

The Humanistic and Cultural Aspects of Science & Technology Education

Glen S. Aikenhead
University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada

A plenary paper presented to the
11th International Organization for Science and Technology Education (IOSTE) Symposium
Lublin, Poland, July 25-30, 2004

It is an honour for me to speak to the 11th IOSTE Symposium, held in a country that enjoys a rich heritage of scientific excellence. This heritage has spanned several centuries: in the 16th century Nicolaus Koppernigk (Copernicus) changed our view of the solar system, in the 19th century Maria Sklodowska (Madame Curie) changed our view of matter, and in the 20th century Theodor Kaluza changed our view of the universe by convincing Einstein that the universe was comprised of more than three spatial dimensions. I am pleased to be in Poland where change in scholarly views is celebrated, because the message I bring today is about changing our view of science and technology education, a change towards greater educational excellence.

The Symposium's theme is "Science and Technology Education for a Diverse World: Dilemmas, Needs and Partnerships." Accordingly, I want to speak about a major *dilemma* facing educators today, the *needs* that inform our decisions about that dilemma (needs based on the educational soundness of research in science education), and the *partnerships* that can evolve from this Symposium to meet those needs. In short, I want to recognize a dilemma, identify needs, and forge partnerships.

A Major Dilemma

A major dilemma arises from the Symposium's emphasis on "a diverse world." Stated simply, science and technology (S&T) education in schools has traditionally served an elite world, not a diverse world (Driver et al., 1996; Fensham, 1992). Traditional school science has attempted to socialize all students into a scientific way of thinking. But when only a small minority of students succeed, educators are *rewarded* for having identified the cream of the crop (the academic elite), ultimately to supply university science and engineering programmes. The other students who comprise the diverse world are screened out. Generally, they do not have a scientific worldview. They do not think like a scientist. They do not *want to* think like a scientist. They experience school science as a foreign culture. They are outsiders to the pre-professional training that funnels the most capable students into courses for university programmes.

This dilemma, "science for all" versus "science for an elite," has plagued S&T education ever since one of the first formal school science curriculum was written (in 1867 in England) by a subcommittee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS). Throughout 150 years of science education's formal existence, there have been debates between two sets of visions of school science (Hurd, 1991). On the one hand, there is a vision that I shall call a "humanistic-cultural" approach to S&T education. It promotes practical utility, human values, and a connectedness with personal and societal issues to achieve both inclusiveness and a student-centred orientation. On the other hand, there is a traditional vision that promotes professional science associations (such as the

BAAS), the rigors of mental training, and academic screening to achieve both exclusiveness and a scientist-centred orientation.

Although the traditional vision of school science has been the status quo all these years, the humanistic-cultural vision has experienced a renaissance since World War II (Jenkins, 2004). As a result, a considerable amount of research has accumulated over the past 40 years that now provides solid evidence for understanding the educational needs of students. In my presentation today, I shall synthesize major findings of this research concerning the needs of students. These are the needs that should inform our discussions about the dilemma over a vision for school science. In a practical way, I place the research findings in the context of the political realities faced by S&T teachers and educators.

Science and technology education for a diverse world is directly related to humanistic-cultural approaches to school science.

Research into Humanistic-Cultural Approaches

Research should inform our rational choices when we develop S&T curriculum and instruction. Evidence-based decisions require us to consider what would likely be successful and useful for students in a typical classroom (i.e. educationally sound propositions). Politics, however, can force us to compromise our choices when we confront non-rational realities such as historical precedence, pressure from universities, directives from professional interest groups, and S&T teachers who hold preconceptions at odds with a humanistic-cultural approach to school science. There is always a tension between *educational soundness* and *political reality*. Today, I wish to explore this tension so we might better understand the choices we make and the compromises we think we must live with.

In our research literature, humanistic perspectives have referred to: values, the nature of science, the social aspects of science, and the human character of science revealed through its sociology, history, philosophy, and its relationship with technology (Aikenhead, 2003; Donnelly, 2002; and Solomon, 1997). In most humanistic S&T courses, this humanistic content is integrated with the canonical content of science.

More recently, progress in understanding students' experiences in school science has occurred when researchers assumed a broader perspective, one drawn from cultural anthropology: treating science as a subculture of Euro-American mainstream culture and recognizing that most students (approximately 80 to 90%) find science to be a foreign culture to be avoided because it is either irrelevant to their cultural identities or repugnant to their social sensibilities (Aikenhead, 1996; Atkin & Helms, 1993; Calabrese Barton, 2002; Cobern & Aikenhead, 1998; Costa, 1995; Eisenhart, Finkel & Marion, 1996; Jegede, 1996; Reiss, 2000; Roth & Désautels, 2002). For them, a meaningful understanding of canonical science is usually beyond their grasp. It is inaccessible to them until they cross the cultural border between their everyday culture and the culture of school science (a cross-cultural event).

But there is a political reality for many of these students. Even though they do not achieve a meaningful understanding of science content, they need to acquire science credentials to enter post secondary educational institutions. Their educational/political dilemma is easily solved when they learn how to pass science courses without achieving the meaningful understanding assumed by teachers and curriculum developers. This occurs when students (and some teachers) play "Fatima's rules," school games such as rote memorization, ingratiation, specific classroom rituals, and pretending to participate in these rituals (Aikenhead, 2000; Larson, 1995).

For the small minority of students who have a worldview in harmony with a scientific worldview (students like ourselves), a meaningful understanding of canonical science is their goal. They are the elite who seldom play Fatima's rules. S&T education for a diverse world of students, however, focuses on the needs of all students (science for all; Fensham, 1985). Research into those needs was recently synthesised in detail (Aikenhead, 2003) but is summarized here, organized into the following topics: major failures of the traditional science curriculum, learning to use science in other (non-school) contexts, relevance, student learning, and teacher orientations.

Major Failures of the Traditional Science Curriculum

A humanistic-cultural approach to S&T education arises from a particular vision of school science but is motivated by three major evidence-based failures of the traditional approach to teaching science: crises in student enrolment, myths conveyed to students, and a ubiquitous failure of school science content to have meaning for most students, especially outside of school. Each issue is examined in turn.

The first failure concerns the chronic decline in student enrolment due to students' disenchantment with school science, particularly for young women and students marginalized on the basis of their culture (Gardner, 1998; Hurd, 1991; Seymour & Hewitt, 1997). Low enrolments have reached crisis proportions in many countries (Frederick, 1991; Osborne & Collins, 2000). Evidence suggests that humanistic perspectives in a science curriculum can improve the recruitment of students (Campbell et al., 1994; Holton, 2003; Solomon, 1994).

A second and related major educational failure of the traditional science curriculum concerns the dishonest and mythical images about science and scientists that the curriculum conveys (Aikenhead, 1973; Gaskell, 1992; Knain, 2001; Millar, 1989; Smolicz & Nunan, 1975). As a consequence, some strong science students lose interest in taking further science classes, some students become interested in science for the wrong reasons, and many students become citizens (some in key positions in government and industry) who make decisions predicated on myths about the nature and social aspects of the scientific enterprise.

A third documented major failure dates back to the 1970s research into student learning: *most students tend not to learn science content meaningfully* (i.e. they do not integrate it into their everyday thinking) (Anderson & Helms, 2001; Hart, 2002; Osborne, Duschl & Fairbrother, 2003). Many research programs in science education have attempted in different ways to solve this lack of meaningful learning (e.g. Millar, Leach & Osborne, 2000). However, even for students preparing for science-related careers, very few of them integrate the science curriculum content into their thinking in science-rich workplaces, and this ability tends to be unaffected by their success at passing science courses (Cobern, 1993; Duggan & Gott, 2002; Lawrenz & Gray, 1995). Thus, a corpus of research suggests that learning canonical science content meaningfully is simply not achievable for the great majority of students in the context of traditional school science (Aikenhead, 2003; Shapiro, 2004).

Learning to Use Science in Other Contexts

Although the goal of meaningful learning is largely unattainable, it seems to be achieved to some degree in out-of-school contexts in which people are personally involved in a science/technology-related everyday issue (Calabrese Barton & Yang, 2000; Davidson & Schibeci, 2000; Dori & Tal, 2000; Layton et al., 1993; Wynne, 1991). Thirty-one different case studies of this type of

research were reviewed by Ryder (2001) who firmly concluded: *When people need to communicate with experts and/or take action, they usually learn the science content required.*

Even though people seem to learn science content as required, this learning is not often the canonical content transmitted from a traditional S&T curriculum. Research has produced one clear and consistent finding: *most often, canonical science content is not directly useable in science-related everyday situations*, for various reasons (Furnham, 1992; Hennessy, 1993; Layton, 1991; Solomon, 1984; Wynne, 1991). This research result can be explained by the discovery that canonical science content must be *transformed* (i.e. deconstructed and then reconstructed according to the idiosyncratic demands of the context) into knowledge very different in character from the canonical science in the typical S&T science curriculum. This happens as one moves from canonical science content for explaining or describing, to practical content for taking action – “transformed science” or “citizen science” (Fourez, 1997; Irwin, 1995; Jenkins, 2002; Layton, 1991; Roth & Lee, 2004). When the S&T curriculum does not engage students in the difficult process of *transforming* abstract canonical content into content for taking action, canonical science remains unusable outside of school for most students (Layton, et al., 1993). And when students attempt to master unusable knowledge, most end up playing Fatima’s rules.

A recurring evidence-based criticism of traditional school science has been its lack of relevance for the everyday world (Osborne & Collins, 2000; Reiss, 2000). The issue of relevance is at the heart of most humanistic-cultural S&T curriculum and instruction.

Relevance

Educational relevance always confronts political expediency in S&T classrooms. Relevance and expediency may coexist by asking, “*Who* decides what is relevant?” (Fensham, 2000), rather than “Relevant to whom?” or “Relevant to what?” The answer to the question “Who decides?” has received sufficient research attention to guide S&T curriculum policy makers towards an educationally sound alternative to traditional school science. I synthesize this research by using seven categories of relevant science (Table 1; based on Fensham, 2000).

[Table 1 fits here.]

Wish-they-knew science is typically embraced by academic scientists, education officials, and many science educators when asked: What knowledge is of most worth? (Fensham, 1992; Walberg, 1991). The usual answer, canonical science content, prepares students for success in university programs. But exactly how relevant is this wish-they-knew content for success in first year university courses taken by science-proficient students? Research evidence suggests it is not as relevant as one might assume, and on occasion, not relevant at all (Aikenhead, 2003). Although the *educational* arguments favouring wish-they-knew science are particularly weak, political realities favouring it are overwhelmingly strong (Fensham, 1993, 1998; Gaskell, 2003).

Need-to-know science is defined by the lay public who have faced a real-life decision related to science and technology (Layton et al., 1993; Ryder, 2001; Wynne, 1991). One reason that people tend not to use canonical science content in their everyday world (in addition to it not being directly useable, as described above) is quite simple: canonical science content is the wrong type of content to use in most socio-scientific settings. Need-to-know science (e.g. citizen science and knowledge about science and scientists; i.e. humanistic-cultural content) turns out to have greater practical value than canonical science.

Functional science is deemed relevant primarily by people with occupations or careers in science-based industries and professions. Industry personnel surveyed by Coles (1997) placed “understanding science ideas” at the lowest priority for judging a recruit to a science-based workplace. By conducting ethnographic research on the job with science graduates, Duggan and Gott (2002) in the UK, Law (2002) in China, and Lottero-Perdue and Brickhouse (2002) in the US discovered that the canonical science content used by science graduates in the workplace was so context specific it had to be learned on the job, and that high school and university science content was rarely drawn upon. On the other hand, Duggan and Gott’s (2002) data suggested that procedural understanding (i.e. the thinking directly related to doing science-like tasks) was essential across most science-related careers. More specifically Duggan and Gott discovered one domain of concepts, “concepts of evidence,” that was applied by workers in all science-related occupations. The humanistic perspective germane here concerns a correct understanding of concepts of evidence and the value judgements used when dealing with social implications, for instance: Is the scientific evidence good enough to warrant the industrial or social action proposed? In this context, it would be useful for workers and the lay public to understand the ways in which scientific evidence is technically and socially constructed (Bingle & Gaskell, 1994). Ethnographic research methods are not the only way to determine functional science content for S&T education. The Delphi research technique was used by Häussler and Hoffmann (2000) in Germany.

By its very nature, *enticed-to-know science* excels at its motivational value. This is science content encountered in the mass media and the internet, characterized by its quest to entice a reader or viewer to pay closer attention. Millar (2000) in the UK and Dimopoulos and Koulaidis (2003) in Greece described how their longitudinal analyses of their respective national newspapers identified the science and technology knowledge that would be most useful in making sense of these articles and the stories they presented. Moral issues and public risk are often associated with enticed-to-know science because the media normally attends to those aspects of events. The more important everyday events in which citizens encounter science and technology involve risk and environmental threats (Irwin, 1995).

Have-cause-to-know science is science content suggested by experts who interact with the general public on real-life matters pertaining to science and technology, and who know the problems the public encounters when dealing with these experts. In Law’s (2002) study, her Chinese experts placed high value on a citizen’s capability to undertake self-directed learning, but placed low value on a citizen knowing particular content from the traditional science curriculum, a result reminiscent of research related to functional science. Have-cause-to-know science is a feature of the Science Education for Public Understanding Project, SEPUP, in the US (Thier & Nagle, 1996). In the Netherlands, Eijkelhof (1990) used the Delphi research technique to gain a consensus among societal experts to establish the humanistic and canonical science content for an STS physics module, “Ionizing Radiation;” while in the UK, Osborne, Collins and colleagues (2003) used the same technique to establish a consensus in the UK on what “ideas about science” (humanistic-cultural content) should be taught in school science. A disadvantage of the Delphi procedure is evident in the ambiguous or “motherhood” statements that sometimes emerge (e.g. “creativity”).

For *personal-curiosity science*, students themselves decide on the topics of interest for school science, and relevance takes on a personal though perhaps idiosyncratic meaning because students’ cultural self-identities are expressed (Brickhouse, 2001; Carlone, 2004; Häussler & Hoffmann, 2000; Reiss, 2000). Two unavoidable conclusions surfaced in this research: traditional science education played a meagre to insignificant role in most of the students’ personal lives; and school science will only engage students in meaningful learning to the extent to which the curriculum has personal value

and enriches or strengthens students' cultural self-identities. Sjøberg (2000) surveyed over nine thousand 13-year-old students in 21 countries to learn about their past experiences related to science, their curiosity towards certain science topics, their attitude to science, their perception of scientists at work, and their self-identity as a future scientist. Sjøberg (2003) recently initiated an extensive international study of personal-curiosity science, the Relevance of Science Education (ROSE) project, whose initial results are reported at this 11th IOSTE Symposium.

A more holistic yet abstract concept of relevance for school science was advanced by Weinstein's (1998) research; a concept he called *science-as-culture*. He identified a network of communities (webs of scientific practice) in students' everyday lives (e.g. health systems, political systems, and environmental groups). Each community network interacts with science professionals, resulting in a cultural *commonsense notion of science*. As a category of relevance, science-as-culture serves in part as a super ordinate category to the need-to-know, functional, enticed-to-know, have-cause-to-know, and personal-curiosity science categories. Science-as-culture can also be found in some project-based learning in which local, science-related, real-life problems are addressed by students in an interdisciplinary way (e.g. Calabrese Barton & Yang, 2000; Roth & Désautels, 2004) and in a cross-cultural way (e.g. Aikenhead, 2002; Keogh & Malcolm, in press).

In conclusion, the research on relevance reviewed here unequivocally points to the need to learn scientific and technological knowledge *as required*. Thus, a clear curriculum policy can be proposed: a central goal of a humanistic-cultural S&T curriculum should be to teach students *how to learn* science and technology canonical content as required by the contexts that students find themselves in (Jenkins, 2002). To prepare students for the diverse world of citizenship or science-related occupations, it would not seem to matter what science content is placed in the curriculum, as long as it enhances students' capability *to learn how to learn* S&T content within a relevant context. The selection criteria, which were suggested by the research on relevance reviewed above in the seven categories of relevance, allow us to achieve the goal "to learn how to learn S&T content" equally well as the status quo criterion "prerequisite coherence with first-year university courses." Curriculum policy based on learning how to learn will produce a much different S&T curriculum than a policy based on screening students through pre-university course content. These two curriculum policies define the difference between science for all and science for the elite.

Ideologies inherent in any S&T curriculum can be categorized in terms of two fundamentally different presuppositions of school science (Aikenhead, 2000; Weinstein, 1998): (1) the enculturation of students into their *local, national, and global communities*, communities increasingly influenced by advances in science and technology, and (2) the enculturation of students into the *disciplines of science*. S&T educators must choose between the two types of enculturation. Cultural relevance favours the former position for most students because from their point of view, relevance concerns the degree to which curriculum content and classroom experiences speak to the students' cultural self-identities (Brickhouse, 2001; Carlone, 2004; Reiss, 2000).

Research clearly suggests that any S&T curriculum, either humanistic-cultural or purely scientific, dedicated to the enculturation of all students into scientific ways of thinking will constantly be undermined by students and teachers playing Fatima's rules.

Student Learning

What students learn, whether planned or unplanned, is given high priority in arguments concerning educational soundness (Gaskell, 1994). As is evident throughout this presentation, a

humanistic-cultural S&T curriculum has various interconnected outcomes: (1) to make the human and cultural aspects of science and technology more accessible and relevant to students (e.g. the sociology, philosophy, and history of S&T, as well as its interrelationships with society); (2) to help students become better critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and especially better decision makers, in a science-related everyday context; (3) to increase students' capabilities to communicate and be self-assertive with the scientific community or its spokespersons (i.e. listen, read, respond, etc.); (4) to augment students' commitment to social responsibility; and (5) to generate interest in, and therefore, increase achievement in learning how to learn canonical science content found in the S&T curriculum.

Research into student learning is summarized here in the following sequence: canonical science content acquired, assessment in quasi-experimental studies and other investigations, and student decision making (Aikenhead, 2003).

Science Content Acquired

As mentioned above, there are several reasons to explain the difficulty most students have when trying to learn canonical science content meaningfully in the context of school science. Researchers once felt that these difficulties might be overcome by placing this content in a context that emotionally connected with a student's world, particularly a student's cultural self-identity. A considerable amount of research has consistently yielded one of two outcomes. This first is a neutral outcome. Based on standardized achievement tests of canonical science, there was no significant effect on students' scores when instruction time for the canonical content was reduced to make room for the history of science, the nature of science, or the social aspects of science (e.g. Bybee, 1993; Eijkelhof & Lijnse, 1988; Irwin, 2000; Klopfer & Cooley, 1963; Welch, 1973). Thus, there would seem to be little educational advantage for a teacher "to cover" the entire canonical S&T curriculum but instead, greater advantage to teaching fewer canonical science concepts chosen because of their relevance to a humanistic-cultural perspective (Eijkelhof, 1990; Kortland, 2001; Häussler & Hoffmann, 2000). A second research outcome was discovered, on occasion. Students in humanistic-cultural S&T courses appeared to fair *significantly better* on achievement tests of canonical science than their counterparts in traditional courses (e.g. Carlone, 2004; Häussler & Hoffmann, 2000; Mbajiorgu & Ali, 2003; Solomon et al., 1992; Yager & Tamir, 1983).

Assessment Studies

There are now a wide variety of research instruments and techniques (both quantitative and qualitative) with which to assess students' acquisition of humanistic-cultural content taught in S&T courses (Aikenhead, 2003). By using these instruments and techniques, assessment studies have been able to document the following claims:

- Students in humanistic-cultural S&T classes (compared with traditional classes) can significantly improve their understanding of social issues both external and internal to science, and of the interactions among science, technology, and society; but this achievement depends on what content is emphasized and evaluated by the teacher. The teacher makes the difference.
- Students in humanistic-cultural S&T classes (compared with traditional classes) can significantly improve their attitudes towards science, towards science classes, and towards learning, as a result of learning humanistic content.
- Students in humanistic-cultural S&T classes (compared with traditional classes) can make modest but significant gains in thinking skills such as applying canonical science content to everyday events, critical and creative thinking, and decision making, as long as these skills are explicitly practiced and evaluated in the classroom.

- Students can benefit from studying science from a humanistic-cultural perspective provided that: the humanistic and cultural content is integrated with canonical science content in a purposeful, educationally sound way; appropriate classroom materials are available; and a teacher's orientation towards school science is in reasonable synchrony with a humanistic-cultural perspective.
- Some students can enhance their socially responsible actions when taught by certain teachers.

In addition, researchers found that even though humanistic-cultural content made intuitive sense to many students, the students still required guidance from their teacher on how to apply their intuitive knowledge to a particular event.

Students' ability to interpret the news media is another expectation of most humanistic-cultural curricula. Ratcliffe (1999), for instance, investigated the evaluation reports (critiquing science articles in the *New Scientist*) written by three groups: school students (11 to 14 year-olds), college science students (17 year-olds), and science baccalaureate graduates (22 to 35 year-olds). Although the skills increased with formal training, years of experience, and self-selection into science, as one would expect, Ratcliffe discovered that the skills of evidence evaluation (a component of "functional science;" i.e. concepts of evidence) were evident across all three populations, and she suggested that these abilities could be developed further through explicit teaching.

The impact of history of science materials was investigated by Solomon et al. (1992) in an 18-month action research project. Interestingly, students' facile, media-icon, image of scientists were *not replaced* by realistic images developed through learning the humanistic-cultural content, but instead, realistic images were *added to* these preconceptions in students minds (i.e. concept proliferation rather than concept replacement). From a student's point of view, learning means they now have a choice between two images, and the choice depends on the context. This result has major implications for the importance of context in the assessment of student learning.

Decision Making

The wise use of knowledge in making decisions enables people to assume social responsibilities expected of attentive citizens or key decision makers employed in public service or business and industry. Thus, decision making is often at the centre of a humanistic-cultural S&T curriculum, and it serves as a classroom vehicle to transport students into their everyday world of: need-to-know science, functional science, enticed-to-know science, have-cause-to-know science, personal-curiosity science, and culture-as-science. Generally the classroom objective is to create a sound simulation of an everyday event (e.g. Kolstø, 2001b; Kortland, 2001; Ratcliffe, 1997), although this approach has been criticized for not being authentic enough (Roth & Désautels, 2004). Decision making necessarily encompasses a wide scope of other types of knowledge: always values and personal knowledge, and often technology, ethics, civics, politics, the law, economics, public policy, etc. (Jiménez-Aleizandre & Pereiro-Muñoz, 2002; Kolstø, 2001a). In research into conflicting testimonies of scientific experts on science-related controversial issues, for instance, even the scientific technical information itself was found to carry political-ideological baggage (i.e. values).

Besides students making moderate gains in their decision-making skills, perhaps the most pervasive result from the research into student decision making is the priority students gave to values over scientific evidence. This result may be due to the fact that values *are* more important in our culture for deciding on most socio-scientific issues, even for science teachers and scientists themselves. Bell and Lederman (2003), for instance, investigated how 21 university research scientists made socio-scientific decisions (e.g. foetal tissue implantations, global warming, and smoking and

cancer). Using questionnaires and telephone interviews, the researchers concluded that all participants considered the scientific evidence, but they “based their decisions primarily on personal values, morals/ethics, and social concerns” (p. 352). Should students be any different?

In summary, the research literature is unambiguous concerning the positive outcomes in student learning in humanistic or cross-cultural S&T classrooms. These students learn traditional science content as well as, or better than, students in traditional courses. At the same time, students in humanistic-cultural courses make significant gains on some humanistic content and modest gains on complex humanistic objectives such as thoughtful decision making. Therefore, humanistic-cultural approaches to school science are educationally sound.

Researchers who observed experimental humanistic-cultural classrooms consistently remarked on the students’ heightened interest in school science, an outcome that some predicted would have a positive effect on their teacher’s orientation to humanistic-cultural approaches to teaching science and technology (e.g. Osborne, Duschl & Fairbrother, 2003).

Teacher Orientations

Political reality, in the form of science teachers’ orientations to humanistic-cultural school science, has undergone extensive research. These findings are almost as negative as those concerning students achieving a meaningful understanding of canonical science.

Teachers construct their own meaning of any curriculum as they negotiate an orientation towards it and decide what to implement, if anything, in their classroom. Over the years, researchers have studied teachers’ rejection, acceptance, and idiosyncratic modulation of an intended humanistic science curriculum. Several general conclusions about teachers’ orientations can be drawn from this literature. First, a small proportion of S&T teachers are supportive of a humanistic-cultural perspective for an S&T curriculum. Thus, there will always be a few S&T teachers who teach from a humanistic point of view (humanistic science teachers), and who gladly volunteer for any research study, R&D project, or action research that promises to enhance their humanistic-cultural orientation. Similarly there will be a nucleus of teachers committed to pre-professional training, mental training, and screening students for university entrance (tradition enthusiasts). These teachers resist and some actively undermine any humanistic-cultural innovation in school science. There exists a third group of science teachers who can be persuaded to move in either direction for a variety of different reasons (middle-of-the-road teachers). For instance, in one of the most insightful in-service programs for an STS science curriculum (Leblanc, 1989), its leaders ensured that a high proportion of participants came from the first and third teacher groups (humanistic and middle-of-the-road teachers), and the leaders selected judiciously a small number of high-profile teachers from the second group (tradition enthusiasts). After three years of periodic intensive in-service sessions, supported by university research scientists and enriched by classroom trials of materials by participants and then followed by in-depth group reflection, the province of Nova Scotia, Canada, formally implemented an STS science curriculum supported by all the in-service teachers, including the tradition enthusiasts. No follow-up study was reported, however.

Challenges to Curriculum Change

Normally science teachers are attracted to, and socialized into, specific scientific disciplines in university programs where teachers are certified to be loyal gatekeepers and spokespersons for science; and in return they enjoy high professional status and a self-identity associated with the scientific community. As forewarned by Gaskell in 1982 and substantiated since then by years of research, a

teacher's values, assumptions, beliefs, ideologies, professional self-identity, status, and loyalties must be in harmony, more or less, with a humanistic-cultural approach to S&T education before a teacher will teach it. Changing any one of these influences on a teacher's orientation is very difficult for most middle-of-the-road teachers, and is usually impossible for tradition enthusiasts (e.g. Kortland, 2001; Osborne, Duschl & Fairbrother, 2003; Sáez & Carretero, 2002). Taken together this cluster of salient influences has been referred to by some researchers as "the culture of school science."

When asked by researchers if teaching from a humanistic-cultural perspective is a good idea (terms such as "socially relevant" are actually used), most science teachers (about 90%) overwhelmingly endorse it. Yet when asked to implement such a curriculum, teachers provide many reasons for not doing so. These reasons are listed here but in no particular order of importance because their presence and priority change from study to study: lack of teaching materials (although when they are provided, other reasons surface); unfamiliarity with student-centred, transactional, teaching and assessment methods (e.g. group work or divergent-thinking); greater than normal emphasis on oral and written language, and the complexity caused by combining everyday and scientific genres; lack of confidence with integrated content; fear of losing control over the class (e.g. open-ended activities and unpredictable outcomes – teachable moments); uncertainty about a teacher's role in the classroom (e.g. facilitator) in spite of attending in-service workshops; a reliance on a single national textbook that contains little or no humanistic content; an unease with handling controversial issues, or even group discussions of a social or ethical nature; uncertainties over assessing students on "subjective" content; inadequate background knowledge and experiences (i.e. pre-service teacher education programs); no opportunity to work with an experienced competent teacher or with scientists in industry; lack of school budget to support the innovation; lack of administrative or colleagues' support; lack of parental or community support; no clear idea what the humanistic innovation means conceptually or operationally; predictions that students will not appreciate or enjoy philosophical, historical and policy issues in a science class (e.g. "students want to light Bunsen burners and get the right answer"); a preoccupation with preparing students for high-stake examinations and success at university; pressure from university science departments to raise standards and cover more content in greater depth; an unease over the reduced time devoted to canonical science content and to covering the traditional curriculum; pressure to comply with state content standards defined by the current US reform movement; identifying oneself with scientists (e.g. lecturer expert) rather than with educators; the fact that non-elite and low achieving students enrol in humanistic-cultural science courses; greater need for cultural sensitivity with some humanistic topics such as social justice in the use of science and technology; and beginning teachers' survival mode discourages them from taking seriously humanistic and cultural ideas developed in their teacher education courses (Aikenhead, 2003). One is faced with an inescapable conclusion: *there are daunting challenges to educators wishing to change the traditional science curriculum into a humanistic-cultural one.*

Success at Implementation

Successful implementation of humanistic-cultural science teaching has occurred under favourable circumstances. Success seemed to be associated with teaching grades 7 to 10 rather than higher grades, perhaps because teachers were not confronted as much with the litany of obstacles to implementation listed above. Action research studies have been consistently successful (e.g. Keiny, 1993), perhaps because of their relatively high proportion of human resources for the participating teachers and the relatively high proportion of eager participants (humanistic S&T teachers).

Research has identified the following favourable circumstances: involvement of teachers in policy and curriculum development; involvement of teachers in producing classroom materials; establishment of supportive networks of teachers that included teachers experienced with humanistic

science teaching who take leadership roles; a predisposition towards exploring new avenues of pedagogy and student assessment; a willingness to deal with degrees of uncertainty in the classroom; a substantial in-service program offered over a long period of time, coordinated with pre-service methods courses and student teaching where possible; teacher reflection via diaries or journals and via discussion; a recognition of the rewards from becoming socially responsible in their community, from enhancing their curriculum development and writing skills, and from improving their vision of science teaching; a responsive and caring project staff to provide the top-down guidance for achieving a balance with grass-roots initiatives; contact with working scientists who convey intellectual, moral, and political support; an openness to evidence-based decisions founded on formative assessment and classroom experiences; and a focus on individual, autonomous, professional development into becoming, for example, a continuous learner rather than a source of all knowledge (Aikenhead, 2003).

By way of an example, one in-depth research study offered insight into features of middle-of-the-road teachers who composed and taught humanistic science lessons in spite of a lack of curriculum materials. Bartholomew and colleagues (2002) in the UK followed and supported 11 volunteer teachers who were interested in implementing the UK national science curriculum's "ideas about science," specific ideas empirically derived from a large Delphi study (reviewed earlier in this paper; Osborne, Collins et al., 2003). The researchers were interested in "what it *means* to integrate teaching about the nature of science, its practices and its processes, with the body of canonical content knowledge in a way which reinforces and adds to the teaching of both" (p. 11, original emphasis). The researchers identified five "dimensions of practice." Each dimension consisted of two extreme orientations that characterize the less successful and more successful teachers (respectively):

1. Teachers' knowledge and understanding of humanistic-cultural content – from "anxious about their understanding" to "confident that they have a sufficient understanding."
2. Teachers' conceptions of their own role – from "dispenser of knowledge" to "facilitator of learning."
3. Teachers' use of discourse – from "closed and authoritative" to "open and dialogic."
4. Teachers' conception of learning goals – from "limited to knowledge gains" to "includes the development of reasoning skills."
5. The nature of classroom activities – from "student activities are contrived and inauthentic" to "activities are authentic and owned by students."

These dimensions are not mutually independent. They do help, however, to locate teachers' orientations to a humanistic-cultural perspective, more so than vague feelings of comfort or discomfort usually reported in the research literature.

Success at changing an S&T curriculum is possible for some teachers under supportive circumstances, with most but not all students (i.e. not those who would benefit from the privilege of an elitist orientation to school science). The importance of the role of students in curriculum change was a finding to emerge from this research literature as well.

Pre-Service Experiences

As with in-service studies, research into pre-service science teachers' orientation to a humanistic-cultural perspective did not find encouraging results. Pre-service teachers have loyalties and self-identities recently established in their university science programs. Researchers who followed these teacher education students into their practice teaching found that little or no humanistic-cultural instruction occurred, in spite of the students' grasp of, and commitment to, this content. Some researchers concluded that these pre-service teachers mimicked the pure content orientation of their

recent university science classes. David (2003) and Schwartz and Lederman (2002) discovered a different reason to explain the reluctance of pre-service teachers to include humanistic-cultural content in their lessons: novice teachers naturally lack confidence in teaching canonical science content, and until a reasonable confidence can be attained, other instructional outcomes are relegated to a low priority.

Background knowledge of humanistic-cultural content seems to exert an influence in some pre-service settings, but not in all; especially when apprentices are placed in an unsupportive school setting. It turns out that school politics have a far greater effect on a student teacher's professional identity than our educationally sound university methods classes. Educational soundness bows to political reality.

School Politics

The challenge of implementing change within a single classroom is one issue. How a teacher's colleagues, administration, and parents react to the change is quite another issue. Recent in-depth research into school politics is both insightful and discouraging (e.g. Carlone, 2003). S&T education always occurs within the context of a school's culture. One way in which research has articulated an understanding of that culture is through an analysis of "actor-networks," teacher loyalties, and cultural self-identities with respect to the status quo (Carlone, 2003; Gaskell, 2003; Gaskell & Hepburn, 1998). A large-scale implementation of a humanistic-cultural S&T curriculum requires an actor-network larger than one or two teachers (Hughes, 2000). Political reality dictates that an expanded actor-network would need to be formed in concert with socially powerful groups to support change at the school culture level. S&T teachers must renegotiate the culture of school science (Aikenhead, 2000).

Reflections on the Research

A humanistic and cultural approach to S&T education aims to develop a student-centred orientation that animates students' cultural self-identities, their future contributions to society as citizens, and their interest in making personal utilitarian meaning of scientific and technological knowledge.

Is humanistic-cultural S&T education credible? The research literature presents us with two clear answers: educationally it is unmistakably credible, but politically it is not. Therefore, all future projects will need to incorporate both an educational and political component if researchers or curriculum specialists are to make a significant difference to what happens in an S&T classroom.

Future research into humanistic-cultural S&T education will need to avoid some of the limitations of past research, such as the small size of projects and a lack of collaboration with teachers *and* students. As an alternative to small-scale studies, researchers can treat a school jurisdiction as the unit of analysis through enacting larger-scale projects (Elmore, 2003). However, a change from a traditional to a humanistic-cultural S&T curriculum may require even a broader context for research than just a school system. Significant change requires a multi-dimensional context of scale that includes diverse stakeholders of social privilege and power, over a long period of time (Sjøberg, 2002). Successful collaboration requires new partnerships among educators, researchers, and stakeholders, forging new actor-networks in support of humanistic-cultural S&T education. We are developing such actor-networks at this 11th IOSTE Symposium.

The most effective research in the future will explore *the interaction of research, policy, practice, and political power* (Alsop, 2003), or at least combinations of these components. Future

projects, both small-scale and large-scale, will need to manage the dynamics among research, policy, practice, and especially power.

Conclusion

The largest obstacle to changing the curriculum is change itself. Change is well-known to the scientific community because scientists shift paradigms from time to time, but not without difficulty. Poland has contributed significantly to these scientific paradigm shifts in the past. Science and technology education, I predict, will be treated similarly. S&T educators will shift from a traditional paradigm to a humanistic-cultural paradigm for school science, to ensure educational excellence in S&T education for a diverse world.

References

- Aikenhead, G.S. (1973). The measurement of high school students' knowledge about science and scientists. *Science Education*, 51, 539-549.
- Aikenhead, G.S. (1996). Science education: Border crossing into the subculture of science. *Studies in Science Education*, 27, 1-51.
- Aikenhead, G.S. (2000). Renegotiating the culture of school science. In R. Millar, J. Leach, & J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education: The contribution of research*. Birmingham, UK: Open University Press, pp. 245-264.
- Aikenhead, G.S. (2002). Cross-cultural science teaching: *Rekindling Traditions* for Aboriginal students. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 2, 287-304.
- Aikenhead, G.S. (2003, August). *Review of research on humanistic perspectives in science curricula*. A paper presented at the European Science Education Research Association (ESERA) Conference, Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands. Available at: http://www.usask.ca/education/people/aikenhead/ESERA_2.pdf
- Alsop, S. (2003). Pupils, science, research, practice, and politics: Musings on the emergence of a pre-paradigmatic field. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 3, 281-285.
- Anderson, R.D., & Helms, J.V. (2001). The ideal of standards and the reality of schools: Needed research. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38, 3-16.
- Atkin, M., & Helms, J. (1993). Getting serious about priorities in science education. *Studies in Science Education*, 21, 1-20.
- Bartholomew, H., Osborne, J., Ratcliffe, M. (2002, April). *Teaching pupils 'ideas-about-science': Case studies from the classroom*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, New Orleans.
- Bell, R.L., & Lederman, N.G. (2003). Understandings of the nature of science and decision making on science and technology based issues. *Science Education*, 87, 352-377.
- Bingle, W.H., & Gaskell, P.J. (1994). Scientific literacy for decisionmaking and the social construction of scientific knowledge. *Science Education*, 78, 185-201.
- Brickhouse, N.W. (2001). Embodying science: A feminist perspective on learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38, 282-295.
- Bybee, R.W. (1993). *Reforming science education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Calabrese Barton, A. (2002). Urban science education studies: A commitment to equity, social justice and a sense of place. *Studies in Science Education*, 38, 1-38.
- Calabrese Barton, A., & Yang, K. (2000). The case of Miguel and the culture of power in science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37, 871-889.

- Campbell, B., Lazonby, J., Millar, R., Nicolson, P., Ramsden, J., & Waddington, D. (1994). Science: The Salters' approach – A case study of the process of large scale curriculum development. *Science Education*, 78, 415-447.
- Carlone, H.B. (2003). Innovative science within and against a culture of “achievement.” *Science Education*, 87, 307-328.
- 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, 392-414.
- Cobern, W.W. (1993). College students' conceptualizations of nature: An interpretive world view analysis. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 30, 935-951
- Cobern, W.W., & Aikenhead, G.S. (1998). Cultural aspects of learning science. In B.J. Fraser & K.G. Tobin (Eds.), *International handbook of science education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 39-52.
- Coles, M. (1997). What does industry want from science education? In K. Calhoun, R. Panwar & S. Shrum (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th symposium of IOSTE*. Vol. 1. Edmonton, Canada: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, pp. 292-300.
- Costa, V.B. (1995). When science is “another world”: Relationships between worlds of family, friends, school, and science. *Science Education*, 79, 313-333.
- David, M.R. (2003). *Biographical influences on teaching STSE: A case study*. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Saskatoon, Canada: University of Saskatchewan.
- Davidson, A., & Schibeci, R. (2000). The consensus conference as a mechanism for community responsive technology policy. In R.T. Cross & P.J. Fensham (Eds.), *Science and the citizen for educators and the public*. Melbourne: Arena Publications, pp. 47-59.
- Dimopoulos, K., & Koulaidis, V. (2003). Science and technology education for citizenship: The potential role of the press. *Science Education*, 87, 241-256.
- Donnelly, J.F. (2002). The ‘humanist’ critique of the place of science in the curriculum in the nineteenth century, and its continuing legacy. *History of Education*, 31, 535-555.
- Dori, Y.J., & Tal, R.T. (2000). Formal and informal collaborative projects: Engaging in industry with environmental awareness. *Science Education*, 84, 95-113.
- Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). *Young people's images of science*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Duggan, S., & Gott, R. (2002). What sort of science education do we really need? *International Journal of Science Education*, 24, 661-679.
- Eijkelhof, H.M.C. (1990). *Radiation and risk in physics education*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: University of Utrecht CDβ Press.
- Eijkelhof, H.M.C., & Lijnse, P. (1988). The role of research and development to improve STS education: Experiences from the PLON project. *International Journal of Science Education*, 10, 464-474.
- Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. (1996). Creating the conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33, 261-295.
- Elmore, R.F. (2003, March). *Large-scale improvement of teaching and learning: What we know, what we need to know*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Philadelphia.
- Fensham, P.J. (1985). Science for all: A reflective essay. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 17, 415-435.
- Fensham, P.J. (1992). Science and technology. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., pp. 789-829.
- Fensham, P.J. (1993). Academic influence on school science curricula. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 25, 53-64.

- Fensham, P.J. (1998). The politics of legitimating and marginalizing companion meanings: Three Australian case stories. In D.A. Roberts & L. Östman (Eds.), *Problems of meaning in science curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 178-192.
- Fensham, P.J. (2000). Issues for schooling in science. In R.T. Cross & P.J. Fensham (Eds.), *Science and the citizen for educators and the public*. Melbourne: Arena Publications, pp. 73-77.
- Fourez, G. (1997). Scientific and technological literacy as social practice. *Social Studies of Science*, 27, 903-936.
- Frederick, W.A. (1991). Science and technology education: An engineer's perspective. In S.K. Majumdar, L.M. Rosenfeld, P.A. Rubba, E.W. Miller & R.F. Schmalz (Eds.), *Science education in the United States: Issues, crises and priorities*. Easton, PA: The Pennsylvania Academy of Science, pp. 386-393.
- Furnham, A. (1992). Lay understanding of science: Young people and adults' ideas of scientific concepts. *Studies in Science Education*, 20, 29-64.
- Gardner, P.L. (1998). Students' interest in science and technology: Gender, age and other factors. In L. Hoffmann, A. Krapp, K.A. Renninger & J. Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and learning. Proceedings of the Seeon conference on interest and gender*. Kiel, Germany: IPN, University of Kiel, pp. 41-57.
- Gaskell, J.P. (1982). Science, technology and society: Issues for science teachers. *Studies in Science Education*, 9, 33-46.
- Gaskell, P.J. (1992). Authentic science and school science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 14, 265-272.
- Gaskell, P.J. (1994). Assessing STS literacy: What is rational? In K. Boersma, K. Kortland, & J. van Trommel (Eds.), *7th IOSTE symposium proceedings: Papers*. Part 1. Endrecht: IOSTE Conference Committee, pp. 309-320.
- Gaskell, J.P. (2003). Perspectives and possibilities in the politics of science curriculum. In R. Cross (Ed.), *A vision for science education: Responding to the work of Peter Fensham*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 139-152.
- Gaskell, P.J., & Hepburn, G. (1998). The course as token: A construction of/by networks. *Research in Science Education*, 28, 65-76.
- Hart, C. (2002). Framing curriculum discursively: Theoretical perspectives on the experience of VCE physics. *International Journal of Science Education*, 24, 1055-1077.
- Häussler, P., & Hoffmann, L. (2000). A curricular frame for physics education: Development, comparison with students' interests, and impact on students' achievement and self-concept. *Science Education*, 84, 689-705.
- Hennessy, S. (1993). Situated cognition and cognitive apprenticeship: Implications for classroom learning. *Studies in Science Education*, 22, 1-41.
- Holton, G. (2003). The *Project Physics Course*, then and now. *Science & Education*, 12, 779-786.
- Hughes, G. (2000). Marginalization of socioscientific material in science-technology-society science curricula: Some implications for gender inclusivity and curriculum reform. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37, 426-440.
- Hurd, P. (1991). Closing the educational gaps between science, technology, and society. *Theory into Practice*, 30, 1991, 251-259.
- Irwin, A.R. (1995). *Citizen science: A study of people, expertise and sustainable development*. New York: Routledge.
- Irwin, A.R. (2000). Historical case studies: Teaching the nature of science in context. *Science Education*, 84, 5-26.
- Jegede, O. (1996). Towards a culturally sensitive relevant science and technology education. (Mini-Symposium). In K. Calhoun, R. Panwar & S. Shrum (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th symposium of IOSTE*. Vol. 2. Edmonton, Canada: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, pp. 141-185.

- Jenkins, E. (2002). Linking school science education with action. In W-M. Roth & J. Désautels (Eds.), *Science education as/for sociopolitical action*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 17-34.
- Jenkins, E. (2004). Science education: Research, practice and policy. In E. Scanlon, P. Murphy, J. Thomas & E. Whitelegg (Eds.), *Reconsidering science learning*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 235-249.
- Jiménez-Aleizandre, M-P., & Pereiro-Muñoz, C. (2002). Knowledge producers or knowledge consumers? Argumentation and decision making about environmental management. *International Journal of Science Education*, 24, 1171-1190.
- Keiny, S. (1993). School-based curriculum development as a process of teachers' professional development. *Educational Action Research*, 1, 65-93.
- Keogh, M., & Malcolm, D. (in press). The science teacher as curriculum developer: Do you think it will rain today? In B. Gray, P. Naidoo & M. Savage (Eds.), *School science in Africa: Teaching to learn, learning to teach*. Cape Town, South Africa: AFCLIST-Juta.
- Klopfer, L.E., & Cooley, W.W. (1963). "The History of Science Cases" for high school in the development of student understanding of science and scientists. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 1, 33-47.
- Knain, E. (2001). Ideologies in school science textbooks. *International Journal of Science Education*, 23, 319-329.
- Kolstø, S.D. (2001a). *Science education for citizenship: Thoughtful decision-making about science-related social issues*. Unpublished doctoral thesis: Oslo, Norway: Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Oslo.
- Kolstø, S.D. (2001b). 'To trust or not to trust, ...' – pupils' ways of judging information encountered in a socio-scientific issues. *International Journal of Science Education*, 23, 877-901.
- Kortland, J. (2001). *A problem posing approach to teaching decision making about the waste issue*. Utrecht: Cdβ Press.
- Larson, J.O. (1995, April). *Fatima's rules and other elements of an unintended chemistry curriculum*. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco.
- Law, N. (2002). Scientific literacy: Charting the terrains of a multifaceted enterprise. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 2, 151-176.
- Lawrenz, F., & Gray, B. (1995). Investigation of worldview theory in a South African context. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 32, 555-568.
- Layton, D. (1991). Science education and praxis: The relationship of school science to practical action. *Studies in Science Education*, 19, 43-79.
- Layton, D., Jenkins, E., Macgill, S., & Davey, A. (1993). *Inarticulate science? Perspectives on the public understanding of science and some implications for science education*. Driffield, East Yorkshire, UK: Studies in Education.
- Leblanc, R. (1989). *Department of education summer science institute*. Halifax, Canada: Ministry of Education, PO Box 578.
- Lottero-Perdue, P.S., & Brickhouse, N.W. (2002). Learning on the job: The acquisition of scientific competence. *Science Education*, 86, 756-782.
- Mbajiorgu, N.M., & Ali, A. (2003). Relationship between STS approach, scientific literacy, and achievement in biology. *Science Education*, 87, 31-39.
- Millar, R. (1989). Bending the evidence: The relationship between theory and experiment in science education. In R. Millar (Ed.), *Doing science: Images of science in science education*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 38-61.
- Millar, R. (2000). Science for public understanding: Developing a new course for 16-18 year old students. In R.T. Cross & P.J. Fensham (Eds.), *Science and the citizen for educators and the public*. Melbourne: Arena Publications, pp. 201-214.

- Millar, R., Leach, J., & Osborne J. (Eds.) (2000). *Improving science education: The contribution of research*. Birmingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Osborne, J., & Collins, S. (2000). Pupils' and parents' views of the school science curriculum. London: Kings College London.
- 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, 692-720.
- Osborne, J., Duschl, R., & Fairbrother, B. (2003, March). *Breaking the mould? Teaching science for public understanding – lessons from the classroom*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Philadelphia.
- Ratcliffe, M. (1997). Pupil decision-making about socio-scientific issues within the science curriculum. *International Journal of Science Education*, 19, 167-182.
- Ratcliffe, M. (1999). Evaluation of abilities in interpreting media reports of scientific research. *International Journal of Science Education*, 21, 1085-1099.
- Reiss, M.J. (2000). *Understanding science lessons: Five years of science teaching*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press .
- Roth, W-M., & Désautels, J. (Eds.) (2002). *Science education as/for sociopolitical action*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Roth, W-M., & Désautels, J. (2004). Educating for citizenship: Reappraising the role of science education. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 4, 149-168.
- Roth, W-M., & Lee, S. (2004). Science education as/for participation in the community. *Science Education*, 88, 263-291.
- Ryder, J. (2001). Identifying science understanding for functional scientific literacy. *Studies in Science Education*, 36, 1-42.
- Sáez, M.J., & Carretero, A.J. (2002). The challenge of innovation: The new subject 'natural sciences' in Spain. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34, 343-363.
- Schwarz, 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, 205-236.
- Seymour, E., & Hewitt, N.M. (1997). *Talking about leaving the sciences*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Shapiro, B.L. (2004). Studying lifeworlds of science learning: A longitudinal study of changing ideas, contests, and personal orientations in science learning. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 4, 127-147.
- Sjøberg, S. (2000). Interesting all children in 'science for all'. In R. Millar, J. Leach, & J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education: The contribution of research*. Birmingham, UK: Open University Press, pp. 165-186.
- Sjøberg, S. (2002). Science and technology education in Europe: current challenges and possible solutions. *Connect (UNESCO)*, 27(3-4), 1-5.
- Sjøberg, S. (2003, August). *ROSE: The relevance of science education: Ideas and rationale behind a cross-cultural comparative project*. A paper presented at the European Science Education Research Association (ESERA) 2003 Conference, Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands.
- Smolicz, J.J., & Nunan, E.E. (1975). The philosophical and sociological foundations of science education: The demythologizing of school science. *Studies in Science Education*, 2, 101-143.
- Solomon, J. (1984). Prompts, cues and discrimination: The utilization of two separate knowledge systems. *European Journal of Science Education*, 6, 277-284.
- Solomon, J. (1994). Conflict between mainstream science and STS in science education. In J. Solomon & G. Aikenhead (Eds.), *STS education: International perspectives on reform*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 3-10.

- Solomon, J. (1997). New science education research for the new Europe? *Studies in Science Education*, 29, 93-124.
- Solomon, J., Duveen, J., Scot, L., & McCarthy, S. (1992). Teaching about the nature of science through history: Action research in the classroom. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 29, 409-421.
- Thier, H.D., & Nagle, B.W. (1996). Development and assessment of an issue-oriented middle school science course. In K. Calhoun, R. Panwar & S. Shrum (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th symposium of IOSTE*. Vol. 3. Edmonton, Canada: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, pp. 265-271.
- Walberg, H.J. (1991). Improving school science in advanced and developing countries. *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 25-69.
- Weinstein, M. (1998). Playing the paramecium: Science education from the stance of the cultural studies of science. *Educational Policy*, 12, 484-506.
- Welch, W.W. (1973). Review of the research and evaluation program of Harvard Project Physics. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 10, 365-378.
- Wynne, B. (1991). Knowledge in context. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 16, 111-121.
- Yager, R.E., & Tamir, P. (1993). STS approach: Reasons, intentions, accomplishments, and outcomes. *Science Education*, 77, 637-658.

Table 1. Categories of Relevance

Type of Relevance	Who Decides What is Relevant?
Wish-They-Knew Science:	Academic scientists, education officials, many science teachers.
Need-To-Know Science:	The general public who have faced and resolved real-life problems/decisions related to science and technology.
Functional Science:	People in science-based occupations.
Enticed-To-Know Science:	The media and internet sites.
Have-Cause-To-Know Science:	Experts who have interacted with the general public on real-life issues.
Personal-Curiosity Science:	Students themselves.
Science-As-Culture:	Interpreters of culture who can determine what aspects of science comprise features of a local, national, and global culture.