiry. Awarded by US DoE Institute of Education Sciences (ED-IES-15-C-0018).

Sao Pedro, M. A. (2016). Inq-blotter: Recognizing how teachers identify and support students needing help during inquiry. Awarded by US DoE Institute of Education Sciences (ED-IES-16-C-0014).

SCANS (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills). (1991). What work requires of schools: A SCANS report for America 2000: Executive summary. U.S. Dept. of Labor.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (2008). Pedagogical biases in educational technologies. Educational Technology, 48(3), 3–11. 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.

Schleicher, A. (2019). PISA 2018: Insights and interpretations. OECD Publishing.

Schmidt, J. A., Rosenberg, J. M., & Beymer, P. N. (2018). A person-in-context approach to student engagement in science: Examining learning activities and choice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55(1), 19–43.

Schunn, C. D., & Anderson, J. R. (1999). The generality/specificity of expertise in scientific reasoning. Cognitive Science, 23(3), 337–370.

Schwarz, C. V., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Kenyon, L., Achér, A., Fortus, D., Schwartz, Y., 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(6), 632–654. doi: 10.1002/tea.20311

Segal, A., Hindi, S., Prusak, N., Swidan, O., Livni, A., Palatnic, A., & Schwarz, B. (2017). Keeping the teacher in the loop: Technologies for monitoring group learning in real-time. In Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED 2017), 28 June–1 July 2017, Wuhan, China (pp. 64–76). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61425-0_6

- Shute, V., & Glaser, R. (1990). A large-scale evaluation of an intelligent discovery world: Smithtown. Interactive Learning Environments, 1, 55–71.
- Shute, V., Leighton, J., Jang, E., & Chu, M.-W. (2016). Advances in the science of assessment. Educational Assessment, 21(6), 34–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2015.1127752
- Shute, V. J. (2011). Stealth assessment in computer-based games to support learning. In S. Tobias & J. D. Fletcher (Eds.), Computer games and instruction (pp. 503–524). Information Age Publishers.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20313
- Sosnovsky, S., Dietrich, M., Andrès, E., Goguadze, G., & Winterstein, S. (2012). Math-bridge: Adaptive platform for multilingual mathematics courses. In 21st century learning for 21st century skills (pp. 495–500). Springer.
- Texas Education Agency . (2017). Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Science (TEKS). https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/laws-and-rules/texas-administrative-code/19-tac-chapter-112
- Tissenbaum, M., & Slotta, J. (2019). Supporting classroom orchestration with real-time feedback: A role for teacher dashboards and real-time agents. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 14(3), 325–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-019-09306-1
- van Joolingen, W. R., & de Jong, T. (1991). Supporting hypothesis generation by learners exploring an interactive computer simulation. Instructional Science, 20(5–6), 389–404.
- van Joolingen, W. R., & de Jong, T. (1993). Exploring a domain through a computer simulation: Traversing variable and relation space with the help of a hypothesis scratchpad. In D. Towne, T. de Jong, & H. Spada (Eds.), Simulation-based experiential learning (pp. 191–206). Springer-Verlag.
- van Leeuwen, A., Janssen, J., Erkens, G., & Brekelmans, M. (2015). Teacher regulation of cognitive activities during student collaboration: Effects of learning analytics. Computers & Education, 90, 80–94.
- van Leeuwen, A., & Rummel, N. (2018). Considering teachers' informational needs and the role division between teacher and orchestration tool in the context of collaborative learning. In Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference of the Learning Sciences (pp. 1230–1231).
- van Leeuwen, A., van Wermeskerken, M., Erkens, G., & Rummel, N. (2017). Measuring teacher sense making strategies of learning analytics: A case study. Learning: Research and Practice, 3(1), 42–58.
- VanLehn, K. (2013). Model construction as a learning activity: A design space and review. Interactive Learning Environments, 21(4), 371–413
- Verbert, K., Govaerts, S., Duval, E., Santos, J. L., Van Assche, F., Parra, G., & Klerkx, J. (2014). Learning dashboards: An overview and future research opportunities. Personal and Ubiquitous Computing, 18(6), 1499–1514.
- Vitale, J., Linn, M., & Gerard, L. (2016). Visualizing data from automated scores to help teachers guide inquiry with scientific visualizations in diverse classes. Presented at the 12th Annual International Conference of the Learning Sciences as part of a symposium, Real-Time Visualization of Student Activities to Support Classroom Orchestration, June 20–24, Singapore.
- White, B. Y. (1993). ThinkerTools: Causal models, conceptual change, and science education. Cognition and Instruction, 10(1), 1–100.
- White, E., & Shakibnia, A. F. (2019). State of STEM: Defining the landscape to determine high-impact pathways for the future workforce. In Proceedings of the Interdisciplinary STEM Teaching and Learning Conference (Vol. 3, No. 1, p. 4).
- Wiggins, G. (1998). Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance. Jossey-Bass. 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.
- Wiliam, D. (2007a). Keeping learning on track: Classroom assessment and the regulation of learning. Information Age Publishing. Wiliam, D. (2007b). Changing classroom practice. Educational Leadership, 65(4), 36.
- Wilkerson, M. H., & Fenwick, M. (2017). Using mathematics and computational thinking. In C. V. Schwarz, C. Passmore, & B. J. Reiser (Eds.), Helping students make sense of the world using next generation science and engineering practices (pp. 181–204). NSTA Press.
- Wilkerson, M. H., Shareff, B., Gravel, B., Shaban, Y., & Laina, V. (2017). Exploring computational modeling environments as tools to structure classroom-level knowledge building. International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- World Economic Forum . (2015). New vision for Education: Unlocking the potential of technology.
- www3.weforum.org/docs/WEFUSA NewVisionforEducation Report2015.pdf

Large-Scale Assessment in Science Education

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1990). Science for all Americans. Oxford University Press.

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., & Bloom, B. S. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.

Bennett, R. E. (2018). Educational assessment: What to watch in a rapidly changing world. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 37(4), 7–15.

Bloom, B., Englehart, M., Furst, E., Hill, W., & Krathwohl, D. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. Longmans, Green.

Berman, A. I., Haertel, E. H., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2020). Comparability of large-scale educational assessments: Issues and recommendations. National Academy of Education.

- Braun, H. I. (2018). How long is the shadow? The relationships of family background to selected adult outcomes: Results from PIAAC. Large-Scale Assessments in Education, 6(1), 1–52.
- Braun, H. I., & Singer, J. D. (2019). Assessment for monitoring of education systems: International comparisons. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 683(1), 75–92.

- Britton, E. D., & Schneider, S. A. (2014). Large-scale assessments in science education. In Handbook of research on science education (pp. 1021–1054). Routledge.
- Bybee, R. W. (2010). Advancing STEM education: A 2020 vision. Technology and Engineering Teacher, 70(1), 30.
- Bybee, R. W., McCrae, B., & Laurie, R. (2009). PISA 2006: An assessment of scientific literacy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 46(8), 865–883.
- Carnoy, M., Khavenson, T., Loyalka, P., Schmidt, W. H., & Zakharov, A. (2016). Revisiting the relationship between international assessment outcomes and educational production: Evidence from a longitudinal PISA-TIMSS sample. American Educational Research Journal, 53(4), 1054–1085.
- Chi, S., Liu, X., Wang, Z., & Won Han, S. (2018). Moderation of the effects of scientific inquiry activities on low SES students' PISA 2015 science achievement by school teacher support and disciplinary climate in science classroom across gender. International Journal of Science Education, 40(11), 1284–1304.
- Denoël, E., Dorn, E., Goodman, A., Hiltunen, J., Krawitz, M., & Mourshed, M. (2017). Drivers of student performance: Insights from Europe. Mckinsey & Company.
- Douglas, K. A., Gane, B. D., Neumann, K., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2020). Contemporary methods of assessing integrated STEM competencies. In Handbook of research on STEM education (pp. 234–254). Routledge.
- Duschl, R. A., Schweingruber, H. A., & Shouse, A. W. (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K-8 (Vol. 500). National Academies Press.
- Ercikan, K., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2017). Validation of score meaning for the next generation of assessments: The use of response processes. Taylor & Francis.
- Ercikan, K., Roth, W.-M., & Asil, M. (2015). Cautions about inferences from international assessments: The case of PISA 2009. Teachers College Record, 117(1), 1–28.
- Fishbein, B., Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V., & Foy, P. (2018). The TIMSS 2019 item equivalence study: Examining mode effects for computer-based assessment and implications for measuring trends. Large-Scale Assessments in Education, 6(1), 1–23.
- Gane, B. D., Zaidi, S. Z., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2018). Measuring what matters: Using technology to assess multidimensional learning. European Journal of Education, 53(2), 176–187.
- Goos, M., Manning, A., & Salomons, A. (2009). Job polarization in Europe. American Economic Review, 99(2), 58-63.
- Grek, S. (2009). Governing by numbers: The PISA "effect"in Europe. Journal of Education Policy, 24(1), 23–37.
- Gurria, A. (2016). PISA 2015 results in focus. PISA in Focus, 67(1).
- Harris, C. J., Krajcik, J. S., Pellegrino, J. W., & DeBarger, A. H. (2019). Designing knowledge-in-use assessments to promote deeper learning. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 38(2), 53–67.
- He, J., Barrera-Pedemonte, F., & Buchholz, J. (2019). Cross-cultural comparability of noncognitive constructs in TIMSS and PISA. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 26(4), 369–385.
- Hooper, M., Mullis, I. V., Martin, M. O., & Fishbein, B. (2015). TIMSS 2015 context questionnaire framework. Timss, 61-82.
- Huang, X., Wilson, M., & Wang, L. (2016). Exploring plausible causes of differential item functioning in the PISA science assessment: Language, curriculum or culture. Educational Psychology, 36(2), 378–390.
- Kauertz, A., Neumann, K., & Haertig, H. (2012). Competence in science education. In Second international handbook of science education (pp. 711–721). Springer.
- Lau, K.-C., & Lam, T. Y.-P. (2017). Instructional practices and science performance of 10 top-performing regions in PISA 2015. International Journal of Science Education, 39(15), 2128–2149.
- Li, M., Ruiz-Primo, M. A., & Shavelson, R. J. (2006). Towards a science achievement framework: The case of TIMSS 1999. In Contexts of learning mathematics and science: Lessons learned from TIMSS (pp. 291–311). Routledge.
- Manyika, J., Lund, S., Chui, M., Bughin, J., Woetzel, J., Batra, P., Ko, R., & Sanghvi, S. (2017). Jobs lost, jobs gained: Workforce transitions in a time of automation. McKinsey Global Institute, 150.
- Martin, M. O. , von Davier, M. , & Mullis, I. V. (2020). Methods and procedures: TIMSS 2019 technical report. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- McKinsey, C., & McKinsey, M. M. (2007). How the world's best performing school systems come out on top.
- www.mckinsey.com/App_Media/Reports/SSO/Worlds_School_Systems_Final.pdf
- Mullis, I. V. S., & Martin, M. O. (2017). TIMSS 2019 assessment frameworks. ERIC.
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Fishbein, B., Foy, P., & Moncaleano, S. (2021). Findings from the TIMSS 2019 problem solving and inquiry tasks. L. S. o. E. a. H. D. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College and International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., Kelly, D. L., & Fishbein, B. (2020). TIMSS 2019 international results in mathematics and science. https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2019/international-results/
- National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Office . (2020). National artificial intelligence initiative: Overseeing and implementing the United States national AI strategy. www.ai.gov/
- National Assessment Governing Board . (2008). Science framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress. ERIC Clearinghouse.
- National Assessment Governing Board . (2018). Technology and engineering literacy framework for the 2018 National Assessment of Educational Progress. ERIC Clearinghouse.
- National Assessment Governing Board . (2019). Science framework for the 2019 National Assessment of Educational Progress. ERIC Clearinghouse.
- National Center on Education and the Economy . (2021). NCEE's blueprint for a high-performing education system. https://ncee.org/blueprint/
- National Research Council . (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school: Expanded edition. National Academies Press
- National Research Council . (2001). Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment. National Academies Press.
- National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K-8. National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012a). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century (J. W. Pellegrino & M. L. Hilton , Eds.). National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012b). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academies Press.

Neidorf, T., Stephens, M., Lasseter, A., Gattis, K., Arora, A., Wang, Y., & Holmes, J. (2016). A comparison between the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) frameworks in science, technology and engineering literacy, and mathematics. US Department of Education.

Nelson, R. R., & Phelps, E. S. (1966). Investment in humans, technological diffusion, and economic growth. The American Economic Review, 56(1/2), 69–75.

Neumann, K., Fischer, H. E., & Kauertz, A. (2010). From PISA to educational standards: The impact of large-scale assessments on science education in Germany. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 8(3), 545–563.

Ng, P. T. (2011). How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better. Journal of Educational Change, 12, 463–468. NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. National Academies Press.

OECD. (2001). Measuring student knowledge and skills: A new framework for assessment.

www.oecd.org/education/school/programmeforinternationalstudentassessmentpisa/33693997.pdf

OECD. (2003). The 2003 assessment framework: Mathematics, reading, science and problem solving knowledge and skills. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

OECD . (2006). Assessing scientific, reading and mathematical literacy: A framework for PISA 2006. www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264026407-

en.pdf?expires=1629582441&id=id&accname=quest&checksum=67498B2B817D8B3589DA9F060F88FBF4

OECD . (2017a). PISA 2015 assessment and analytical framework: Science, reading, mathematic, financial literacy and collaborative problem solving. O. Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264281820-en

OECD. (2017b). PISA 2015 technical report. www.oecd.org/pisa/data/2015-technical-report/PISA2015_TechRep_Final.pdf

OECD . (2020). PISA 2024 strategic vision and direction for science. www.oecd.org/pisa/publications/PISA-2024-Science-Strategic-Vision-Proposal.pdf

OECD . (2023). PISA 2025 Science Framework. Paris.

Oliver, M., McConney, A., & Woods-McConney, A. (2019). The efficacy of inquiry-based instruction in science: A comparative analysis of six countries using PISA 2015. Research in Science Education, 1–22.

Osborne, J. (2007). Science education for the twenty first century. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 3(3), 173–184.

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.

Pellegrino, J. W. (2013). Proficiency in science: Assessment challenges and opportunities. Science, 340(6130), 320-323.

Pellegrino, J. W. , Chudowsky, N. , & Glaser, R. (2001). Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment. ERIC.

Pellegrino, J. W., & Quellmalz, E. S. (2010). Perspectives on the integration of technology and assessment. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 43(2), 119–134.

Pellegrino, J. W., Wilson, M. R., Koenig, J. A., & Beatty, A. S. (2014). Developing assessments for the next generation science standards. The National Academies Press.

PISA, O. (2015). Released field trial: Cognitive items. www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/PISA2015-Released-FT-Cognitive-Items.pdf Pohl, S. , Ulitzsch, E. , & von Davier, M. (2021). Reframing rankings in educational assessments. Science, 372(6540), 338–340.

Ruiz-Primo, M. A., & Li, M. (2015). The relationship between item context characteristics and student performance: The case of the 2006 and 2009 PISA science items. Teachers College Record, 117(1), n1.

Singer, J. D., & Braun, H. I. (2018), Testing international education assessments, Science, 360(6384), 38–40.

Solano-Flores, G., & Milbourn, T. (2016). Assessment capacity, cultural validity and consequential validity in PISA. Relieve, 22(1), M12.

Teltemann, J., & Klieme, E. (2016). The impact of international testing projects on policy and practice. In Handbook of human and social conditions in assessment (pp. 369–386). Taylor Francis.

Travers, K. J., & Westbury, I. (1988). The IEA study of mathematics I: Analysis of mathematics curriculum (Vol. 1). Pergamon Press. Way, D., & Strain-Seymour, E. (2021). A framework for considering device and interface features that may affect student performance on the national assessment of educational progress. https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/Framework-for-Considering-Device-and-Interface-Features-NAEP-NVS-Panel-March-2021.pdf

Zhai, X. (2021). Practices and theories: How can machine learning assist in innovative assessment practices in science education. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30(2), 1–11.

Zhai, X., Haudek, K. C., Shi, L., Nehm, R., & Urban-Lurain, M. (2020a). From substitution to redefinition: A framework of machine learning-based science assessment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(9), 1430–1459.

Zhai, X., Haudek, K. C., Wilson, C., & Stuhlsatz, M. (2021a). A framework of construct-irrelevant variance for contextualized constructed response assessment. Frontiers in Education, 6, 751283. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.751283

Zhai, X., Krajcik, J., & Pellegrino, J. (2021b). On the validity of machine learning-based next generation science assessments: A validity inferential network. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30(2), 298–312.

Zhai, X., & Li, M. (2021). Validating a partial-credit scoring approach for multiple-choice science items: An application of fundamental ideas in science. International Journal of Science Education, 43(10), 1640–1666.

Zhai, X., Yin, Y., Pellegrino, J. W., Haudek, K. C., & Shi, L. (2020b). Applying machine learning in science assessment: A systematic review. Studies in Science Education, 56(1), 111–151.

Zhang, T. , Xie, Q. , Park, B. J. , Kim, Y. Y. , Broer, M. , & Bohrnstedt, G. (2016). Computer familiarity and its relationship to performance in three NAEP digital-based assessments. AIR-NAEP Working Paper# 01-2016.

Zhao, Y. (2020). Two decades of havoc: A synthesis of criticism against PISA. Journal of Educational Change, 1–22.

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), 010101.

Al-Amoush, S., Markic, S., Usak, M., Erdogan, M., & Eilks, I. (2014). Beliefs about chemistry teaching and learning: A comparison of teachers' and student teachers' beliefs from Jordan, Turkey, and Germany. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 12(4), 767–792.

Avraamidou, L. (2017). A well-started beginning elementary teacher's beliefs and practices in relation to reform recommendations about inquiry-based science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 12(2), 331–353.

Bahçivan, E., & Aydin, Y. (2020). Pre-service science teachers' teaching beliefs: Responding to "which", "how" and "why" questions. Action in Teacher Education, 42(2), 120–136.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191.

Bandura, A. (2000). Self-efficacy. In A. E. Kazdin, (Ed.), Encyclopedia of psychology (pp. 212-213). Oxford University Press.

Blanchard, M. R., LePrevost, C. E., Tolin, A. D., & Gutierrez, K. S. (2016). Investigating technology-enhanced teacher professional development in rural, high-poverty middle schools. Educational Researcher, 45(3), 207–220.

Boesdorfer, S. B., Del Carlo, D. I., & Wayson, J. (2019). Secondary science teachers' reported practices and beliefs on teaching and learning from a large national sample in the united states. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(8), 815–837.

Brígido, M. , Borrachero, A. B. , Bermejo, M. L. , & Mellado, V. (2013). Prospective primary teachers' self-efficacy and emotions in science teaching. European Journal of Teacher Education, 36(2), 200-217.

Brownlee, J. M., Schraw, G., & Berthelsen, D. C. (2011). Personal epistemology and teacher education: An emerging field of research. In J. M. Brownlee, G. Schraw, & D. C. Berthelsen (Eds.), Personal epistemology and teacher education (pp. 3–24). Routledge.

Bryan, L. A. (2012). Research on science teacher beliefs. In B. A. Frasier , K. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 477–495). Springer.

Buehl, M. M., Alexander, P. A., & Murphy, P. K. (2002). Beliefs about schooled knowledge: Domain specific or domain general? Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27, 415–449. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.2001.1103

Buldur, S. (2017). A longitudinal investigation of the preservice science teachers' beliefs about science teaching during a science teacher training programme. International Journal of Science Education, 39(1), 1–19.

Caleon, I. S., Tan, Y. S. M., & Cho, Y. H. (2018). Does teaching experience matter? The beliefs and practices of beginning and experienced physics teachers. Research in Science Education, 48(1), 117–149.

Chinn, C. A., & Rinehart, R. W. (2016). Epistemic cognition and philosophy: Developing a new framework for epistemic cognition. In W. A. Sandoval, J. A. Greene, & I. Braten (Eds.), Handbook of epistemic cognition (pp. 460–478). Routledge.

Constantine, A., Rózowa, P., Szostkowski, A., Ellis, J., & Roehrig, G. (2017). The "T" in STEM: How elementary science teachers' beliefs of technology integration translate to practice during a co-developed STEM unit. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 36(4), 339–349.

Correia, C. F., & Harrison, C. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about inquiry-based learning and its impact on formative assessment practice. Research in Science & Technological Education, 38(3), 355–376.

Czerniak, C., & Lumpe, A. (1996). Relationship between teacher beliefs and science education reform. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 7, 247–266.

DeCoito, I., & Myszkal, P. (2018). Connecting science instruction and teachers' self-efficacy and beliefs in STEM education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29(6), 485–503.

Deehan, J., McKinnon, D. H., & Danaia, L. (2019). A long-term investigation of the science teaching efficacy beliefs of multiple cohorts of preservice elementary teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(8), 923–945.

Ding, L., & Zhang, P. (2016). Making of epistemologically sophisticated physics teachers: A cross-sequential study of epistemological progression from preservice to in-service teachers. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020137.

Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2018). The power of collective efficacy. Educational Leadership, 75(6), 40–44.

Duschl, R. (2008). Science education in three-part harmony: Balancing conceptual, epistemic, and social learning goals. Review of Research in Education, 32(1), 268–291.

Eagly, A., & Chaiken, S. (1993). The psychology of attitudes. Wadsworth Group/Thomson Learning.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61, 101859.

Elby, A. (2009). Defining personal epistemology: A response to Hofer & Pintrich (1997) and Sandoval (2005). Journal of the Learning Sciences, 18, 138–149.

Enderle, P. , Dentzau, M. , Roseler, K. , Southerland, S. , Granger, E. , Hughes, R. , Golden, B. , & Saka, Y. (2014). Examining the influence of RETs on science teacher beliefs and practice. Science Education, 98(6), 1077-1108.

Feldman, A. (2002). Multiple perspectives for the study of teaching: Knowledge, reason, understanding, and being. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39(10), 1032–1055.

Fenstermacher, G. D., & Richardson, V. (2005). On making determinations of quality in teaching. Teachers College Record, 107(1), 186–213.

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). John Wiley & Sons.

Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2012). Spring cleaning for the "messy" construct of teachers' beliefs: What are they? Which have been examined? What can they tell us? In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, & T. Urdan (Eds.), APA educational psychology handbook, Vol 2: Individual differences and cultural and contextual factors (pp. 471–499). American Psychological Association.

Ford, M. J. (2015). Educational implications of choosing "practice" to describe science in the next generation science standards. Science Education, 99(6), 1041–1048.

Furtak, E. M., & Penuel, W. R. (2019). Coming to terms: Addressing the persistence of "hands-on" and other reform terminology in the era of science as practice. Science Education, 103(1), 167–186.

- Gill, M. G., & Hardin, C. (2014). A "hot" mess. In International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs (pp. 230–245). Routledge. Guilfoyle, L., McCormack, O., & Erduran, S. (2020). The "tipping point" for educational research: The role of pre-service science teachers' epistemic beliefs in evaluating the professional utility of educational research. Teaching and Teacher Education, 90, 103033. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103033
- Güneş, E., & Bahçivan, E. (2018). A mixed research-based model for pre-service science teachers' digital literacy: Responses to "which beliefs" and "how and why they interact" questions. Computers & Education, 118, 96–106.
- Goldin, G., Hannula, M. S., Heyd-Metzuyanim, E., Janson, A., Kaasila, R., Lutovac, S., Di Martino, P., Morselli, F., Middleton, J., Pantziara, M., & Zhang, Q. (2016). Attitudes, beliefs, motivation and identity in mathematics education. Springer Open.
- Herranen, J., Kousa, P., Fooladi, E., & Aksela, M. (2019). Inquiry as a context-based practice: A case study of pre-service teachers' beliefs and implementation of inquiry in context-based science teaching. International Journal of Science Education, 41(14), 1977–1998.
- Higde, E., Oztekin, C., & Sahin, E. (2017). Turkish pre-service science teachers' awareness, beliefs, values, and behaviours pertinent to climate change. International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education, 26(3), 253–263.
- Hofer, B. K., & Bendixen, L. D. (2012). Personal epistemology: Theory, research, and future directions. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. Urdan, C. B. McCormick, G. M. Sinatra, & J. Sweller (Eds.), APA handbooks in psychology®: APA educational psychology handbook, Vol. 1. Theories, constructs, and critical issues (pp. 227–256). American Psychological Association.
- Hoffman, B. H., & Seidel, K. (2015). Measuring teachers' beliefs. In International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs (pp. 106–127). Routledge.
- Hundal, S., Levin, D. M., & Keselman, A. (2014). Lessons of researcher-teacher co-design of an environmental health afterschool club curriculum. International Journal of Science Education, 36(9), 1510–1530.
- Hutner, T. L., & Markman, A. B. (2016). Proposing an operational definition of science teacher beliefs. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(6), 675–691.
- Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Crujeiras, B. (2017). Epistemic practices and scientific practices in science education. In Science education (pp. 69–80). Sense Publishers.
- Jones, M. G., & Carter, G. (2006). Science teacher attitudes and beliefs. In S. Abel & N. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science teaching. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Jones, M. G., & Legon, M. (2014). Teacher attitudes and beliefs: Reforming practice. In N. Lederman & S. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science Ttaching (pp. 830–847). Routledge.
- Jugert, P., Greenaway, K. H., Barth, M., Büchner, R., Eisentraut, S., & Fritsche, I. (2016). Collective efficacy increases proenvironmental intentions through increasing self-efficacy. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 48, 12–23.
- Kaya, G. I. (2017). The relations between scientific epistemological beliefs and goal orientations of pre-service teachers. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 5(10), 33-42.
- Kazempour, M., & Sadler, T. D. (2015). Pre-service teachers' science beliefs, attitudes, and self-efficacy: A multi-case study. Teaching Education, 26(3), 247–271.
- Kelly, G. (2008). Inquiry, activity and epistemic practice. In R. Duschl & R. Grandy (Eds.), Teaching scientific inquiry: Recommendations for research and implementation (pp. 99–117, 288–291). Sense Publishers.
- Kirmizigul, A. S., & Bektas, O. (2019). Investigation of pre-service science teachers' epistemological beliefs. Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 14(1), 146.
- Kitchener, K. S. (1983). Cognition, metacognition, and epistemic cognition. Human Development, 26, 222–232. https://doi.org/10.1159/000272885
- Kite, V., Park, S., McCance, K., & Seung, E. (2020). Secondary science teachers' understandings of the epistemic nature of science practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 1–22.
- Kleickmann, T., Tröbst, S., Jonen, A., Vehmeyer, J., & Möller, K. (2016). The effects of expert scaffolding in elementary science professional development on teachers' beliefs and motivations, instructional practices, and student achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 108(1), 21.
- Knigh-Bardsley, A., & McNeill, K. L. (2016). Teachers' pedagogical design capacity for scientific argumentation. Science Education, 100(4), 645–672.
- Korur, F., Vargas, R. V., & Serrano, N. T. (2016). Attitude toward science teaching of Spanish and Turkish in-service elementary teachers: Multi-group confirmatory factor analysis. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 12(2), 303–320
- Kuhn, D. (1991). The skills of argument, Cambridge University Press.
- Lebak, K. (2015). Unpacking the complex relationship between beliefs, practice, and change related to inquiry-based instruction of one science teacher. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26(8), 695–713.
- Lee, H., Longhurst, M., & Campbell, T. (2017). Teacher learning in technology professional development and its impact on student achievement in science. International Journal of Science Education, 39(10), 1282–1303.
- Levin, B. B. (2015). The development of teachers' beliefs. In International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs (pp. 48–65). Routledge.
- Liljedahl, P. (2010). Noticing rapid and profound mathematics teacher change. Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 13(5), 411–423.
- Liljedahl, P. (2011). The theory of conceptual change as a theory for changing conceptions. Nordic Studies in Mathematics Education, 16(1-2), 101-124.
- Lin, S. C., & Chao, S. L. (2014). Relationships among senior high vocational school teacher teaching beliefs, self-efficacy, gender, and school type. Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(1), 1–12.
- Lin, Y.-R., Hung, C.-Y., & Hung, J.-F. (2017). Exploring teachers' meta-strategic knowledge of science argumentation teaching with the repertory grid technique. International Journal of Science Education, 39(2), 105–134.
- Loper, S., McNeill, K. L., González-Howard, M., Marco-Bujosa, L. M., & O'Dwyer, L. M. (2019). The impact of multimedia educative curriculum materials (MECMs) on teachers' beliefs about scientific argumentation. Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 28(2), 173–190.
- Luft, J., & Roehrig, G. (2007). Capturing science teachers' epistemological beliefs: The development of a teacher beliefs interview. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 11(2), 58–63.

- Mansour, N. (2009). Science teachers' beliefs and practices: Issues, implications and research agenda. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 4, 25–48.
- Martin, A., Park, S., & Hand, B. (2019). What happens when a teacher's science belief structure is in disequilibrium? Entangled nature of beliefs and practice. Research in Science Education, 49(3), 885–920.
- McGinnis, J. R., Hestness, E., Mills, K., Ketelhut, D., Cabrera, L., & Jeong, H. (2020). Preservice science teachers' beliefs about computational thinking following a curricular module within an elementary science methods course. Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 20(1), 85–107.
- McLeod, D. B. (1992). Research on affect in mathematics education: A reconceptualization. Handbook of Research on Mathematics Teaching and Learning, 1, 575–596.
- McNeill, K. L., Katsh-Singer, R., González-Howard, M., & Loper, S. (2016). Factors impacting teachers' argumentation instruction in their science classrooms. International Journal of Science Education, 38(12), 2026–2046.
- Menon, D., & Sadler, T. D. (2016). Preservice elementary teachers' science self-efficacy beliefs and science content knowledge. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(6), 649–673.
- Merk, S., Rosman, T., Rueß, J., Syring, M., & Schneider, J. (2017). Pre-service teachers' perceived value of general pedagogical knowledge for practice: Relations with epistemic beliefs and source beliefs. PLoS One, 12(9), 1e25.
- Mintzes, J. J., Marcum, B., Messerschmidt-Yates, C., & Mark, A. (2013). Enhancing self-efficacy in elementary science teaching with professional learning communities. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24(7), 1201–1218.
- National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academy Press.
- Nussbaum, E. M., Sinatra, G. M., & Poliquin, A. (2008). Role of epistemic beliefs and scientific argumentation in science learning. International Journal of Science Education, 30(15), 1977–1999.
- OECD . (2019). PISA 2018 assessment and analytical framework. In OECD, PISA 2018 science framework (pp. 97–117). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/f30da688-en
- Perez, T., Cromley, J. G., & Kaplan, A. (2014). The role of identity development, values, and costs in college STEM retention. Journal of Educational Psychology, 106, 315–329.
- Ramnarain, U., & Hlatswayo, M. (2018). Teacher beliefs and attitudes about inquiry-based learning in a rural school district in South Africa. South African Journal of Education, 38(1), 1–10.
- Rinehart, R. W., Kuhn, M., & Milford, T. M. (2020). The relationship between epistemic cognition and dialogic feedback in elementary and middle school science classrooms. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print), 1–18. https://10.1080/02635143.2020.1799779
- Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. Jossey-Bass.
- Sampson, V., & Blanchard, M. R. (2012). Science teachers and scientific argumentation: Trends in views and practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(9), 1122–1148.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Ringstaff, C. (2014). Inspiring instructional change in elementary school science: The relationship between enhanced self-efficacy and teacher practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(6), 729–751.
- Sawada, D., Piburn, M. D., 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(6), 245–253. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2002.tb17883.x
- Schommer, M. (1990). Effects of beliefs about the nature of knowledge on comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 498–504.
- Schraw, G., & Olafson, L. (2015). Assessing teachers' beliefs. International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs, 87-105.
- Sengul, O., Enderle, P. J., & Schwartz, R. S. (2020). Science teachers' use of argumentation instructional model: Linking PCK of argumentation, epistemological beliefs, and practice. International Journal of Science Education, 42(7), 1068–1086. https://doi.org.prox.lib.ncsu.edu/10.1080/09500693.2020.1748250
- Skott, J. (2015). The promises, problems, and prospects of research on teachers' beliefs. In H. Fives & M. G. Gill (Eds.), International handbook of research on teacher beliefs (pp. 13–30). Routledge.
- Stevenson, K. T., Peterson, M. N., & Bradshaw, A. (2016). How climate change beliefs among US teachers do and do not translate to students. PLoS One, 11(9), e0161462.
- Tarmo, A. (2016). Pre-service science teachers' epistemological beliefs and teaching reforms in Tanzania. Cogent Education, 3(1), 1178457. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1178457
- Taylor, D. L., & Booth, S. (2015). Secondary physical science teachers' conceptions of science teaching in a context of change. International Journal of Science Education, 37(8), 1299–1320. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1035356
- Thomas, J. A., Pedersen, J. E., & Finson, K. D. (2001). Validating the draw-a-science-teacher-test checklist (DASTT-C): Exploring mental models and teacher beliefs. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 12(3), 295–310.
- Tsai, C. C. (2003). Taiwanese science students' and teachers' perceptions of the laboratory learning environments: Exploring epistemological gaps. International Journal of Science Education, 25(7), 847–860.
- 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. (2013). Measuring primary teachers' attitudes toward teaching science: Development of the dimensions of attitude toward science (DAS) instrument. International Journal of Science Education, 35(4), 577–600.
- van Aalderen-Smeets, S. I., & Walma van der Molen, J. H. (2015). Improving primary teachers' attitudes toward science by attitude-focused professional development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52(5), 710–734.
- Velthuis, C., Fisser, P., & Pieters, J. (2014). Teacher training and pre-service primary teachers' self-efficacy for science teaching. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(4), 445–464.
- Voelkel Jr., R. H., & Chrispeels, J. H. (2017). Understanding the link between professional learning communities and teacher collective efficacy. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 28(4), 505–526.
- Wallace, C. S. (2014). Overview of the role of teacher beliefs in science education. In R. Evans , J. Luft , C. Czerniak , & C. Pea (Eds.), The role of science teachers' beliefs in international classrooms (pp. 17–31). Sense Publishers.

- Wallace, C. S., & Priestley, M. R. (2017). Secondary science teachers as curriculum makers: Mapping and designing Scotland's new curriculum for excellence. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54(3), 324–349.
- https://doi.org.prox.lib.ncsu.edu/10.1002/tea.21346
- Wang, Y. L., Tsai, C. C., & Wei, S. H. (2015). The sources of science teaching self-efficacy among elementary school teachers: A mediational model approach. International Journal of Science Education, 37(14), 2264–2283.
- Watt, H. M. G., Richardson, P. W. (2015). A motivational analysis of teachers' beliefs. In H. Fives, and M. Gill (Eds.), International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs (1st ed., pp. 191–211). Routledge.
- Wendell, K. B., Swenson, J. E. S., & Dalvi, T. S. (2019). Epistemological framing and novice elementary teachers' approaches to learning and teaching engineering design. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56(7), 956–982. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21541
- Wendt, J. L., & Rockinson-Szapkiw, A. (2018). A psychometric evaluation of the English version of the dimensions of attitudes toward science instrument with a US population of elementary educators. Teaching and Teacher Education, 70, 24–33.
- Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. Review of Educational Research, 72, 131–175. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072002131
- Wong, S. S., & Luft, J. A. (2015). Secondary science teachers' beliefs and persistence: A longitudinal mixed-methods study. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26(7), 619–645.
- Yadav, A., & Koehler, M. J. (2007). The role of epistemological beliefs in preservice teachers' interpretation of video cases of early-grade literacy instruction. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 15(3), 335–361.
- Yakar, Z., & Turgut, D. (2017). Effectiveness of lesson study approach on preservice science teachers' beliefs. International Education Studies, 10(6), 36–43.
- Zangori, L., & Forbes, C. T. (2014). Scientific practices in elementary classrooms: Third-grade students' scientific explanations for seed structure and function. Science Education, 98(4), 614–639.

Research on Science Teacher Knowledge and Its Development

- Abell, S. K. (2007). Research on science teacher knowledge. In S. Abell & N. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 1105–1149). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Abell, S. K., Park Rogers, M. A., Hanuscin, D. L., Lee, M. H., & Gagnon, M. J. (2009). Preparing the next generation of science teacher educators: A model for developing PCK for teaching science teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20, 77–93.
- Alonzo, A. C., Berry, A., & Nilsson, P. (2019). Unpacking the complexity of science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 271–288). Australia Springer.
- Alonzo, A. C., & Kim, J. (2016). Declarative and dynamic pedagogical content knowledge as elicited through two video-based interview methods. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(8), 1259–1286.
- Andrews, T. C., Auerbach, A. J. J., & Grant, E. F. (2019). Exploring the relationship between teacher knowledge and active-learning implementation in large college biology courses. CBE Life Sciences Education, 18(4), ar48.
- Arzi, H., & White, R. (2007). Change in teachers' knowledge of subject matter: A 17-year longitudinal study. Science Education 92 (2), 221–251.
- Aydin, S., Demirdöğen, B., Akin, F. N., Uzuntiryaki-Kondakci, E., & Tarkin, A. (2015). The nature and development of interaction among components of pedagogical content knowledge in practicum. Teaching and Teacher Education, 46, 37–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.10.008
- Barendsen, E., & Henze, I. (2019). Relating teacher PCK and teacher practice using classroom observation. Research in Science Education, 49, 1141–1175. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–017–9637-z
- Batiza, A. F., Gruhl, M., Zhang, B., Harrington, T., Roberts, M., LaFlamme, D., Haasch, M. A., Knopp, J., Vogt, G., Goodsell, D., Hagedorn, E., Marcey, D., Hoelzer, M., & Nelson, D. (2013). The effects of the SUN project on teacher knowledge and self-efficacy regarding biological energy transfer are significant and long-lasting: Results of a randomized controlled trial. CBE-Life Science Education, 12, 287–305. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.12-09-0155
- Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., Klusmann, U., Krauss, S., Neubrand, M., & Tsai, Y.-M. (2010). Teachers' mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. American Educational Research Journal, 47(1), 133–180.
- Bayram-Jacobs, D., Henze, I., Evagorou, M., Shwartz, Y., Aschim, E. L., Alcaraz-Dominguez, S., Barajas, M., & Dagan, E. (2019). Science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge development during enactment of socioscientific curriculum materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 1207–1233. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21550
- Berry, A., Friedrichsen, P., & Loughran, J. (Eds.). (2015). Re-examining pedagogical content knowledge in science education. Routledge.
- Bradbury, L. U. , Wilson, R. E. , & Brookshire, L. E. (2018). Developing elementary science PCK for teacher education: Lessons learned from a second grade partnership. Research in Science Education, 48, 1387–1408. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–016–9607-x
- Brown, S., & McIntyre, D. (1993). Making sense of teaching. Open University Press.
- Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 709–725). Macmillan.
- Carlson, J., Daehler, K. R., Alonzo, A. C., Barendsen, E., Berry, A., Borowski, A., Carpendale, J., Chan, K. K. H., Cooper, R., Friedrichsen, P., Gess-Newsome, J., Henze-Rietveld, I., Hume, A., Kirschner, S., Liepertz, S., Loughran, J., Mavhunga, E., Neumann, K., Nilsson, P., ... Wilson, C. D. (2019). Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 77–94). Australia Springer.

- Carlson, J., Stokes, L., Helms, J., Gess-Newsome, J., & Gardner, A. (2015). The PCK Summit: A process and structure for challenging current ideas, provoking future work, and considering new directions. In A. Berry, P. Friedrichsen, & J. Loughran (Eds.), Re-examining pedagogical content knowledge in science education (pp. 14–27). Routledge.
- Carpendale, J., & Hume, A. (2019). Investigating practising science teachers' pPCK and ePCK development as a result of collaborative CoRe design. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 223–250). Australia Springer.
- Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 291–310). Macmillan.
- Chan, K. K. H., & Hume, A. (2019). Towards a consensus model: Literature review of how science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge is investigated in empirical studies. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 3–76). Australia Springer.
- Chan, K. K. H., Rollnick, M., & Gess-Newsome, J. (2019). A grand rubric for measuring science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 251–269). Australia Springer.
- Chan, K. K. H., Xu, L., Cooper, R., Berry, A., & Van Driel, J. H. (2021). Teacher noticing in science education: Do you see what I see? Studies in Science Education, 57(1), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2020.1755803
- Chan, K. K. H., & Yung, B. H. W. (2015). On-site pedagogical content knowledge development. International Journal of Science Education, 37, 1246–1278. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1033777
- Chan, K. K. H., & Yung, B. H. W. (2018). Developing pedagogical content knowledge for teaching a new topic: More than teaching experience and subject matter knowledge. Research in Science Education, 48, 233–265. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9567-1 Chen, B., & Wei, B. (2015). Examining chemistry teachers' use of curriculum materials: In view of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 16, 260–272. https://doi.org/10.1039/c4rp00237g
- Chen, C., Sonnert, G., Sadler, P. M., & Sunbury, S. (2020). The impact of high school life science teachers' subject matter knowledge and knowledge of student misconceptions on students' learning. CBE-Life Sciences Education, 19(ar9), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19–08–0164
- Cite, S., Lee, E., Menon, D., & Hanuscin, D. L. (2017). Learning from Rookie mistakes: Critical incidents in developing pedagogical content knowledge for teaching science to teachers. Studying Teacher Education, 13, 275–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2017.1366306
- Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. Teaching and Teacher Education, 18, 947–967.
- Coetzee, C., Rollnick, M., & Gaigher, E. (2020). Teaching electromagnetism for the first time: A case study of pre-service science teachers' enacted pedagogical content knowledge. Research in Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09948-4 Cooper, R. (2013). Using critical experiences to build understanding of science teacher educators' pedagogical knowledge. Teacher Education and Practice, 26(4), 637–650.
- Cooper, R., & Van Driel, J. H. (2019). Developing research on PCK as a community. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 301–313). Australia Springer. Davis, E. A., Kloser, M., Wells, A., Windschitl, M., Carlson, J., & Marino, J. C. (2017). Teaching the practice of leading sensemaking discussions in science: Science teacher educators using rehearsals. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28, 275–293.
- Demirdöğen, B., Aydin, S., & Tarkin, A. (2015). Looking at the mirror: A self-study of science teacher educators' PCK for teaching teachers. Eurasia, Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 11, 189–205. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2015.1315a

https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1302729

- Demirdöğen, B., Hanuscin, D. L., Uzuntiryaki-Kondakci, E., & Koseoglu, F. (2016). Development and nature of preservice chemistry teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for nature of science. Research in Science Education, 46, 575–612. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–015–9472-z
- Demirdöğen, B., & Uzuntiryaki-Kondakci, E. (2016). Closing the gap between beliefs and practice: Change of pre-service chemistry teachers' orientations during a PCK-based NOS course. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 17, 818–841. https://doi.org/10.1039/c6rp00062b
- Diamond, B. S., Maerten-Rivera, J., Rohrer, R. E., & Lee, O. (2014). Effectiveness of a curricular and professional development intervention at improving elementary teachers' science content knowledge and student achievement outcomes: Year 1 results. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(5), 635–658.
- Donna, J. D., & Hick, S. R. (2017). Developing elementary preservice teacher subject matter knowledge through the use of educative science curriculum materials. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28, 92–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560x.2017.1279510 Faikhamta, C., & Clarke, A. (2013). A self-study of a Thai teacher educator developing a better understanding of PCK for teaching about teaching science. Research in Science Education, 43, 955–979. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-012-9300-7
- 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). 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). 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). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7_30
- Förtsch, C., Werner, S., von Kotzebue, L., & Neuhaus, B. J. (2016). Effects of biology teachers' professional knowledge and cognitive activation on students' achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 38, 2642–2666. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1257170
- Fraser, S. P. (2016). Pedagogical content knowledge (PCK): Exploring its usefulness for science lecturers in higher education. Research in Science Education, 46(1), 141–161.
- Friedrichsen, P., Van Driel, J., & Abell, S. (2011). Taking a closer look at science teaching orientations. Science Education, 95, 358–376.
- Gess-Newsome, J. (2015). A model of teacher professional knowledge and skill including PCK: Results of the thinking from the PCK Summit. In A. Berry, P. Friedrichsen, & J. Loughran (Eds.), Re-examining pedagogical content knowledge in science education (pp.

- Gess-Newsome, J., Cardenas, S., Austin, B. A., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Stuhlsatz, M. A. M., Taylor, J. A., & Wilson, C. D. (2011). 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, April 6. Gess-Newsome, J., Taylor, J., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Wilson, C. D., & Stuhlsatz, M. A. M. (2019). Teacher pedagogical content knowledge, practice, and student achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 41, 944–963. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1265158
- Glaze, A. , & Goldston, J. (2019). Acceptance, understanding & experience: Exploring obstacles to evolution education among advanced placement teachers. American Biology Teacher, 81, 71-76. https://doi.org/10.1525/abt.2019.81.2.71
- $Groß schedl, J.\ , Harms, U.\ , Kleickmann\ T.\ , \&\ Glowinski, I.\ (2015).\ Preservice\ biology\ teachers'\ professional\ knowledge:\ Structure\ and\ learning\ opportunities.\ Journal\ of\ Science\ Teacher\ Education,\ 26,\ 291-318.\ https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-015-9423-6$
- Großschedl, J. , Welter, V. , & Harms, U. (2019). A new instrument for measuring pre-service biology teachers' pedagogical content knowledge: The PCK-IBI. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 402–439. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21482
- Gunckel, K. L., Covitt, B. A., & Salinas, I. (2018). Learning progressions as tools for supporting teacher content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge about water in environmental systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 1339–1362. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21454
- Hanuscin, D. L. (2013). Critical incidents in the development of pedagogical content knowledge for teaching the nature of science: A prospective elementary teacher's journey. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 933–956. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-013-9341-4
- Hanuscin, D. L., de Araujo, Z., Cisterna, D., Lipsitz, K., & van Garderen, D. (2020). The re-novicing of elementary teachers in science? Grade level reassignment and teacher PCK. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31, 780–801. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2020.1778845
- Hanuscin, D. L., Donova, D., Acevedo-Gutiérrez, A., Borda, E., DeBari, S., Melton, J., Le, T., Morrison, W., & Ronca, R. (2021). Supporting the professional development of science teacher educators through shadowing. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-021-10154-5
- Hume, A. (2016). Finding the means to initiate and sustain a teacher educator's pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) development in science education. In G. A. Buck & V. L. Akerson (Eds.), Enhancing professional knowledge of pre-service science teacher education by self-study research turning a critical eye on our practice (pp. 317–339). Springer Publishers.
- Irmak, M., & Yilmaz-Tuzun, O. (2019). Investigating pre-service science teachers' perceived technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) regarding genetics. Research in Science & Technological Education, 37, 127–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2018.1466778
- Jin, H., Shin, H., Johnson, M. E., Kim, J., & Anderson, C. W. (2015). Developing learning progression-based teacher knowledge measures. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 52, 1269–1295. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21243
- Jüttner, M., Boone, W., Park, S., & Neuhaus, B. J. (2013). Development and use of a test instrument to measure biology teachers' content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 25, 45–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092–013–9157-y
- 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.
- Kaya, Z., Kaya, O. N., Aydemir, S., & Ebenezer, J. (2021). Knowledge of student learning difficulties as a plausible conceptual change pathway between content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Research in Science Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09971-5
- Kelchtermans, G., Smith, K., & Vanderlinde, R. (2018). Towards an "international forum for teacher educator development": An agenda for research and action. European Journal of Teacher Education, 41, 120–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1372743
- Keller, M. M., Neumann, K., & Fischer, H. E. (2017). The impact of physics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and motivation on students' achievement and interest. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54, 586–614. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21378 Kind, V. (2009). 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. (2014). A degree is not enough: A quantitative study of aspects of pre-service science teachers' chemistry content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 36, 1313–1345. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2013.860497 Kind, V. (2019). Development of evidence-based, student-learning-oriented rubrics for pre-service science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 41, 911–943. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1311049 Kind, V., & Chan, K. K. H. (2019). Resolving the amalgam: Connecting pedagogical content knowledge, content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 41, 964–978. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1584931 Kirschner, S., Borowksi, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2011). Measuring physics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Paper presented at the Biannual Conference of the European Science Education Research Association, September 8.
- Kirschner, S., Borowksi, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2016). Developing and evaluating a paper-and-pencil test to assess components of physics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 38, 1343–1372. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1190479
- Leuchter, M., Saalbach, H., Studhalter, U., & Tettenborn, A. (2020). Teaching for conceptual change in preschool science: Relations among teachers' professional beliefs, knowledge, and instructional practice. International Journal of Science Education, 42(12), 1941–1967.
- Liepertz, S., & Borowski, A. (2019). Testing the consensus model: Relationships among physics teachers' professional knowledge, interconnectedness of content structure and student achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 41, 890–910. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1478165
- Lin, J. W. (2017). A comparison of experienced and preservice elementary school teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge about electric circuits. Eurasia, Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13, 835–856. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.00646a
- 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.

- Loughran, J. J., Mulhall, P., & Berry, A. (2006). Understanding and developing science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Sense Publishers.
- Lucero, M. M., Petrosino, A. J., & Delgado, C. (2017). Exploring the relationship between secondary science teachers' subject matter knowledge and knowledge of student conceptions while teaching evolution by natural selection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54, 219–246. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21344
- 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). Kluwer Academic.
- Mahler, D., Großschedl, J., & Harms, U. (2017). Using doubly latent multilevel analysis to elucidate relationships between science teachers' professional knowledge and students' performance. International Journal of Science Education, 39, 213–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1276641
- Mesci, G., Schwartz, R. S., & Pleasants, B. A. S. (2020). Enabling factors of preservice science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for nature of science and nature of scientific inquiry. Science & Education, 29, 263–297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-019-00090-w
- Miheso, J. M., & Mavhunga, E. (2020). The retention of topic specific PCK: A longitudinal study with beginning chemistry teachers. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 21, 789–805. https://doi.org/10.1039/d0rp00008f
- Morine-Dershimer, G., & Kent, T. (1999). The complex nature and sources of teachers' pedagogical knowledge. In J. Gess-Newsome & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Examining pedagogical content knowledge (pp. 21–50). Kluwer Academic.
- Neumann, K., Kind, V., & Harms, U. (2019). Probing the amalgam: The relationship between science teachers' content, pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 41, 847–861. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1497217
- Nilsson, P., & Elm, A. (2017). Capturing and developing early childhood teachers' science pedagogical content knowledge through CoRes. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(5), 406–424.
- Nilsson, P., & Vikström, A. (2015). Making PCK explicit-capturing science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in the science classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 37, 2836–2857. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2015.1106614 Nixon, R. S., Campbell, B. K., & Luft, J. A. (2016). Effects of subject-area degree and classroom experience on new chemistry teachers' subject matter knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 38, 1636–1654. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1204482
- Nixon, R. S., Hill, K. M., & Luft, J. A. (2017). Secondary science teachers' subject matter knowledge development across the first 5 years. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28, 574–589. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560x.2017.1388086
- Nixon, R. S., Smith, L. K., & Sudweeks, R. R. (2019). Elementary teachers' science subject matter knowledge across the teacher career cycle. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56, 707–731. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21524
- 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., & Oliver, J. S. (2008). 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., Suh, J., & Seo, K. (2018). Development and validation of measures of secondary science teachers' PCK for teaching photosynthesis. Research in Science Education, 48, 549–573. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165–016–9578-y
- Park Rogers, M., Berry, A., Krainer, K., & Even, R. (2021). Finding common ground: A synthesis of science and mathematics teacher educators experiences with professional growth. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 19, 167–180.
- Paulick, I., Großschedl, J., Harms, U., & Moller, J. (2016). Preservice teachers' professional knowledge and its relation to academic self-concept. Journal of Teacher Education, 67, 173–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116639263
- Pitjeng-Mosabala, P., & Rollnick, M. (2018). Exploring the development of novice unqualified graduate teachers' topic-specific PCK in teaching the particulate nature of matter in South Africa's classrooms. International Journal of Science Education, 40, 742–770. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1446569
- Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). (1989). The knowledge base for the beginning teacher. Pergamon Press.
- Reynolds, W. M., & Park, S. (2021). Examining the relationship between the educative teacher performance assessment and preservice teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 58(5), 721–758. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21676
- Rollnick, M. (2017). Developing and evaluating a paper-and-pencil test to assess components of physics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 38, 1343–1372. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1190479 Roth, K. J., Wilson, C. D., Taylor, J. A., Stuhlsatz, M. A., & Hvidsten, C. (2019). Comparing the effects of analysis-of-practice and content-based professional development on teacher and student outcomes in science. American Educational Research Journal, 56(4), 1217–1253.
- Sadler, P. M., Coyle, H., Miller, J. L., Cook-Smith, N., Dussault, M., & Gould, R. R. (2010). The astronomy and space science concept inventory: Development and validation of assessment instruments aligned with the K-12 national science standards. Astronomy Education Review, 8(010111), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.3847/AER2009024
- Sadler, P. M., Sonnert, G., Coyle, H. P., Cook-Smith, N., & Miller, J. L. (2013). The influence of teachers' knowledge on student learning in middle school physical science classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 50, 1020–1049. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213477680
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-012-9384-6
- Schultz, M., Lawrie, G. A., Bailey, C. H., & Dargaville, B. L. (2018). Characterisation of teacher professional knowledge and skill through content representations from tertiary chemistry educators. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 19(2), 508–519. Schultze, F., & Nilsson, P. (2018). Coteaching with senior students: A way to refine teachers' PCK for teaching chemical bonding in upper secondary school. International Journal of Science Education, 40, 688–706. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1436792 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.

Shulman, L. S. (2015). PCK: Its genesis and exodus. In A. Berry , P. Friedrichsen , & J. Loughran (Eds.), Re-examining pedagogical content knowledge in science education (pp. 3–13). Routledge.

Sorge, S., Kröger, J., Petersen, S., & Neumann, K. (2019). Structure and development of pre-service physics teachers' professional knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 41, 862–889. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1346326

Soysal, Y. (2018). An exploration of the interactions among the components of an experienced elementary science teacher's pedagogical content knowledge. Educational Studies, 44, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2017.1331839

Tepner, O., & Sumfleth, E. (2019). Postscript: Considerations from an external perspective. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 315–329). Australia Springer.

Tom, A. R., & Valli, L. (1990). Professional knowledge for teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 372–392). MacMillan.

Underwood, J. B., & Moore Mensah, F. (2018). An investigation of science teacher educators' perceptions of culturally relevant pedagogy. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29, 46–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1423457

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., Berry, A., & Meirink, J. A. (2014). Research on science teacher knowledge. In N. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (2nd ed., pp. 848–870). Taylor & Francis.

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(5), 441–461.

Wilson, C. D., Borowski, A., & Van Driel, J. H. (2019). Perspectives on the future of PCK research in science education and beyond. In A. Hume, R. Cooper, & A. Borowski (Eds.), Repositioning pedagogical content knowledge in teachers' knowledge for teaching science (pp. 289–300). Australia Springer.

Wongsopawiro, D., Zwart, R. C., & Van Driel, J. H. (2017). Identifying pathways of teachers' PCK development. Teachers and Teaching: Theory & Practice, 23, 2, 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1204286

Yang, Y., Liu, X. F., & Gardella, J. A. (2018). Effects of professional development on teacher pedagogical content knowledge, inquiry teaching practices, and Ssudent understanding of interdisciplinary science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 29, 263–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560x.2018.1439262

Yang, Y., Liu, X. F., & Gardella, J. A. (2020). Effects of a professional development program on science teacher knowledge and practice, and student understanding of interdisciplinary science concepts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 1028–1057. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21620

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. Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (2001). Designs for science literacy. 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). Macmillan.

Ausubel, D. (1968). Educational psychology: A cognitive view. 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. Monash University.

Brown, C. L., & Russell, T. (2012). A collaborative self-study of a physics teacher's first two years of teaching. In S. M. Bullock & T. Russell (Eds.), Self-study, science teaching, and science teacher education (pp. 9–29). 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.

Buaraphan, K. (2011). Metaphorical roots of beliefs about teaching and learning science and their modifications in the standard-based science teacher preparation programme. International Journal of Science Education, 33(11), 1571–1595.

Bullock, S. M. (2011). Inside teacher education: Challenging prior views of teaching and learning. Sense Publishers.

Bullock, S. M., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2012). Self-studies of science teacher education practices. Springer.

Carpendale, J. , & Cooper, R. (2021). Conceptual understanding procedure to elicit metacognition with pre service physics teachers. Physics Education, 56(2), 025008. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6552/abc8fd

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). 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. Author. https://science.cmec.ca/framework/index.htm

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. Curriculum Corporation.

Curriculum Corporation. (1994b). A statement on science for Australian schools. Curriculum Corporation.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. 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). Falmer Press.

Duhigg, C. (2012). The power of habit: Why we do what we do in life and business. 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). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Duschl, R. A. (1990). Restructuring science education: The importance of theories and their development. 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). 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.

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). Falmer Press.

Fitzgerald, A., Pressick-Kilborn, K., & Mills, R. (2021). Primary teacher educators' practices in and perspectives on inquiry-based science education: Insights into the Australian landscape. Education 3–13, International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education, 49 (3), 344–356. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2020.1854962

Franklin, U. (1994, November). Making connections: Science and the future of citizenship. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Science Teachers Association of Ontario.

Grimmett, P. P., & MacKinnon, A. M. (1992). Craft knowledge and the education of teachers. In G. Grant (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. 18, pp. 385–456). American Educational Research Association.

Guzetti, B. J., Snyder, T. E., Glass, G. V., & Gamas, W. S. (1993). Meta-analysis of instructional interventions from reading education and science education to promote conceptual change in science. Reading Research Quarterly, 28(2), 116–161.

Hagger, H., & McIntyre, D. (2006). Learning teaching from teachers: Realising the potential of school-based teacher education. Open University Press.

Handelsman, J., Ebert-May, D., Beichner, R., Bruns, P., Chang, A., DeHaan, R., Gentile, J., Lauffer, S., Stewart, J., Tilghman, S. M., & Wood, W. B. (2004). Scientific teaching. Science, 304, 521–522.

Harrison, D. E. (2014). The evolution of a pedagogy: A preservice teacher's learning experience. Unpublished Manuscript, Queen's University.

Hattie, J. (2008). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.

Hattie, J. (2012). Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning. Routledge.

Hodson, D. (1998). Teaching and learning science: Towards a personalized approach. 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). Nova Science Publishers.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. Educational Psychologist, 27(1), 65-90.

Kelly, G. (1995). The psychology of personal constructs. Norton.

Kitchen, J., Berry, A., Bullock, S. M., Crowe, A. R., Taylor, M., Guðjónsdóttir, H., & Thomas, L. (2020). Second international handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. Springer.

Knight, R. D. (2004). Five easy lessons: Strategies for successful physics teaching. 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 University Press.

Labaree, D. F. (2004). The trouble with ed schools. Yale University Press.

Lederman, N. G. (1998). The state of science education: Subject matter without context. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 3(2), 1–12.

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 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). 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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Linn, M. C., & Eylon, B.-S. (2011). Science learning and instruction: Taking advantage of technology to promote knowledge

integration. 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). Teachers College Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher; A sociological study. University of Chicago Press.

Loughran, J. (2006). Developing a pedagogy of teacher education. Routledge.

Loughran, J. (2008). Toward a better understanding of teaching and learning about teaching. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (3rd ed., pp. 1177–1182). Routledge.

Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V. K., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2004). International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. 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). Australian Council for Educational Research.

McDevitt, T. M., & Ormrod, J. E. (2002). Child development and education. Merrill Prentice Hall.

McGoey, J., & Ross, J. (1999). Research, practice, and teacher internship. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36(2), 117–120.

McIntyre, D. (1988). Designing a teacher education curriculum from research and theory on teacher knowledge. In J. Claderhead (Ed), Teachers' professional learning (pp. 97–114). Falmer.

McIntyre, D., & Hagger, H. (Eds.). (1996). Mentors in schools: Developing the profession of teaching. Routledge.

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). Academic Press.

Mitchell, I., Mitchell, J., McKinnon, R., & Scheele, S. (2004). PEEL in practice: 1100 ideas for quality teaching. 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.

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). American Educational Research Association.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. National Academy Press.

National Research Council. (2006). Learning to think spatially. National Academy 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). 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). 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). 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 University Press.

Ontario Ministry of Education . (2008). The Ontario curriculum grades 11 and 12: Science. Queen's Printer.

Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62, 307–332.

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.

Redish, E. F. (2021). Using math in physics: Overview. The Physics Teacher, 318-322. https://doi.org/10.1119/5.0021129

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. P. Sikula , T. J. Buttery , & E. Guyton (Eds.),

Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed., pp. 102-119). Association of Teacher Educators.

Russell, T., & Martin, A. K. (2017). Teacher education needs an epistemology of practice. In J. Mena (Eds.), Search and research: Teacher education for contemporary contexts (pp. 111–118). Ediciones Universidad Salamanca.

Russell, T., Martin, A. K., & Loughran, J. (2020). Introducing new practices in a teacher education classroom: Lessons learned, insights gained. In C. Edge, A. Cameron-Standerford, & B. Bergh (Eds.), Textiles and tapestries. EdTech Books. https://edtechbooks.org/textiles_tapestries_self_study/chapter_115

Sarason, S. B. (1996). Revisiting "The culture of the school and the problem of change." Teachers College Press.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. Change, 27, 27-34.

Scott, P. H., 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). 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, part one (pp. 67–80). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum . (1996). Science education in Scottish schools: Looking to the future. 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). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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). Macmillan.

Westaway, F. W. (1929). Science teaching: What it was - what it is - what it might be. Blackie & Son Limited.

White, R. T. (2001). The revolution in research on science teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (4th ed., pp. 457–471). American Educational Research Association.

White, R. T., & Gunstone, R. F. (2008). The conceptual change approach and the teaching of science. In S. Bosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 619–628). 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.

Willingham, D. T. (2009). Why don't students like school? Jossey-Bass.

Willingham, D. T. (2016, March). Knowledge and practice: The real keys to critical thinking. Issue Briefs, 1, 1–8.

https://knowledgematterscampaign.org/dig-deeper/#issuebriefs

Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. Review of Educational Research, 72(2), 131–175.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23-49.

Zembal-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

- Al-Balushi, S. M., & Al-Abdali, N. S. (2015). Using a Moodle-based professional development program to train science teachers to teach for creativity and its effectiveness on their teaching practices. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 24(4), 461–475. Alonzo, A. C., & Kim, J. (2018). Affordances of video-based professional development for supporting physics teachers' judgments about evidence of student thinking. Teaching and Teacher Education, 76, 283–297.
- Altan, E. B., & Ercan, S. (2016). STEM education program for science teachers: Perceptions and competencies. Journal of Turkish Science Education, 13, 103–117.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment, and Reporting Authority . (2016). www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/media/3220/stem-connections-report.pdf
- Bancroft, S. F., & Nyirenda, E. M. (2020). Equity-focused K-12 science teacher professional development: A review of the literature 2001–2017. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(2), 151–207.
- Bianchini, J. A., Dwyer, H. A., Brenner, M. E., & Wearly, A. J. (2015). Facilitating science and mathematics teachers' talk about equity: What are the strengths and limitations of four strategies for professional learning? Science Education, 99(3), 577–610. Billiar, K., Hubelbank, J., Thomas, O., & Camesano, T. (2014). Teaching STEM by design. Advances in Engineering Education, 4(1), 1–21.
- Binkhorst, F., Handelzalts, A., Poortman, C. L., & Van Joolingen, W. R. (2015). Understanding teacher design teams: A mixed methods approach to developing a descriptive framework. Teaching and Teacher Education, 51, 213–224.
- Blanchard, M. R., LePrevost, C. E., Tolin, A. D., & Gutierrez, K. S. (2016). Investigating technology-enhanced teacher professional development in rural, high-poverty middle schools. Educational Researcher, 45(3), 207–220.
- Blanchard, M. R., Southerland, S. A., & Granger, D. E. (2008). No silver bullet for inquiry: Making sense of teacher change following an inquiry-based research experience for teachers. Science Education, 93(2), 322–360.
- Blank, R. K., de las Alas, N., & Smith, C. (2008). Does teacher professional development have effects on teaching and learning? Analysis of evaluation findings from programs for mathematics and science teachers in 14 states. Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Borko, H., Jacobs, J., & Koellner, K. (2010). Contemporary approaches to teacher professional development. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.), International encyclopedia of education (Vol. 7, pp. 548–556). Elsevier.
- Boschman, F., McKenny, S., & Voogt, J. (2014). Understanding decision making in teachers' curriculum design approaches. Educational Technology Research and Development, 62, 393–416.
- Brenneman, K., Lange, A., & Nayfeld, I. (2019). Integrating STEM into preschool education; designing a professional development model in diverse settings. Early Childhood Education Journal. 47, 15–28.
- Brown, J. C., & Crippen, K. J. (2016a). Designing for culturally responsive science education through professional development. International Journal of Science Education, 38(3), 470–492.
- Brown, J. C., & Crippen, K. J. (2016b). The growing awareness inventory: Building capacity for culturally responsive science and mathematics with a structured observation protocol. School Science and Mathematics, 113(6), 127–138.
- Bybee, R. W. (2010). Advancing STEM education: A 2020 vision. Technology and Engineering Teacher, 70(1), 30-35.
- Campbell, T., Longhurst, M. L., Wang, S.-K., Hsu, H.-Y., & Coster, D. C. (2015). Technologies and reformed-based science instruction: The examination of a professional development model focused on supporting science teaching and learning with technologies. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 24(5), 562–579.
- 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.
- Clarke, D. J., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. Teaching and Teacher Education, 18(8), 947–967.
- Cofre, H., Cuevas, E., & Becerra, B. (2017). The relationship between biology teachers' understanding of the nature of science and the understanding and acceptance of the theory of evolution. International Journal of Science Education, 39(16), 2243–2260.
- Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. (2000). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California. The Teachers College Record, 102, 294–343.
- Crotty, E. A., Guzey, S., Roehrig, G. H., Glancy, A. W., Ring-Whalen, E. A., & Moore, T. J. (2017). Approaches to integrating engineering in STEM units and student achievement gains. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research (J-PEER), 7(2), 1–14.
- Dare, E. A., Ellis, J. A., & Roehrig, G. H. (2018). Understanding science teachers' implementations of integrated STEM curricular units through a phenomenological multiple case study. International Journal of STEM Education, 5(4). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0101-z
- Dare, E. A., Hiwatig, B., Keratithamkul, K., Ellis, J. A., Roehrig, G. H., Ring-Whalen, E. A., Rouleau, M. D., Faruqi, F., Rice, C., Titu, P., Li, F., Wieselmann, J. R., & Crotty, E. A. (2021). Improving STEM education: The design and development of a K-12 STEM observation protocol (STEM-OP) (RTP). ASEE 2021 Annual Conference & Exposition. Virtual Conference.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. Dede, C., Ketelhut, D. J., Whitehouse, P., Breit, L., & McCloskey, E. M. (2009). A research agenda for online teacher professional development. Journal of Teacher Education, 60, 8–19.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. Educational Researcher, 38, 181–199.
- Diamond, B. S., Maerten-Rivera, J., Rohrer, R. E., & Lee, O. (2014). Effectiveness of a curricular and professional development intervention at improving elementary teachers' science content knowledge and student achievement outcomes: Year 1 results. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 51(5), 635–658.
- Dixon, P., & Wilke, R. (2007). The influence of a teacher research experience on elementary teachers' thinking and instruction. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 19(1), 25–43.

- Doppelt, Y., Schunn, C. D., Silk, E. M., Mehalik, M. M., Reynolds, B., & Ward, E. (2009). Evaluating the impact of facilitated learning community approach to professional development on teacher practice and student achievement. Research in Science and Technological Education, 27(3), 339–354.
- Dubinsky, J. M., Guzey, S. S., Schwartz, M. S., Roehrig, G. H., MacNabb, C., Schmied, A., Hinesley, V., Hoelscher, M., Michlin, M., Schmitt, L., Ellingson, C., Chang, Z., & Cooper, J. C. (2019). Contributions of neuroscience knowledge to teachers and their practice. The Neuroscientist, 5(5), 394–407.
- Ekanayake, S. Y., & Wishart, J. (2015). Integrating mobile phones into teaching and learning: A case study of teacher training through professional development workshops. British Journal of Educational Technology, 46(1), 173–189.
- Ellis, J., McFadden, J., Anwar, T., & Roehrig, G. H. (2015). Investigating the social interactions of beginning teachers using a video annotation tool. Contemporary Issues in Technology & Teacher Education, 15(3). www.citejournal.org/vol15/iss3/general/article1.cfm Enderle, P., Dentzau, M., Roseler, K., Southerland, S., Granger, E., Hughes, R., Golden, B., & Saka, Y. (2014). Examining the influence of RETs on science teacher beliefs and practice. Science Education, 98(6), 1077–1108.
- European Commission . (2015). Science education for responsible citizenship. European Union.
- Finkelstein, C., Jaber, L. Z., & Dini, V. (2019). "Do I feel threatened? No ... I'm learning!": Affective and relational dynamics in science professional development. Science Education, 103(2), 338–361.
- Fishman, B. J., Konstantopoulos, S., Kubitskey, B. W., Vath, R., Park, G., Johnson, H., & Edelson, D. C. (2013). Comparing the impact of online and face-to-face professional development in the context of curriculum implementation. Journal of Teacher Education, 64(5), 426–438.
- 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(6), 643–658.
- Freeman, B., Marginson, S., & Tytler, R. (Eds.). (2014). The age of STEM: Educational policy and practice across the world in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Routledge.
- Fullan, M. (2007). The new meaning of educational change (4th ed., 35). Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Furman, M., Luzuriaga, M., Taylor, I., Jarvis, D., Prost, E. D., & Podestá, M. E. (2019). The use of questions in early years science: a case study in Argentine preschools. International Journal of Early Years Education, 27(3), 271–286.
- Furtak, E. M., Kiemer, K., Circi, R. K., Swanson, R., de Leon, V., Morrison, D., & Heredia, S. C. (2016). Teachers' formative assessment abilities and their relationship to student learning: Findings from a four-year intervention study. Instructional Science, 44(3), 267–291.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915–945.
- Goodnough, K. (2018). Addressing contradictions in teachers' practice through professional learning: An activity theory perspective. International Journal of Science Education, 40(17), 2181–2204.
- Greene, B. A., Lubin, I. A., Slater, J. L., & Walden, S. E. (2013). Mapping changes in science teachers' content knowledge: Concept maps and authentic professional development. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 22(3), 287–299.
- Gropen, J., Kook, J. F., Hoisington, C., & Clark-Ciarelli, N. (2017). Foundations of science literacy: Efficacy of a preschool professional development program in science on classroom instruction, teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, and children's observations and predictions. Early Education and Development, 28(5), 607–631.
- Grove, C. M., Dixon, P. J., & Pop, M. M. (2009). Research experiences for teachers: Influences related to expectancy and value of changes to practice in the American classroom. Professional Development in Education, 35(2), 247–260.
- Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 15(5), 5–12.
- Guskey, T. R. (2003). What makes professional development effective? Phi Delta Kappan, 80, 748–750.
- Guzey, S., Tank, K. G., Wang, H., Roehrig, G. H., & Moore, T. J. (2014). A high-quality professional development for teachers of grades 3–6 for implementing engineering into classrooms. School Science and Mathematics, 114(3), 139–149.
- Hammond, T., Bodzin, A., Popejoy, K., Anastasio, D., Holland, B., & Sahagian, D. (2019). Shoulder to shoulder: Teacher professional development and curriculum design and development for geospatial technology integration with science and social studies teachers. Contemporary Issues in Technology & Teacher Education, 19(2), 279–301.
- Han, S., Bugrahan, Y., Capraro, M. M., & Capraro, R. M. (2015). In-service teachers' implementation and understanding of STEM project-based learning. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 11(1), 2015, 63–76.
- Hong, O. (2017). STEAM education in Korea: Current policies and future directions. Policy Trajectories and Initiatives in STEM Education, 8(2), 92–102.
- Huizinga, T., Handelzalts, A., Nieveen, N., & Voogt, J. M. (2014). Teacher involvement in curriculum design: Need for support to enhance teachers' design expertise. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 46(1), 33–57.
- Johnson, C. C., Bolshakova, V. L. J., & Waldron, T. (2016). When good intentions and reality meet: Large-scale reform of science teaching in urban schools with predominantly Latino ELL students. Urban Education, 51(5), 476–513.
- Johnson, C. C., & Fargo, J. D. (2014). A study of the impact of transformative professional development on Hispanic student performance on state mandated assessments of science in elementary school. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(7), 845–859.
- Kelly, M. P., & Staver, J. R. (2005). A case study of one school system's adoption and implementation of an elementary science program. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42(1), 25–52.
- Kennedy, M. (1998). Form and substance of inservice teacher education Research Monograph No. 13. National Institute for Science Education, University of Wisconsin.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? Review of Educational Research, 86(4), 945–980. Ketelaar, E., Beijaard, D., Boshuizen, H. P. A., & Den Brok, P. J. (2012). Teachers' positioning towards an educational innovation in the light of ownership, sense-making and agency. Teaching and Teacher Education, 28(2), 273–282.
- Kleickmann, T., Trobst, S., Jonen, A., Vehmeyer, J., & Moller, K. (2016). The effects of expert scaffolding in elementary science professional development on teachers' beliefs and motivations, instructional practices, and student achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 108(1), 21–42.
- Kowalski, S. M., Hvidsten, C., Belcastro, A., Constantine, A., Askinas, K., Devaul, R., Roehrig, G. H., & Faruqi, F. (2021). Design decisions in translating face-to-face video-based elementary science professional development to an online environment. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference (virtual).

- Kowalski, S. M., Taylor, J. A., Askinas, K. M., Wang, Q., Zhang, Q., Maddix, W. P., & Tipton, E. (2020). Examining factors contributing to variation in effect size estimates of teacher outcomes from studies of science teacher professional development. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 13(3), 430–458.
- Kragler, S., Martin, L., & Kroeger, D. (2008). Money down the drain: Mandated professional development. Journal of School Leadership, 18, 528–550.
- Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2019). Teaching and learning of nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry: Building capacity through systematic research-based professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(7), 737–762.
- Lewis, E. B., Baker, D. R., & Helding, B. A. (2015). Science teaching reform through professional development: Teachers' use of a scientific classroom discourse community model. Science Education, 99(5), 896–931.
- Lotter, C., Carnes, N., Marshall, J. C., Hoppmann, R., Kiernan, D. A., Barth, S. G., & Smith, C. (2020). Teachers' content knowledge, beliefs, and practice after a project-based professional development program with ultrasound scanning. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(3), 311–334.
- Lotter, C., Smiley, W., Thompson, S., & Dickenson, T. (2016). The impact of a professional development model on middle school science teachers' efficacy and implementation of inquiry. International Journal of Science Education, 38(18), 2712–2741.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Love, N., Stiles, K. E., Mundry, S. E., & Hewson, P. (2003). Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics (2nd ed.). Corwin Press.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., & Matsumoto, C. (1999). Research on professional development for teachers of mathematics and science: The state of the scene. School Science and Mathematics, 99(5), 258–271.
- Luft, J. A., & Hewson, P. W. (2014). Research on teacher professional development programs in science. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (Vol. 2). Routledge.
- Lynch, S., Hill, H. C., Gonzalez, K. E., & Pollard, C. (2019). Strengthening the research base that informs STEM instructional improvement efforts: A meta-analysis. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 41(3), 260–293.
- Maeng, J. L., Whitworth, B. A., Gonczi, A. L., Navy, S. L., & Wheeler, L. B. (2018). Elementary science teachers' integration of engineering design into science instruction: Results from a randomized controlled trial. International Journal of Science Education, 39(11), 1529–1548.
- Manz, E., & Suárez, E. (2018). Supporting teachers to negotiate uncertainty for science, students, and teaching. Science Education, 102, 771–795.
- Marshall, J. C., & Alston, D. M. (2014). Effective, sustained inquiry-based instruction promotes higher science proficiency among all groups: A 5-year analysis. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25(7), 807–821.
- McFadden, J. F., Ellis, J., Anwar, T., & Roehrig, G. (2014). Beginning science teachers' use of a digital video annotation tool to promote reflective practices. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 23(3), 458–470.
- McFadden, J. F., & Roehrig, G. H. (2020). Missed expectations: Teacher and coach tensions at the boundary of STEM integration in an elementary classroom. Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research, 2(4). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-020-00021-8
- McNally, J. C. (2016). Learning from one's own teaching: New science teachers analyzing their practice through classroom observation cycles. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 53(3), 473–501.
- McNeill, K. L., & Knight, A. M. (2013). Teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of scientific argumentation: The impact of professional development on K-12 teachers. Science Education, 97(6), 936–972.
- McNeil, K., & Krajcik, J. S. (2008). Inquiry and scientific explanations: Helping students use evidence and reasoning. In J. A. Luft, R. L. Bell, & J. Gess-Newsome (Eds.), Science as inquiry in the secondary setting. NSTA Press.
- Merritt, E. G. (2016). Time for teacher learning, planning critical for school reform: Students aren't the only ones who need more time to learn; teachers also need more and better time for learning and for planning. Phi Delta Kappan, 98(4), 31–36.
- Moore, T. J., Glancy, A. W., Tank, K. M., Kersten, J. A., Smith, K. A., & Stohlmann, M. S. (2014). A framework for quality K-12 engineering education: Research and development. Journal of Pre-College Engineering Education Research (J-PEER), 4(1), 1–13.
- Moore, T. J., Johnston, A. C., & Glancy, A. W. (2020). STEM integration: A synthesis of conceptual frameworks and definitions. In C. C. Johnson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, T. J. Moore, & L. D. English (Eds.), Handbook of research in STEM education (pp. 3–16). Routledge.
- Mulveya, B. K., & Bell, R. L. (2017). Making learning last: Teachers' long-term retention of improved nature of science conceptions and instructional rationales. International Journal of Science Education, 39(1), 62–85.
- Nadelson, L. S., Callahan, J., Pyke, P., Hay, A., Dance, M., & Pfiester, J. (2013). Teacher STEM perception and preparation: Inquiry-based STEM professional development for elementary teachers. The Journal of Educational Research, 106(2), 157–168.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine . (2015). Science teachers' learning: Enhancing opportunities, creating supportive contexts. The National Academies Press.
- National Academy of Engineering and National Research Council . (2014). STEM integration in K-12 education: Status, prospects, and an agenda for research. National Academies Press.
- National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. The National Academies Press.
- National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. National Academies Press.
- National Science and Technology Council Committee on STEM Education . (2018). Charting a course for success: America's strategy for STEM education. National Science and Technology Council. www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/STEM-Education-Strategic-Plan-2018.pdf
- Nesmith, S. M., & Cooper, S. (2019). Engineering process as a focus: STEM professional development with elementary STEM-focused professional development schools. School Science and Mathematics, 119, 487–498.
- NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. National Academies Press.
- Nichol, C., Chow, A., & Furtwengler, S. (2018). Year-long teacher professional development on fifth grade student science outcomes. International Journal of Science Education, 40(17), 2099–2117.
- Osborne, J., Shirley, S., Christodoulou, A., Howell-Richardson, C., & Richardson, K. (2013). Learning to argue: A study of four schools and their attempt to develop the use of argumentation as a common instructional practice and its impact on students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50(3), 315–347.

- Peercy, M. M., Martin-Beltrán, M., Silverman, R. D., & Daniel, S. (2015). Curricular design and implementation as a site of teacher expertise and learning. Teachers and Teaching, 21(7), 867–893.
- Peltola, P., Haynes, E., Clymer, L., McMillan, A., & Williams, H. (2017). Opportunities for teacher professional development in Oklahoma rural and nonrural schools (REL 2017–273). Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for education evaluation and regional assistance, regional educational Laboratory southwest. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs
- Pleasants, J., Olson, J. K., & De La Cruz, I. (2020). Accuracy of elementary teachers' representations of the projects and processes of engineering: Results of a professional development program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(4), 362–383.
- Reiser, B. J. (2013). What professional development strategies are needed for successful implementation of the next generation science standards? Paper prepared for K12 Center at ETS Invitational Symposium on Science Assessment. www.k12center.org/rsc/pdf/reiser.pdf
- Ring, E. A., Dare, E. A., Crotty, E. A., & Roehrig, G. H. (2017). The evolution of teacher conceptions of STEM education throughout an intensive professional development experience. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 28(5), 444–467.
- Ring-Whalen, E. A., Dare, E. A., Roehrig, G. H., Titu, P., & Crotty, E. (2018). How teachers' conceptions of integrated STEM education are reflected in curriculum writing. International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, 6(4), 343–362.
- Robertson, D. A., Ford-Connors, E., Frahm, T., Bock, K., Paratore, J. R. (2019). Unpacking productive coaching interactions: Identifying coaching approaches that supports instructional uptake. Professional Development in Education, 46(5), 1–19.
- Robinson, A., Dailey, D., Hughes, G., & Cotabish, A. (2014). The effects of a science-focused STEM intervention on gifted elementary students' science knowledge and skills. Journal of Advanced Academics, 25(3), 189–213.
- Roehrig, G. H., Constantine, A., Faruqi, F., Hvidsten, C., Belcastro, A., Askinas, K., DeVaul, R., & Kowalski, S. (2021). Online Professional Development for Elementary Science Teachers. Paper presented at the Association for Science Teacher Education Conference (virtual).
- Roth, K. J., Garnier, H. E., Chen, C., Lemmens, M., Schwille, K., & Wickler, N. I. Z. (2011). Video-based lesson analysis: Effective science PD for teacher and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 117–148.
- Roth, K. J., Wilson, C. D., Taylor, J. A., Stuhlsatz, M. A., & Hvidsten, C. (2019). Comparing the effects of analysis-of-practice and content-based professional development on teacher and student outcomes in science. American Educational Research Journal, 56(4), 1217–1253.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Ringstaff, C. (2016). The influence of contextual factors on the sustainability of professional development outcomes. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27(2), 205–226.
- Sandholtz, J. H., Ringstaff, C., & Matlen, B. (2016). Temporary fix or lasting solution? Investigating the longitudinal impact of teacher professional development on K-2 science instruction. The Elementary School Journal, 117(2), 192–215.
- Scher, L., & O'Reilly, F. (2009). Professional development for K-12 math and science teachers: What do we really know? Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2(3), 209–249.
- Schuchardt, A. M., Tekkumru-Kisa, M., Schunn, C. D., Stein, M. K., & Reynolds, B. (2017). How much professional development is needed with educative curriculum materials? It depends upon the intended student learning outcomes. Science Education, 101, 1015–1033.
- Seraphin, K. D., Philippoff, J., Parisky, A., Degnan, K., & Warren, D. P. (2013). Teaching energy science as inquiry: Reflections on professional development as a tool to build inquiry teaching skills for middle and high school teachers. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 22(3), 235–251.
- Sgouros, G., & Stavrou, D. (2019). Teachers' professional development in nanoscience and nanotechnology in the context of a community of learners. International Journal of Science Education, 41(15), 2070–2093.
- Sgro, C. M., Bobowski, T., & Oliveira, A. W. (2020). Current praxis and conceptualization of STEM education: A call for greater clarity in integrated curriculum development. In V. Akerson & G. Buck (Eds.), Contemporary trends and issues in science education: Critical questions in STEM rducation (pp. 185–210). Springer.
- Smithenry, D. W., Prouty, J., & Capobianco, B. M. (2013). Collaboratively exploring the use of a video case-based book as a professional development tool. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 22(5), 735–750.
- Spatz, V., Wilhelm, T., Hopf, M., Waltner, C., & Wiesner, H. (2019). Teachers using a novel curriculum on an introduction to Newtonian mechanics: The effects of a short-term professional development program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(2), 159–178.
- Supovitz, J. A. (2001). Translating teaching practice into improved student performance. In S. Fuhrman (Ed.), From the capitol to the classroom: Standards-based reform in the states (pp. 81–98). University of Chicago Press.
- Tang, X., & Shao, F. (2014). On the evolution of a lesson: Group preparation for teaching contest as teacher professional
- development activity for Chinese elementary science teachers. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 23(2), 252–266. Taylor, J. A., Getty, S. R., Kowalski, S. M., Wilson, C. D., Carlson, J., & Van Scooter, P. (2015). An efficacy trial of research-based curriculum materials with curriculum-based professional development. American Educational Research Journal, 52(5), 984–1017.
- Tekkumru-Kisa, M., Stein, M. K., & Coker, R. (2018). Teachers' learning to facilitate high-level student thinking: Impact of a video-based professional development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 479–502.
- Tolbert, P. S., & Hall, R. H. (2015). Organizations: Structures, processes and outcomes. Routledge.
- van Driel, J. H., Meirink, J. A., van Veen, K., & Zwart, R. C. (2012). Current trends and missing links in studies on teacher professional development in science education: A review of design features and quality of research. Studies in Science Education, 48(2), 129–160.
- Watkins, J., Jaber, L. Z., & Dini, V. (2020). Facilitating scientific engagement online: Responsive teaching in a science professional development program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31(5), 515–536.
- Watkins, J., McCormick, M., Wendell, K. B., Spencer, K., Milto, E., Portsmore, M., & Hammer, D. (2018). Data-based conjectures for supporting responsive teaching in engineering design with elementary teachers. Science Education, 102(3), 548–570.
- Whitworth, B. A., & Chiu, J. L. (2015). Professional development and teacher change: The missing leadership link. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 26(2), 121–137.
- Whitworth, B. A., Maeng, J. L., Wheeler, L. B., & Chiu, J. L. (2017). Investigating the role of a district science coordinator. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 54, 914–936.

- Wiener, G. J., Schmeling, S. M., & Hopf, M. (2018). The technique of probing acceptance as a tool for teachers' professional development: A PCK study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55, 849–875.
- Wilson, S. M. (2013). Professional development for science teachers. Science, 340(6130), 310-313.
- Wylie, C. E., & Lyon, C. J. (2015). The fidelity of formative assessment implementation: Issues of breadth and quality. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 22(1), 140–160.
- Yang, R., Porter, A. C., Massey, C. M., Merlino, J. F., & Desimone, L. M. (2020). Curriculum-based teacher professional development in middle school science: A comparison of training focused on cognitive science principles versus content knowledge. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57, 536–566.
- Yang, Y., Liu, X., & Gardella, J. A. (2020). Effects of a professional development program on science teacher knowledge and practice, and student understanding of interdisciplinary science concepts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 57(7), 1028–1057.
- Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement. Issues and Answers Report, REL2007-No.033. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Yoon, S. A., Klopfer, E., Anderson, E., Koehler-Yom, J., Sheldon, J., Schoenfeld, I., Wendel, D., Scheintaub, H., Oztok, M., Evans, C., & Goh, S.-E. (2016). Designing computer-supported complex systems curricula for the next generation science standards in high school science classrooms. Systems, 4(38), 1–18.
- Yoon, S. A., Koehler-Yorn, J., Anderson, E., Lin, J., & Klopfer, E. (2015). Using an adaptive expertise lens to understand the quality of teachers' classroom implementation of computer-supported complex systems curricula in high school science. Research in Science & Technological Education, 33(2), 237–251.
- Yoon, S. A., Miller, K., Richman, T., Wendel, D., Schoenfeld, I., Anderson, E., & Shim, J. (2020). Encouraging collaboration and building community in online asynchronous professional development: Designing for social capital. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 15(3), 351–371.