A CHANGE IN PERSPECTIVE: SCIENCE EDUCATION GRADUATE STUDENTS' REFLECTIONS ON LEARNING NOS

Renee' Schwartz (Contact author: r.schwartz@wmich.edu)
George Akom
Brandy Skjold
HangHwa Hong
Robert Kagumba
Fang Huang

Western Michigan University
The Mallinson Institute for Science Education

Abstract

Research emphasizes requirements of NOS knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, internalized beliefs in the importance of NOS, and intentional translation of this knowledge into explicit/reflective classroom instruction. Science educators conduct much of this research targeting K-16 arenas. Yet, a gap exists in the literature with respect to understanding how science educators come to their own understanding of NOS, NOS research, and NOS teaching. For systemic reform, graduate programs in science education need to provide NOS learning opportunities for future scholars and teacher educators. This study describes experiences of five science education graduate students' learning about NOS content, pedagogy and research throughout one year of their graduate program. We explore key turning points as they developed personal orientations toward NOS. The "change in perspective" experienced by these students was multifaceted. Motivation for learning NOS shifted from primarily external sources to internal sources. Internal motivating factors for learning and teaching NOS relate to goals as a science educator, and were especially instrumental regarding perceived value of NOS to science learners. Internal motivations yielded awareness of self and students. These critical appraisals and goals as future science educators appeared to be substantial contributing factors in internalizing the value of NOS as well as driving further NOS learning. Moreover, these were reported to be contributing factors in sustaining tenacity with planning, implementing, and reflecting on NOS teaching within science content courses. Establishing a consistent NOS focus throughout the graduate program; providing multiple exposures, requirements, and supports; and building upon graduate students' internal motivations for science education are recommended considerations for enabling future science educators to bring to bear NOS literacy goals.

Paper presented at the international meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, April 15-18, 2007. New Orleans, LA.

Paper available at: http://homepages.wmich.edu/~rschwart/

Introduction

It seems reasonable to say that most science educators today are products of science instruction that presented science as an objective and value-free process of discovering an empirical truth. Even though this position counters current perspectives on nature of science [NOS] (AAAS, 1993; Lederman, 2007; NRC, 2000), undergraduates (majors, nonmajors, future teachers) continue to describe science as "truth seeking," where the "scientific method" produces data in an objective way that reveals absolute answers (Abd-El-Khalick, 2001; Hanuscin, Akerson, & Phillipson-Mower, 2006; Ryder, Leach, & Driver, 1999). Even some scientists voice similar views regarding NOS (Schwartz, 2004; Schwartz & Lederman, in press). Graduate students in science education, the future scholars of science teaching and learning, are products of this tradition as well. Most graduate students who come to science education originated from k-12 teaching or science research communities. They have experienced a goal transition from science teaching or science research toward examining science teaching and learning from the perspective of research and teacher education. As science educators who teach and mentor these beginning scholars, we need to have an understanding of their perspectives and developments as learners. Such understanding is imperative to building and sustaining systemic reform toward scientific literacy (Abell, 1997). As it stands, this is an untapped pool of learners when it comes to understanding how they develop conceptions of NOS and NOS teaching (Irez, 2006). What are their motivations? What are their challenges? What experiences have impact on their views of NOS and science teaching? What experiences have impact on their teaching? How do they view themselves as learners and teachers of NOS? Our graduate students are the future leaders of science education. These are critical questions that warrant investigation. The current study reports the personal stories of five science education graduate students. This is a report of self-reflection, where the students assume a metacognitive perspective to examine developments in learning, teaching, and orientations toward NOS during their graduate program. We characterize experiential and personal factors that mediate developments.

Nature of Science

Nature of science refers to the qualities and assumptions that are inherent to the products of scientific inquiry (i.e. scientific knowledge). Reform documents (AAAS, 1990, 1993; NRC, 1996) and international science education efforts (see, for example, Hodson, 1998; Matthews, 1998; Osborne et al., 2003; Ryan & Aikenhead, 1992) present similar descriptions of NOS. These general tenets pose little disagreement according to current philosophical perspectives. Science education graduate students' learning of the following NOS aspects served to focus the present study. These are scientific knowledge is (a) *tentative*, or subject to revision based on new information or new perspective. Reasons for the inherent tentativeness of scientific knowledge stems from several other aspects including: (b) scientific knowledge has basis in *empirical evidence*, (c) collection and interpretation of empirical evidence is influenced by current scientific perspectives (*theory-laden* observations and interpretations) as well as *personal subjectivity* due to scientists' values, knowledge, and prior experiences, (d) scientific knowledge is the product of human *imagination and creativity*, and (e) scientific knowledge involves both *observation and inference*. These aspects also reinforce the durability of scientific knowledge. The empirical nature of science, while this aspect underlies the tentativeness of science, also negates an "anything goes" perspective. Scientific

knowledge is founded in data which are subject to interpretation (necessarily a theory-laden and socially influenced negotiation) and accepted within the community based on consistency and strength of argument. It cannot be overlooked that there is variability in the strength of the empirical foundation and argument upon which scientific knowledge is based. The knowledge is tentative, yes, yet nonetheless durable because of these other features. Another feature of scientific knowledge is (f) the functional difference and relative status between *scientific theories and laws.* Often associated with NOS, but reflective of the nature of scientific inquiry is that there is no single way in which all scientific investigations are conducted, e.g. (g) there is *no single scientific method.* Investigations are designed based on the questions posed and can follow a variety of approaches, including experimental (seeking cause/effect relationships) or descriptive, wherein there is no direct manipulation of variables.

Literature Review

"What does/should the professional development of the science education professorate look like?" (Abell,1997). Sandra Abell asked this question 10 years ago as she called for our commitment to better understand the growth and knowledge base of science teacher educators. She also asked, "Why is it that science educators have little to say about their own or their graduate students' professional development?" (Abell,1997). These concerns stem from the limited, at best, research focused on developing science educators. In response to such concerns, the Association for Science Teacher Education (ASTE, formerly AETS) developed *Professional Knowledge Standards for Science Teacher Educators* in 1997 (AETS, 1997). These standards apply to "Science Teacher Educators," who include:

- Faculty in higher education who provide course work in science subject matter and/or science pedagogy
- School-based mentor teachers
- Personnel in schools who provide professional development activities
- Personnel from agencies other than universities or schools who provide for the professional development of science teachers

Included among the standards is that science teacher educators should have knowledge about the philosophy, sociology, and history of science. They should be articulate in current perspectives of NOS and knowledgeable of difficulties prospective teachers have with conceptual and pedagogical developments. In the 10 years since the publication of these standards, we still know very little. A gap exists in the literature with respect to understanding how science educators develop as professionals in general, and with respect to how they develop understanding of NOS, specifically.

Developing Teachers' Knowledge of NOS

Science educators have been addressing how students and teachers learn NOS and examining effective means of teaching NOS. The research suggests varied complexities in developing conceptions of NOS (Lederman, 2007). Implicit approaches are not as successful as explicit approaches in aiding learners' NOS conceptual development (Abd-El-Khalick & Lederman, 2000). Contexts that provide inquiry experiences and guide reflection *on* those experiences are influential to NOS learning (Bianchini & Colburn, 2000; Lederman, 2007; Schwartz, Lederman, & Crawford, 2004). Studies of pedagogical content knowledge [PCK] for NOS and factors associated with teachers' abilities to teach NOS are among current research agendas (Abd-El-Khalick &

Lederman, 2000; Schwartz & Lederman, 2002). Extant research exploring means of effective teaching about NOS consistently emphasize requirements of NOS knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, internalized beliefs in the importance of NOS, and intentional translation of this knowledge into explicit/reflective classroom instruction (Akerson & Abd-El-Khalick, 2003; Khishfe & Abd-El-Khkalick, 2002; Lederman, 2007; Schwartz & Lederman, 2002). Science educators conduct much of this research targeting K-16 teachers and learners of science. They not only need to have knowledge within the same domains as K-16 teachers to effectively teach NOS, they also have the added requirement of developing knowledge of how to teach teachers concepts of NOS and NOS teaching.

Irez (2006) examined NOS views of 15 Turkish preservice science teacher educators. Through analysis of interviews and cognitive maps, Irez determined that the future science teacher educators held inadequate conceptions regarding NOS, especially relative to scientific method and the tentativeness of scientific knowledge. Twelve of the 15 agreed that there was a single, universal, scientific method. Sixty percent reported absolutist views of science, seeing "scientific laws as the final form of scientific knowledge representing truth and, therefore, not subject to change" (Irez, 2006, p. 1127). The author reported a lack of previous interest in and reflection about NOS as contributing to the participants' views. The content-based science curriculum may be a contributing factor. "As the products of such an education, it is not surprising that these participants were left with a range of misconceptions or naïve beliefs about NOS" (p. 1137). Irez suggests that such inadequate conceptions could be detrimental on practical (classroom) and policy levels (science teacher education programs).

Volkmann and Zgagacz (2004) investigated the learning experiences of a graduate teaching assistant as she taught an undergraduate inquiry-based physics course. By utilizing orientation and identity frameworks, they determined that NOS beliefs may relate to teaching orientations. Change in teacher identity and teaching orientation requires reflection on views and practice. The authors pose several recommendations for science education programs, including consistency with promoting inquiry orientations and course work in teaching and learning of NOS.

Consistency and multiple experiences that reinforce NOS and challenge learners to reflect on personal NOS views and practices are recommended for promoting and internalizing NOS views of preservice science teachers (e.g. Akerson et al., 2006; Lederman, Schwartz, Abd-El-Khalick, & Bell, 2001; Schwartz & Lederman, 2002). In a study of preservice elementary teachers, Akerson et al. (2006) examined retention of NOS views 5 months after a science methods course that emphasized explicit/reflective NOS. They found that despite enhanced views immediately after the methods course, several had reverted back to their more naïve NOS views. Akerson et al. suggest possible strategies to improve conceptual development, including use of metacognitive strategies and prompts to contextualize their views within classroom activities. Indeed prior research demonstrates the effectiveness of aiding teachers' NOS views and abilities to teach NOS by offering examples of content-embedded NOS instruction and support with implementation (Akerson & Abd-El-Khalick, 2003; Hanuscin et al., 2006; Lederman et al., 2001).

Purpose of the Study

Given the needs of science teacher educators and given the requirements for effective learning and teaching of NOS, there is a need to explore how science education programs affect future science educators' views of NOS and factors that influence their teaching practice and decisions regarding curriculum development. The present study examines developments of five science education graduate students as they learn about NOS and attempt to teach and conduct

research on NOS. The purpose of this study is to characterize experiences and associated cognitive, affective, and practical impacts on science education graduate students' orientations to NOS teaching.

Method

This exploratory study utilizes a qualitative approach with elements of narrative case study conducted from a constructivist perspective. Yin (1994) describes a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" and "in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (p. 13). We adopted a constructivist, naturalistic approach. By exploring and describing science education graduate students' experiences vis-à-vis the learning and teaching of NOS, the study aims at making "meaning within a natural setting" (Williamson et. al, 2002). A constructivist approach is adopted because the study makes meaning out of individuals' accounts of their experiences. Darke et al (1998) states that the interpretation is based on the "ontology in which reality is subjective, a social product constructed and interpreted by humans as social actors according to their beliefs and value systems." This is self-study, in that five of the researchers are also the participants. Through self reflections, the group explored personal experiences. The primary researcher, not a participant, served to guide the reflections and data analysis.

Participants

The participants are five graduate students in science education (Table 1). Four of the five are working toward a Ph.D. in Science Education and the fifth is working toward a Master's Degree in Science Education. When the study began, three were in their first year in their respective programs and two were in their second year. Four students had previous teaching experience at the middle school, high school or undergraduate science. All five have a Bachelor's degree in a science area; four hold Master's degrees, and one a PhD. The group is culturally diverse, with each originating and being educated in a different country. Only one, Brandy, said she had heard of NOS prior to the beginning of the study in the fall of 2005. All are supported through teaching assistantships in the undergraduate science courses for elementary education majors.

Context of the study

The science education graduate program that provides the context for the present study is situated within an Institute which is in the College of Arts and Sciences at a large Midwestern university. The institute has ten faculty and approximately 15 full time graduate students at both the master's and doctoral levels. Doctoral students are required to take five core courses, including two semesters of a research traditions course with variable topics depending on the expertise of the professor leading the course. The five participants of this study enrolled in one of these research traditions courses in the fall of 2005. The course instructor (the primary researcher) focused the course on research in nature of science. In the spring of 2006, the five participants and the same professor formed a NOS research group in order to continue their conversations and conduct various NOS-related research projects designed by the students (see description of research traditions course below). This group met several times over the semester and summer to discuss research progress, goals, and findings. In the fall of 2006, the five students were enrolled in a methods course for college science teaching, again taught by the same professor. The methods course provided opportunity for planning, practicing, and reflecting upon NOS instruction within science content courses. All of the participants were also teaching their own section of an

undergraduate science course as part of their assistantship. The two courses, the research group, and teaching responsibilities provided common experiences for these five students as they learned about NOS and attempted to teach NOS within their respective science disciplines. Further details of the two courses and research group, as they attended to issues of NOS, are provided here.

The Research Traditions Course

In the fall of 2005, the topic of the Research Traditions course was "Perspectives and practices of research in Nature of Science." The course was taught by a faculty member with experience in NOS research and teaching (primary researcher). The class met 3 hours a week for 15 weeks. This course focused on what NOS is, what and how research on views of NOS has been conducted, current issues in NOS research, and future directions for NOS research. The goals of the course included that students will (1) gain knowledge and experience with past and current NOS assessments, research practices, and teaching practices, (2) conduct a literature review, and (3) prepare a research proposal for investigating NOS views and/or teaching. The beginning of the semester focused on developing conceptions of NOS by engaging in numerous NOS activities, discussions, personal and group reflections. Students initial NOS views were elicited through the VNOS-C survey (Lederman et al., 2002). Instruction modeled an explicit/reflective approach to teach NOS. Group activities such as "the tube," "tricky tracks," "pattern cubes," and "fossil fragments" (Lederman & Abd-El-Khalick, 1998) and "mystery bones" (Lederman & Lederman, 2005), readings from philosophy of science (e.g. Thomas Kuhn) and science education (complete reading list available upon request) further introduced NOS aspects and prompted reflective discussions. Through discussions, students were asked to compare their initial views with those presented through the course. Various writing assignments required them to discuss their NOS views, views of the place of NOS within science teaching, and reactions to readings. The next segments of the course focused on traditions of NOS assessments, research techniques, and the progression of research in NOS teaching and learning. Assignments included readings and reflective writings about philosophy of science and science education literature, observations/reflections of science teaching, observations/reflections of science research, interviews with college science instructors and scientists, analysis of various NOS assessments, analysis of VNOS written and interview responses, and preparation/presentation of a NOS research proposal. Throughout the course we held discussions about how views have been challenged, why, and the impact on views and practice of science teaching.

NOS Research Group

We initiated group meetings to discuss research and teaching progress. The intent was to build a research group that would maintain motivation established during the research course through continuing discussion and goal setting. This group consists of the five graduate students and the faculty member (the NOS researcher). Four of the five students conducted their proposed study during a qualitative practicum course the spring 2006 semester, taught through a different department. George decided not to pursue his original proposed study at that time, realizing the difficulty with finding participants who teach both NOS and history of science. Three have completed their studies. One presented her study at a conference (Hong, Schwartz, & Holms, 2006).

The College Science Methods Course

In the fall of 2006, the five students took a methods course for college science teaching, taught by the same faculty member. There were 11 students total in the course, all graduate students

in science education. The course met for three hours, once a week for 15 weeks. The course emphasized "active learning" and teaching of NOS within all science disciplines, and within a variety of instructional strategies and contexts (e.g. large lecture, discussion, laboratory, inductive, and deductive approaches). The course included model lessons, readings, reflective writings, and discussions targeting explicit/reflective NOS pedagogy embedded within science content courses. Students conducted classroom observations and interviews of university faculty, aiming to elucidate enacted and perceived objectives, including NOS. They were asked to describe the image of science portrayed in the observed classes and expressed by the instructors, the demonstrated roles of the instructors and learners, and how these align with constructivist perspectives and current views of NOS. Self (through video-taping) and peer observations of teaching in the undergraduate science courses also enabled focused attention on NOS, in addition to other teaching and learning factors of interest to the students (e.g. management, questioning strategies, levels of inquiry, etc.). Students designed a syllabus and full unit lesson plans for an introductory undergraduate science course, where they were required to include goals and objectives for NOS, explicit/reflective NOS instruction, and NOS assessments. Students were required to include NOS objectives within their model lesson plans for a lecture and a laboratory session. They were also required to design and present an inquiry-based lesson that targeted NOS aspects tied with other science content. Knowledge of college students as learners, typical misconceptions about NOS and other science content, goals of reform in science education, and the role of college science instructors were emphasized throughout the course.

Teaching Assistantship: Undergraduate science content courses

The five graduate students serve as instructors in the undergraduate program for elementary education majors. Three of them teach biology, one in chemistry, and one in physics. All of the courses are laboratory, inquiry-based science designed for the needs of future elementary teachers.

Data Sources and Analysis

We needed to examine the phenomenon (learning about NOS) from within the real life context (the daily experiences of the graduate students in the program) (Yin, 1994). Thus data collection spanned nearly 18 months and data analysis proceeded in an iterative fashion. Data sources comprised their initial VNOS survey, reflective writings (narratives and written impact statements), field notes from discussions and meetings, and a videotaped group discussion. Data were analyzed through a constant comparative method, in that themes emerged from initial data sources and comparisons, refinements, and additions were made as necessary throughout the study.

In the summer of 2006, the group decided they needed written descriptions of their personal experiences and reflections from the year that related to their growth in understanding, teaching, and research on NOS. The purpose was to identify themes from these experiences and how they might affect NOS learning as well as the future teaching and research endeavors of the graduate students. One of the participants designed a guideline for the narratives which served as a starting point for generating and organizing the reflections (Appendix). The guidelines include providing background information about education and work experience, initial perspectives on NOS, significant events in understanding NOS, future expectations of using NOS, and problems encountered in both learning and applying NOS. None of the participants read or advised any of the others on their writing to ensure that all responses were accurate individual assessments of each participant's experiences. These narratives were analyzed through an inductive approach (Bogdin & Biklin, 1990) to identify themes among experiences and perspectives. In addition, the data were

analyzed to distinguish differences among the five narratives that can be attributed to personal factors such as their different cultural influences. Data also include responses to the VNOS questionnaire that participants provided during their first week of the initial course. These responses provide description of initial views and were compared to participants' perceived initial views as reported in their narratives.

During meetings of the NOS research group, discussions centered around experiences, challenges, successes, and perceived developments in NOS views and practices. These discussions were documented through field notes. Notable experiences, changes, and rationales were recorded.

Experiences and influences from the methods course were included in a "written impact statement" (Appendix). The impact statements provided a comprehensive reflection on learning experiences and personal developments throughout the year. Each participant reviewed all the statements and provided initial analysis to identify common themes represented by the group. We then held a group discussion to share analyses, review the reflections, and gain consensus on themes from the data. The "trustworthiness of inferences drawn from the data" was ensured through the self-study and reflective comparisons (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992).

The primary researcher then reviewed all data again for confirming and disconfirming instances, further reducing and altering the categories as needed to describe types of experiences and personal factors that represent the graduate students' learning of NOS.

Results

The results are presented first through summary of the graduate students personal narratives and impact statements that describe reactions and turning points as they learned NOS. The summaries give an indication of the unique perspectives each graduate student associates with NOS. They also show how all five students went down a common path, leading from confusion to enlightenment regarding their understanding and application of NOS. Yet, there are distinct differences in orientations and motivations. Second, we summarize initial NOS views and changes in views. This establishes the baseline to describe personal challenges, perspectives, and growth. Through the NOS research course, science teaching methods course, teaching attempts, and research endeavors over almost 18 months, all of the students demonstrated substantial conceptual change. Next, we describe NOS teaching attempts. Finally, we present themes that emerged from the comprehensive data analysis. We provide statements of personal voice that are representative of reflections.

Personal Reflections: Perspectives and Impacts

Brandy: Before taking the course on NOS research, I was frustrated and confused by my past experiences in science. Most of my coursework and teaching had been in Biology. I had always been taught that science is important and absolutely fundamental in education. I was given the impression that it deserved a place of prominence when compared to other subjects. However, my experiences in the [research] labs and the classroom led me to believe that science was arbitrary and subjective. I had a difficult time trying to justify this and was becoming frustrated with science in general. I was also finding it difficult to be confident in teaching the subject because I was losing interest in it. After taking the nature of science course I realized that subjectivity, creativity and tentativeness are a part of science. However, I no longer feel this reduces science's credibility, because I no longer see science as being more important than other subjects. I was holding science to a different, and inappropriate, standard than other types of study. This new realization [from the

NOS research course] allowed me to justify my interest in it, has given me a new confidence to teach science. I feel I now truly understand what I am teaching and I can discern appropriate situations in which science should be emphasized…..I tend to concentrate on the areas of law and theory, especially when discussing evolution. I also incorporate tentativeness and social/cultural aspects into lectures, often through the use of historical perspectives on the topics….I tend to miss opportunities to discuss creativity, which I could incorporate into small group modeling activities I do. I also tend to avoid the idea of empirical knowledge, because I have a difficult time distinguishing it from objectivity (versus subjectivity, which I often incorporate into discussion on social/cultural contexts). The roadblocks I have in teaching NOS is the students I am teaching, as well as other faculty. Students get frustrated when asked to learn in ways they have never learned before [use of inquiry]. They have learned that science is something different from what I am teaching them…[Note: Brandy has incorporated explicit/reflective NOS instruction into an undergraduate biology course for elementary education majors, under the supervision of the primary researcher. She has collected pre/post data on student learning of NOS. Data analysis is pending.]

Fang. As Chinese, we are growing up in an environment that the dominant dogma is materialism… In our mind, science represents truth, equality, and authority. Few of us ever questioned the rules, theory, or the law of theory we learned. I first heard about NOS in the research course. My feeling was like walking in a maze, having not even a little clue, which is very uncomfortable. It was hard to change and accept an almost opposite view. I did not get the idea of NOS until after experiencing formal instruction, authentic observation and group discussion for about two months. It was a gradual process, from doubting and unbelieving, to confusing, and understanding and believing finally. I felt shocked since the perceptions of science that have been rooted in my mind for over twenty years suddenly had to change. The most effective experiences were the hands-on NOS activities and minds-on questions from the class. Discussions made me clarify and deepen my personal understanding. I think this is a crucial part for people to understand NOS. The other impressive experience was observing a science Ph.D student. I could describe aspects of NOS in his work. However, as a teacher, I still feel difficult to put NOS in my lecture. What is the good topic and what is the good time to insert NOS are two big problems for me.

After summer 2006, I took the college methods course and prepared for the comprehensive examination about NOS. [These experiences (reading of more research, practical application through lesson planning)] helped me develop deeper understanding of NOS, and made me to understand how to design a NOS lesson within science context and how to teach. To speak in detail beyond what is the meaning of NOS and how to assess people's view of NOS that taught before, both the method course and preparation of comps broadened my knowledge of NOS. Comparing what I learned before which is more theoretical, these knowledge helped me realize the value, the meaning, and the usage of NOS research. In other word, these knowledge made me to understand the importance of NOS, which actually improved my motivation in learning NOS. The methods course facilitated me to teach NOS in science context. Understanding NOS does not mean being able to teach it. I have the same problem as many teachers described in many researches. I was able to tell students what the meaning of NOS, for example what the subjectivity of science means. But I can only explain it with very limited sentences that learned from the articles. I felt that my lecture of NOS would be very abstract and boring. So at that time, I did not have enough courage and belief to teach NOS. The methods course provided some good examples of teaching NOS in science context, which make me to get familiar with this type of class and get a sense of how to teach NOS in a science context. The assignment of NOS teaching plan in this course has the direct effect on my

view of NOS teaching. Under the pressure of the assignment, I started to think seriously how to design a class. It took me some time and efforts on searching materials, examples discussing with colleagues, but it was really a very good experience. After some hard work, some ideas came up. I started to understand where to put NOS in the science context and how to integrate both NOS and subject knowledge to teach. This experience not only helped me learn how to teach NOS, but also improved my confidence in NOS teaching.

Hang Hwa. I'm a scientist and also a science teacher educator. The NOS research course was the first time for me to learn and to think about NOS. At that time, I didn't realize that to know the knowledge of NOS could help me to understand and to expand my ideas for science. Now, I'm sure that NOS will help pupils to be interested to do science. I first thought that NOS was very easy and common for scientists. However, when I got a question about "What is the NOS?" I couldn't answer it quickly. The main experiences that impacted my knowledge were realizing my uncertain ideas for NOS, having an expert who could check my ideas for NOS, and then trying to teach NOS to inservice and preservice teachers. As I prepared to teach a methods course in my country [during the summer], I reviewed the NOS materials and publications. I discussed with the students about NOS. The aspects of NOS became clearer to me. Teaching experience gave me an assurance to teach NOS explicitly. The students reflected that if NOS is taught explicitly, their pupils could feel that science is very interesting instead of boring. I now have many ideas for research in science education. I conducted a research study of Korean preservice elementary teachers' NOS views. Conducting the interviews and analyzing the data impacted my NOS views. I had to reread the NOS articles because I want to get clearer framework for research analysis. At that moment, I could find more information from references. I'm pretty sure that information already there when I read it, however, I just ignore some points because I didn't realize that those information in every each line are important for my research. If I stopped in there to think about NOS aspect after the [first NOS research] course, I might stop to keep different views of NOS and probably back to chaos about aspects of NOS. Teaching is a good chance to think more deeply about aspects of NOS since it was a challenge to say aspects of NOS explicitly and research procedures also helped me as a kind of beginner of informed view of NOS. [Note: Hang Hwa has incorporated explicit/reflective NOS instruction into an undergraduate biology course for elementary education majors, under the supervision of the primary researcher. She has collected pre/post data on student learning of NOS. Data analysis is pending.]

George: Coming from Anglophone Cameroon where is a tradition of discipline-specific science teaching and learning, I went through many 'missed opportunities' in my struggle to understand what science really is. I knew science as a compartmentalized body of undisputable facts which was done by following a rigid set of procedures. There is the unavoidable reliance on textbooks which are like bibles. From this perspective, it does not matter if students understand how scientific knowledge is developed. What is important is making the grades and going out to get a job. Later as a science teacher and trainer the cycle was to continue. NOS eluded me till twenty-five years after my formal initiation into science. With my enrolment into a graduate program in science education and taking a NOS research course my perspective of science and science education was to be dramatically overhauled. At first it did not make much sense to me. It was only through careful reflection that I could come to terms with 'this stuff known as NOS'. I do not only see science now as this body of knowledge and processes which students have to know so as to pass exams, but also as a way of knowing. At this moment I cannot stop wondering if Cameroonian students are actually

becoming scientifically literate and what effect this has on the society. This leaves me thinking about what can be done in bringing about a change in the teaching and learning of science in Cameroon.

Through subsequent courses I have been able to put into practice some of the ideas I learned in the research course. Two courses involving learning theories and college science teaching have helped me shape my ideas and use of NOS. During these courses there have been opportunities to incorporate aspects of NOS in the learning process, most significant of which were the creating of lesson plans and presenting of micro-lessons. This helped me face and overcome the challenges involved in understanding and teaching NOS. I had to re-read some writings on NOS in order to properly use them. Through use of NOS I became more confident and motivated to incorporate NOS in my teaching. I am able to freely include and discuss many aspects of NOS during my lessons. A very important discovery for me has been the use of history in the teaching of NOS. I feel my teaching has improved because I am able to explain certain issues in science to my students in more appropriate and convincing manner. I still struggle a bit with explaining aspects such as the distinction between theories and laws to the students. The engrained nature of their earlier views makes it more challenging for me. This hasn't been free of frustration for me. My greatest frustration has been having some students still asking for "right answers" or "right procedures." However, I think I am expecting a fast change when it was not that easy for me to understand some of the aspects of NOS. This consoles me and teaches me to be persistent but gentle in guiding students to an appreciation of NOS. I am learning more and more about NOS as time goes by.

Robert: Since my primary education I had been told that science establishes facts that are very close to the truth and if science says, it is so. I had been told and I had learned that science made such great progress and advancement because of its tested and proven scientific method. These were my thoughts coming into the graduate program. Funny, but at the end of the first session of the NOS research course, I was in denial. Letting go of the scientific method was a very great problem for me until I internalized the role creativity plays in science. It was new to me to know that there are values and norms that govern science and its products. Something that gave me confidence to associate freely with the body of knowledge called science for my life is really the value laden NOS. It was a great relief for me to know that there are social cultural values carried with every scientific endeavor. This realization gave me a boost of self esteem for then I knew that African science can be accepted as a contribution to the global scientific movement. Remember I came into the [NOS research] class knowing that the globally accepted science is western science. The class activities like the Mystery tube, the foot prints, etc., and the group discussions played a great role in helping me learn **about** science instead of science. Right now I can try to evaluate scientific statements; I can participate comfortably in science related debates. My confidence to voice out my scientific opinions has greatly improved and my science teaching has greatly improved. Now I can teach through inquiry with a little bit more confidence than before. Even with all this long strides into the better understanding about science, I've needed help especially in the pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) area to enable me teach NOS with confidence.

The college science methods course greatly helped me acquire the PCK to teach NOS. The methods course helped me acquire the strategy to identify the learner's misconception and come up with an activity that will help that learner drop their conception. Moreover, take on the accepted scientific conception. The different peer teaching presentations from various scientific disciplines helped me polish up and internalize further NOS. I also studied the phenomenon of teaching NOS in the middle school. I gained great insights into the NOS views of middle school teachers. I also come

to appreciate that the teachers do not differentiate clearly about teaching by inquiry and teaching NOS. This makes them unable to plan to teach NOS; those who try, they do it implicitly.

My view of science as a conscious human activity has been greatly strengthened. I have with greater confidence to discuss and explore other opinions in class. I found out that the tentativeness, empirical, observation vs. inference, creativity and subjective aspects of NOS are easy to embed in my teaching material. At least I plan with fair ease to incorporate any of these in my lessons. The social cultural context and functional relationships of theory and law have been the hardest to embed in my teaching material.

Changes in NOS Views

The VNOS-C and initial discussions elicited conceptions of eight NOS aspects (tentativeness, subjectivity, creativity, empirical NOS, difference between observation and inference, difference between theory and law, sociocultural embeddedness of science, multiple scientific methods). All of the graduate students began with fairly positivist perspectives of NOS. Four of the five reported being comfortable with the ideas that science is objective, authoritative, and value-free. Three of the five reported that there is a single scientific method. The two who considered multiple investigative approaches (Brandy and Hang Hwa) were the only two to also initially describe the role of creativity in development of scientific knowledge. Only one, Brandy, viewed scientific knowledge as inherently tentative. Overall Brandy held views more aligned with current NOS perspectives than the others. Her VNOS responses indicated consistency with current views on seven of the eight aspects examined. The others held aligned views for one to three aspects. Robert was the only one to describe a functional difference between theories and laws, although he still thought scientific knowledge could be absolute (although unlikely) and objective.

Throughout the reflective study, the participants indicated dramatic positive shifts in their conceptual understanding and affective commitments to NOS. Through discussions and course work, all demonstrated enhanced views of NOS and developed pedagogical strategies to teach NOS within science content courses. Rather than devote our attention in this paper to the nature of the advancements in NOS conceptual understanding, we focus our results on influential factors associated with change. In the summaries of personal reflections, the graduate students describe their advances and reasons for change.

Teaching NOS in Undergraduate Science Courses

Teaching Attempts

All five reported success, to different degrees, in incorporating explicit/reflective NOS into their undergraduate science courses. Brandy and HangHwa were under the supervision of the primary researcher in their planning and teaching for their biology classes. NOS was already embedded through objectives, instruction, and assessments. Nonetheless, they needed to negotiate for themselves how best to address relevant NOS aspects within the biology content. George, Robert, and Fang had more independence with their NOS teaching choices. Most common NOS aspects addressed were tentativeness, subjectivity, observation and inference, and multiple scientific methods. For all five, finding appropriate contexts to distinguishing between theory and law and teaching about the social and cultural NOS were more difficult.

George embraced the use of history of science to address NOS topics in his chemistry class. For example, he used historical models of atomic structure to discuss social/cultural influences, tentativeness, and observation/inference. George would ask students to make connections from examples and NOS. Within an historical context, George would ask, "What does this tell you about

NOS?" As the semester progressed, he reports increased confidence and insight into how to utilize historical examples to teach NOS. "I incorporate NOS with everything now."

Robert, HangHwa, and Brandy utilize group discussion to raise NOS connections within science contexts. Through questioning strategies, they aimed to challenge students to think about how class activities and investigations represent specific aspects of NOS. Robert has embraced the essence of creativity and social/cultural influences. He wants his students to know that their ideas are important and that everyone can be successful with science. His prior view of teaching science as factual, through methodical procedures, is gone. Nonetheless, there were challenges with implementing this new perspective.

Challenges with Teaching NOS

Challenges spanned from curricular restrictions to feelings of low efficacy in abilities to teach NOS. All the participants recognized the need for informed NOS views as well as multiple examples that mesh with the science content of their courses. Although they report having better understanding of NOS, teaching was another matter, at least initially. Within the undergraduate science courses offered for elementary education majors, challenges for all stemmed from not seeing connections with the science content, not explicitly planning to teach NOS, and having to maintain consistency with the other sections of the course. The undergraduate courses have multiple sections, taught by other graduate students and faculty. The teaching teams for respective undergraduate science courses meet weekly to discuss upcoming lessons. With the exception of Brandy and HangHwa, the participants reported that these meetings either never did, or did so sporadically; attend to embedding NOS within the specific content or context. The external constraints were considered barriers, but only to an extent. Internal motivations for teaching NOS needed to be realized. How important is NOS to my students? We discuss below external and internal factors influencing successful teaching practice as they relate to conceptual knowledge, efficacy, and pedagogical content knowledge.

Factors Influencing NOS Conceptual Knowledge and Practice

We present categories and descriptive themes that describe the perceived influential factors on developing NOS conceptions and teaching practices. Recall that influential factors are based on self reports from the participant researchers. We provide representative quotes to support our inferences. Many of the quotes are also presented within the individual summary statements above.

Initial Reactions to and Rationales about NOS Views

The novelty of NOS

None of the graduate students had every considered NOS in an explicit manner. The NOS concept was novel, and this surprised them, especially given their science backgrounds. Although Brandy had rather informed conceptions of NOS, she, like all the others really had not heard of NOS before the research course.

> "I had no idea what [NOS] was or why anyone would have studied it. I assumed it [NOS research course] was going to be a discussion about each of the four major science disciplines. When I finally did realize that NOS was simply about science in general and what it is, I was relatively taken aback. It has never occurred to me that someone could define science…" [Brandy, initial narrative]

> "I am a scientist and also a science teacher educator….[NOS research course] was the first time for me to learn and to think about the NOS." [HangHwa, initial narrative]

> "It was a gradual process, from doubting and unbelieving, to confusing, and understanding and believing finally. I felt shocked since the perceptions of science that have been rooted in my mind for over twenty years suddenly had to change." [Fang, initial narrative]

> "Since my primary education I had been told that science establishes facts that are very close to the truth and if science says, it is so. I had been told and I had learned that science made such great progress and advancement because of its tested and proven scientific method. These were my thoughts coming into the graduate program. Funny, but at the end of the first session of the NOS research course, I was in denial."[Robert, initial narrative]

Impact of prior science learning and teaching experiences: Awareness of the disconnect between how science was taught and NOS

As depicted in Robert's quote above, prior science learning and teaching experiences, that presented science as objective, truthful, and value-free, was considered a major impact on initial views.

> "I was always taught science in this way. So that is how I always thought science is." [George, initial narrative]

> "Whatever majoring in engineering or higher education, I never heard about NOS, not to mention to learn or attend any program about it." [Fang, initial narrative]

> "The NOS was foreign to me, even as a graduate student. I was taught that one thing that has made science very successful is the scientific method. I knew that this method was universal, there by making science universal…I knew that science was very objective and free of values. I had this mind set that there is only one science through out all cultures and it was not a social construct at all. Science was there and men and women just discovered it." [Robert, final narrative]

Impact of culture on initial views of NOS and science teaching

All five participants were raised and educated in a different country (Table 1). In discussions about prior experiences and embedded perspectives about science, participants' cultural origins and worldviews provided rationale.

> "As Chinese, we are growing up in an environment that the dominant dogma is materialism. From elementary school, we have been taught that there is no divinity or supernatural beings, all the legends are fictive, all that we can believe is the true and absolute material world. Subsequently, in terms of science, we trust it, and respect scientists as well since in our mind. We believe without any doubts that scientists strictly follow well-designed procedure. In our mind, science represents truth, equality, and authority. Few of us ever questioned the rules, theory, or the law of theory we learned." [Fang, initial narrative]

> "I came into the [NOS research] class knowing that the globally accepted science is western science." [Robert, impact statement]

Factors Associated with Developments in NOS Conceptual Knowledge and Practice

From the reflections on experience and rationales for decisions, we have identified external and internal (personal) factors that were influential in learning of NOS. External factors relate to programmatic components (things graduate students have to do). Internal factors relate to personal motivations. At times the effects of the factors are indistinguishable; as internal motivations (mastery or performance) are triggered through external pressures of course assignments, for example. Motivations to succeed, for example, manifest through external impulses. The following categories represent the reported influential features of student experience, but the effects of any one should not be considered in isolation.

What experiences were influential?

The group addressed this question multiple times throughout the study. As new experiences arose, they reflected on the impact as well as reconsidered impacts of earlier experiences. Programmatic components including the two courses (NOS research and College Science Methods), teaching experiences, NOS research projects, and group support were reported to be main influences. Elements within these components that served as triggers for NOS developments are discussed here.

Graduate Courses

Both the NOS Research course and the College Science Methods course were considered influential on views of NOS, views of NOS teaching, and abilities to teach NOS. This finding is certainly not a surprise, given the focus of the courses. The more interesting elements are the graduate students' descriptions of learning components within and across the courses that they feel challenged them to consider personal NOS views as well as views of science teaching and learning. These elements include consistency of NOS message; opportunity/requirement to formalize NOS views, opportunity/requirement to evaluate NOS views relative to others', to readings, and to activities; requirement of planning NOS objectives and instruction in lesson plans; requirement of including NOS in lesson presentations; feedback from faculty and peers; observations and interviews of college science teaching/teachers; requirement of reflective discussions and writings. These elements were present within one or both courses experienced by the group.

NOS Research Course

The NOS research course positively impacted all of the graduate students with respect to enhancing their conceptual understanding of NOS, and raised awareness of NOS teaching issues. The degree of enhancement varied, but all report profound enlightenment regarding awareness of NOS and awareness of the importance of NOS to science teaching. Robert began the course with beliefs in science as objective and product of a single scientific method. He describes his conceptual change from the course:

> "After my experience in the [NOS research course], my conception of what science is and what it is not changed completely. The knowledge I got out of the course took me to a completely different way of examining scientific claims. I came to understand and appreciate that scientific knowledge is tentative and there was never a mighty scientific method. I learned to appreciate that prior knowledge plays a big role in the observations

> scientists make. This makes science subjective and debatable." [Robert, final impact statement]

Influential factors from the course included *NOS activities, group discussions, teaching observations, readings, and reflections*. The simple, non-threatening NOS activities that introduced the concepts were thought to be an important introduction that provided common experience to base discussion about the more philosophical issues and personal controversies. Observing and reflecting on college science teaching (assigned activities for the course) raised awareness of how science is typically presented as misaligned with NOS. These experiences also provided context for group discussion.

> "I really began to understand what was meant by NOS when we conducted observations of classroom teaching. I observed a course that I had formerly taught and felt constrained by the ideas of right and wrong answers or methodology. It was through this observation and subsequent interview with the instructor that I realized that we are told by others that science is strict and all-knowing, but we understand within ourselves that it is not…the conflict is there, not just in me, but in others and that conflict needs to be resolved." [Brandy, initial narrative]

College Science Methods Course

The methods course provided opportunity for further consideration of NOS as integral to learning objectives. The course further advanced NOS conceptual understanding and had greater impact on understanding of NOS teaching. The course also discussed common misconceptions about NOS, facilitated by review of the research and a reflective discussion on the graduate students' progressions in learning NOS since the beginning of the NOS research course. Instruction modeled integration of NOS within science content and within various instructional strategies, including lecture, discussion, and laboratory techniques. Students were required to develop two lesson plans, a course syllabus, and a science unit (comprised of at least five instructional sessions). They were required to include explicit NOS objectives, instruction, and assessments.

Lesson presentations. Instruction embedding explicit NOS and science content was modeled during the course. These lessons were accompanied by rationale and discussion of strategies for college science teaching. Discussion also focused on how NOS issues were attended in an explicit manner. Students also developed and presented an inquiry-based lesson that included NOS. Through presentation and discussion of these lessons, students were exposed to a variety of strategies and contexts for NOS teaching.

> "A big impact was the methods course. From the NOS research course, I had memorized aspects without real understanding or application; The methods course required application and had more NOS activities and examples that helped clarify for me. I found it difficult to make connections with physics context, but lesson planning and feedback helped. Easiest for me was observation and inference and tentativeness."[Fang, final discussion]

Lesson planning. Lesson planning was valued for demanding clear NOS understanding, and also for pushing students to explicitly construct relevant objectives and instruction. The students realized that in order to teach NOS, they must have a good understanding of what NOS is. Thus, the

lesson planning process challenged them to match their NOS ideas with the science content. They also came to realize that understanding NOS, although necessary, is insufficient to effectively and consistently incorporate NOS into science teaching. Through the requirement of lesson planning, the students reported an increase in addressing NOS in their science teaching.

> "During these courses there have been opportunities to incorporate aspects of NOS in the learning processes, most significant of which were the creating of lesson plans and presenting of micro-lessons which had NOS explicitly embedded. This helped me face and overcome the challenges involved in understanding and teaching NOS. I had to re-read some writings on NOS in order to properly use them." [George, impact statement]

> "Under the pressure of the assignment, I started to think seriously on how to design a class. It took me some time and efforts on searching materials, examples, discussing with colleagues, but it was really a very good experience. After some hard work, some ideas came up. I started to understand where to put NOS in the science context; how to integrate both the NOS and subject knowledge to teach. This experience not only helped me learn how to teach NOS, but also improved my confidence in NOS teaching." [Fang, impact statement]

Peer interactions/sharing. Sharing of ideas and experiences through class discussions were valuable. Experiencing different science lessons that attempted to embed NOS impressed upon the students the diversity of venues to include NOS. Discussions of seized and missed opportunities within science lessons demonstrated where and how various NOS aspects could be connected to science content and learning activities.

> "The different peer teaching presentations from various disciplines and discussions helped me polish up and internalize further NOS." [Robert, final discussion]

Classroom observations. Students were required to conduct six teaching observations (2 self, 2 peers, 2 other). These experiences brought a reality to why we were having so much focus on NOS and the image of NOS in college science classes. Observation opportunities and reflections pushed the focus of science teaching (from the perspective of the observer) on the image of science portrayed in real classrooms. For some, there was a challenge to set aside the typical science content and focus attention on NOS portrayals. Some students in the methods course were unable to set aside their content focus. Yet, the participant researchers from this study, having had prior experience in the NOS research course, were more successful in describing and analyzing NOS portrayals. The evidence for this statement stems from the primary researchers' access to student reflective writings. Specific responses, however, are not available for the present paper. What is available, are responses from the participant researchers regarding the impact of such experiences on their views of NOS and NOS teaching.

Research

All five students proposed research studies with a NOS focus. They began to conduct their studies in the spring of 2006. Three completed their studies. They reported that the experience of studying others' views of NOS and NOS teaching practices were influential on their own views of NOS, NOS teaching, and needs of teachers.

> "I myself prepared some interview questions as I went through participants' reactions on questionnaires…I realized that I have no detailed ideas of views to make an analysis for my research. Therefore, I read references of NOS again because I want to get clearer framework for research analysis." [Hang Hwa, impact statement]

> "I have been able to study the phenomenon of teaching aspects of NOS in the middle school. I gained great insights into the NOS views of middle school teachers. I also come to appreciate that teachers do not differentiate clearly by inquiry and teaching NOS. Teachers run short of the pedagogical content knowledge in as far as NOS teaching is concerned. This makes them unable to plan to teach NOS; those who try, they do it implicitly." [Robert, impact statement]

Teaching experiences

All five graduate students were teaching in the undergraduate science program for elementary education (Table 1) as part of their assistantships. As discussed above, they all reported trying to embed NOS within their instruction, and feeling various levels of success with various NOS aspects. Personal teaching experiences provided contexts for challenging NOS views and teaching orientations. Initial teaching attempts were challenging. As George stated, "I thought it would be fairly easy, but it wasn't. I had to explicitly plan to teach it." Hang Hwa realized that to teach NOS, she needed to increase her comfort with her own NOS knowledge, "Planning required rereading of materials to be sure I know the content and planned appropriately." As she reflected on her NOS teaching and the impact on her own views, she realized the limitations of her own views.

> "Discussions with students helped me to further reflect on my NOS views and effects of teaching attempts. I realized I wasn't being explicit enough. Students had some problems with understanding that I need to address. This made me further to understand NOS. Memorization is not good enough for teaching it." [Hang Hwa, final discussion]

The importance of planning became evident through the process of teaching attempts. They all reported that, especially initially, they would forget to make NOS connections unless they planned explicitly to do so.

> "If I didn't use it in my planning, I wouldn't think about it. I thought it would be fairly easy, but it wasn't. I had to explicitly plan to teach it. The methods course required objectives and instruction. I then tried to put it into my chemistry course. I have to plan for it." [George, final discussion]

Comprehensive examination preparation

Two students, Fang and Brandy, were preparing to take the comprehensive examinations. One of their questions focused on NOS and NOS research. Brandy felt comfortable with her NOS views. Fang felt that she did not have a well formed conception of NOS. In preparation for the exams, Fang read and reread articles from the NOS research course, methods course, and other articles she collected. She reported that preparing for exams motivated her to clarify and deepen her views. She also reported that the process enhanced her understanding of NOS research.

Discussion

Change in perspective

Each member of this group of graduate students experienced a change in perspective. For four, the change was dramatic with respect to understanding NOS and the relevance of NOS to science teaching and learning. One student, Brandy, was less comfortable with the absolutist view of science teaching, yet she felt she was *supposed* to think this way. Her NOS views did not mesh with what she thought they were supposed to be, at least as far as teaching science. For Brandy, learning about NOS was somewhat of a relief. Her "change in perspective" was different from the others in that she already understood many of the concepts of NOS, but she felt that she was supposed to teach science in the more absolutist, value-free way in which she was taught. Finding out that there was a concept called "NOS" that fit with her already formed conceptions validated her prior feelings about how she *wanted* to teach science. Her "change in perspective" was more relative to her views of good science teaching. For the others, the "change in perspective" was with respect to NOS views *and* with respect to what constitutes good science teaching.

That each participant experienced personal transitions and growth is not surprising, given the consistent message; requirements for personal reflection, modeling, planning, and teaching; and on-going support. These influential elements are consistent with prior research on developing teachers' NOS views and practices (Abd-El-Khalick & Akerson, 2004; Hanuscin et al., 2006; Lederman, 2007). The notion that "one course is not enough" (Akerson et al., 2006; Lederman et al., 2001) is also quite evident in this study.

Utilizing *Internal* Commitments Toward NOS Conceptual Development and Teaching Practice

External factors, such as program elements/requirements, initiated change, but it is perhaps the internal factors and perspectives of these students that provide insights to sustaining progressions once the external pressures subside. Abd-El-Khalick & Akerson (2004) describe "motivational factors" as they relate to preservice elementary teachers' perceptions of the importance of NOS. What influences teachers' internalization of NOS? Our study suggests personal commitments to science teaching and personal goals may be important factors. Programmatic requirements provided external pressures and supports to learning and teaching NOS. It was, however, personal commitments that may have enabled the students to internalize what they had learned and, moreover, to negotiate through challenges. Our results suggest that commitments to improving science teaching and learning were paramount in advancing past initial conceptual understanding toward a more meaningful embracement of NOS as important for all science learners. There were common experiences and personal elements that utilized and further deepened these commitments. It is important to note that these features are not mutually exclusive from each other or the aforementioned programmatic elements.

Learning in Social Contexts

Group activities from courses, teaching discussions, and informal discussions challenged NOS conceptions and provided peer support and feedback. Our findings suggest that the act of talking with others who shared common experiences and goals regarding learning and teaching NOS was influential in triggering conceptual development and sustaining motivations. Reflective discussions about readings and teaching attempts were venues to vent frustrations as well as share personal ideas, pose "what ifs" and compare experiences. Learning did not take place in isolation. Challenges were not unique to any one person. This finding is supported by the work of Loving and

Foster (2000), who examined graduate student understand compatibility of science and religion. They report the importance of peer sharing that provides a "sense of relief from most who had struggled to find a position but gained from the experience" (p. 465). Sharing, comparing, evaluating, and re-evaluating continued throughout the 18 months, regardless of course or program assignments. Conversations in graduate student cubicles often involved reactions, challenges, and possibilities regarding NOS. That group sharing took place, and was valued, suggests an internalized commitment to NOS.

Orientations and Critical Appraisal

Our results support the notion that reflection as an instrumental factor in facilitating graduate students' transitions in conceptual knowledge and teaching orientations (Irez, 2006; Loving & Foster, 2000; Volkmann & Zgagacz, 2004). Our results further suggest that motivation to continuously improve science teaching may be an instrumental factor in realizing effects of reflection. For these graduate students, conceptions of "good teaching" and orientations toward becoming "good teachers" may provide the internal motivation necessary to gain from reflective and metacognitive activities. This finding can perhaps be better understood based on the work of Volkmann and Zgagacx (2004), who find that NOS views can support certain teaching orientations, but there is a need to explore professional identity as well. Their work discusses the interplay between teaching orientations and professional identity. Challenges to beliefs are necessary in order to modify teaching orientations. Our work provides an in-depth examination and personal account of five graduate students' challenging their NOS beliefs through continued reflection and action.

Reflection, however, did not come automatically. Course assignments, modeling, and scaffolding of reflection on experience seemed to facilitate a reflective perspective. Outside of coursework, reflection about others' teaching, personal teaching, and science-related encounters (e.g. readings, media, conversations) seemed to prompt further reconstruction of NOS ideas and needs of NOS teaching. As external prompts waned, internal motivations took front stage to sustain learning. Multiple exposures aided the processes. For example, the first time reading about NOS and reading primary NOS literature can be overwhelming when NOS is brand new. To advance NOS conceptions and awareness of applicability of NOS, several reported that rereading the literature was helpful. HangHwa reported that about six months after the NOS research course, she reread the same literature. She was able to understand the literature better and gain more from the articles when she read them again in preparation for her research and her teaching. What was different? First, her motivation was altered from external (course requirement) to internal (prepare for teaching and conducting independent research). Second, she had an idea about NOS. She was better prepared and accepting of the descriptions and claims from the literature she was reading. It could now make more sense to her, personally. She had internalized NOS as a concept of importance and utility, wanting to incorporate NOS into her own teaching. Similar shifts with understanding the NOS literature were reported by Fang, Robert, and George.

Self-Awareness

Discussions and reflective writings prompted the graduate students to assess their NOS views and teaching views. They became, or drew upon a preexisting stance, critical appraisers of themselves as well as their students. A theme of "self-awareness" runs through the indicated influential experiences. The students utilized their self-awareness regarding personal views of NOS and requirements for successful learning and teaching. As a group, they realized the need to plan for teaching NOS in order to teach NOS. They realized the need to understand NOS and connections to

their science content in order to plan for teaching NOS. They repeatedly mentioned elements of critical appraisal of "self" in order to compare the sufficiency of their own knowledge and abilities for "good teaching." The metacognitive perspective needed for such appraisal was evident from the beginning of the NOS research course. It is interesting, but not surprising, that four of the five were initially "shocked" as Fang described it. They had never been exposed to NOS before. Through initial readings, writings, and discussions that prompted comparison of personal views with advocated NOS perspectives, the graduate student began their journey of critical appraisal.

Awareness of and concerns for students

The graduate students expressed concerns for student learning and discussed student preconceptions regarding science. We see this type of appraisal very early process when George and Robert wondered how children in Cameroon and Uganda would react to learning NOS. As the graduate students attempted to teach NOS in their undergraduate courses, they were aware that their students held many of the same misconceptions that they themselves had. This awareness of students and recognition of student challenges in their science classrooms seemed to integrate with awareness of the graduate students' own learning progressions for NOS. The integration may have helped several of the graduate students to understand student resistance/struggles to the extent

> "The engrained nature of [students] earlier views makes it more challenging for me. I feel my teaching has improved because I am able to explain certain issues in science to my students in a more appropriate and convincing manner. I also find my students getting less confused with some activities as they understand they can use different approaches, have different results, and feel they are doing science… My greatest frustration has been having some students still asking for "right answers" or "right procedures." However, I think I am expecting a fast change when it was not that easy for me to understand some of these aspects of NOS. This consoles me and teaches me to be persistent but gentle in guiding students to an appreciation of NOS." [George, impact statement]

Impacts on Efficacy of Science Teaching

The cycle of trying to explicitly teach NOS, reflecting on success and challenges, trying again, and reflecting, trying and reflecting, and so on….reportedly had a positive impact on the graduate students' self efficacy for NOS teaching, but also for science teaching in general. Initial frustrations were met with commitment to do better. Peer and faculty support provided a safety net to sustain motivation. Any success was embraced and used as a catalyst for further attempts. Similar impacts have been described for generating and sustaining NOS success with elementary teachers (Akerson et al., 2006; Abd-El-Khalick & Akerson, 2004), secondary preservice teachers (Schwartz & Lederman, 2002), and undergraduate teaching assistants (Hanuscin et al., 2006). In the present study, George described initial attempts with embedding NOS with study of atomic structure. He knew there were connections he could make. He planned. He taught. He reflected. He saw additional opportunities. He reports that now, he sees opportunities for embedding NOS in everything he teaches. Hang Hwa experienced small successes with her summer methods course. She brought those successes to her biology course. She reports feeling like a better teacher. Robert and George make similar claims. They feel their teaching, in general, has improved because of their perspective on NOS and inclusion of relevant NOS connections in their classrooms.

Cultural Influences on Views, Motivations, and Future Directions

Initial reactions to the novel NOS concepts were ones of surprise for four of the five. These four were international students, originating from four different countries. They reported learning science from within a "western" perspective, consistent with absolutist promotions. NOS seemed to be a welcomed change in perspective. For them, their worldview (in as much as we can describe the participants' worldviews from self-report) was more compatible with NOS ideas. This is consistent with Abd-El-Khalick and Akerson's finding that preservice teachers who held compatible worldviews compatible with NOS ideas were better positioned to advance in NOS understandings (2004).

For the present study, motivations for continued learning of NOS also appeared to stem from future goals and potential impact of NOS as they relate to those goals. Being an international group, some members of the group discussed possibilities of introducing NOS in their home countries. Robert mentioned his initial reaction in comparing NOS as presented in the program with the portrayal of science as exclusively "western." He discussed potential ideas of NOS providing an avenue for establishing and maintaining science learners in Uganda. He has come to value the creativity and social and cultural aspects that he feels would be attractive to African children. Likewise, George considered how he might raise awareness of NOS to learners in Cameroon.

> "I do not only see science now as this body of knowledge and processes which students have to know so as to pass exams, but also as a way of knowing. At this moment I cannot stop wondering if Cameroonian students are actually becoming scientifically literate and what effect this has on the society. This leaves me thinking about what can be done in bringing about a change in the teaching and learning of science in Cameroon." [George, initial narrative]

Hang Hwa has already begun teaching NOS in Korea. In the summer of 2006, she taught a course to preservice elementary teachers. She chose to teach NOS. Further, her research interests target developing conceptions of NOS among Korean elementary teachers. She has translated the VNOS instrument into Korean, validated the translation, and conducted initial studies.

Conclusions and Implications

Our stories of personal reflection highlight challenges and influential factors in the preparation of science educators. The "change in perspective" experienced by these students was multifaceted. They demonstrated change relative to their knowledge about NOS, NOS teaching, science teaching, and potential professional contributions within different cultural settings. They reported profound realization that, despite substantial science knowledge and experiences, they had not *really* thought about NOS before, or they had passively accepted the traditional view. Reflection on their prior learning experiences and science practice in light of NOS readings and activities provided cognitive dissonance. Furthermore, these students were able to identify applications of NOS to addressing other issues in science learning that were already of concern to them (e.g. cultural perceptions and attitudes toward science). These metacognitive elements may be critical to breaking the cycle of "teach as you have been taught."

External motivators ⟷ Internal motivators

Seeing NOS as important for science learners seems to be a necessary advancement to develop conceptions and teaching skills beyond external pressures ("I need to do this for a course.") to embrace internal motivations ("I am a science teacher; I teach students about science; NOS is part of science; without NOS, science is misrepresented"). This perspective is an internalization of the importance and utility of NOS. What does it take to internalize the importance and utility of NOS? We identified external and internal motivating factors that are associated with these graduate students' learning of NOS. These factors are overlapping, yet there seems to be a necessary shift from relying primarily on external factors to drawing upon internal factors that sustain momentum regarding a NOS focus. From this reflective study, external factors of course requirements, consistency, and support initiated the processes. Internal factors of commitment to becoming a better science teacher and science teacher educator, values and perceptions of science teaching and learning , and personal goals influenced continued developments. There may be a complex relationship between the relative reliance on external and internal motivations and conceptual development. Potential associations, prerequisites, exclusions, and additions need to be examined. The internal motivations are always there, but may shift in relative impact as perceptions about science teaching shift. Valuing NOS as a construct may enhance, or may contradict, a teacher's professional identity as a science teacher and scholar. What does it mean to be a science teacher? What science, how, and why should I teach my students? To internalize the importance of NOS, conceptions of NOS likely need to be compatible with a teacher's answer to these questions. Our study suggests that, for these graduate students, NOS needs be viewed as an ingrained part of the science curriculum, essential for scientific literacy, but, moreover, essential for motivating learners toward science. An examination of NOS learning from perspectives of motivation theory, orientations, and identity may help us to understand deep internal factors that are facilitators or barriers to success.

Our results highlight the importance of consistency and repeated challenges toward learning NOS within the science education graduate program. The two courses and NOS research group kept NOS visible for these students. They could not just learn about it in a class and leave it behind. Four of the five admit they likely would have regressed to earlier teaching orientations had they not been pressed to keep thinking about it and practicing. The other, Brandy, found a good fit between NOS and her existing teaching perspectives. These students then continued to attempt and reflect upon embedding NOS within their teaching assignment. Consistent exposure and multiple challenges for examining existing NOS ideas and teaching practices are recommended for preservice teacher programs to prepare teachers for effective NOS instruction (Abd-Ek-Khalick & Akerson, 2004; Akerson et al., 2006; Lederman, 2007). Similar focus is warranted for preservice science teacher educators. For science education graduate programs, we recommend consistent exposure, multiple challenges for reflection, and supported experiences with teaching NOS within science content contexts. The added challenge for these future science educators is developing proficiency in teachers others how to teach NOS. Further research is clearly needed in all these areas.

Although there is an abundance of research that has been done on student development, very little of it focuses on graduate students, despite the huge demands these students often have on their abilities to teach, learn and do research. Science education graduate students are the future of science education. Attention is due to understand their professional development. It is our hope that this work will provide some guidance, or at least raise questions, concerning the needs of science education graduate students in preparation for careers as science educators.

References

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2001). Embedding nature of science instruction in preservice elementary science courses: Abandoning scientism but…*Journal of Science Teacher Education, 12*(3), 215-233.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., Bell, R. L., & Lederman, N. G. (1998). NOS and instructional practice: Making the unnatural natural. *Science Education, 82*, 417-436.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Akerson, V., (2004). Learning as conceptual change: Factors mediating the development of preservice elementary teachers' views of nature of science, *Science Education, 89*(5), 785-810.

Abell, S. (1997). The professional development of science teacher educators: Is there a missing piece? *Electronic Journal of Science Education, 1*(4).

AETS Ad Hoc Commiteee on Science Teacher Educator Standards: Lederman, B. G., Kuerbis, P., Loving, C., Ramey-Gassert, L., Roychoudhury, A., & Spector, B. (1997). AETS position statement: Professional knowledge standards ofr science teache educators. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 8(4), 233-240. (available URL: http://aste.chem.pitt.edu/)

Akerson, V., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2003). Teaching elements of nature of science: A yearlong case study of a fourth-grade teacher, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching,* 40(10), 1025-1049

Akerson, V., Morrison, J., & Roth McDuffie, A. (2006). One course is not enough: Preservice elementary teachers' retention of improved views of nature of science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42*(2.), 194-213.

Darke, P., Shanks, G. & Broadbent, M. (1998). Successfully completing case study research: combining rigour, relevance and pragmatism. *Information Systems Journal, 8, 273–289*.

Hanuscin, D., Akerson, V., & Phillipson-Mower, T. (2006). Integrating nature of science instruction inot a physical science content course for preservice elementary teachers: NOS views of teaching assistants. *Science Education, 90*, 912-935.

Hong, H. H., Schwartz, R. S., & Holm, G. (2006, August). Korean elementary preservice teachers' views of nature of science. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Korean Association for Research in Science Education, Gangwon National University, Korea.

Irez, S. (2006). Are we prepared? An assessment of preservice science teacher educators' beliefs about nature of science. *Science Education, 90,* 1113-1143.

King, P., Kitchener, K. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment.* Jossey-Bass Inc. San Fransisco, CA.

Lederman, N. G. (2007). Nature of science: Past, present, and future. In Abell, S. & Lederman, N. (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Science Education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Lederman, N. G., Abd-El-Khalick, F., Bell, R. L., & Schwartz, R. S. (2002). Views of Nature of Science Questionnaire (VNOS): Toward Valid and Meaningful Assessment of Learners' Conceptions of Nature of Science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39*(6), 497-521.

Lederman, N. G., Schwartz, R. S., Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Bell, R. L. (2001). Preservice Teachers' Understanding and Teaching of the Nature of Science: An Intervention Study. *The Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education, 1*(2), 135-160.

Loving, C., & Foster, A. (2000). Religion-in-the-science-classroom issue: Seeking graduate student conceptual change, *Science Education, 84*, 445-468.
National Research Council. (1996). *National science education standards.* Washington, DC: National Academic Press

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

Ryder, J., Leach, J., & Driver, R. (1999). Undergraduate science students' images of science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36*(2), 201-220.

Schwartz, R. S. (2004). Epistemological views in authentic science context: A cross-discipline comparison of scientists' views of nature of science and scientific inquiry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oregon State University. Corvallis, OR.

Schwartz, R. S., & Crawford, B. A. (2004). Authentic scientific inquiry as a context for teaching nature of science: Identifying critical elements for success. In Flick, L., & Lederman, N. (Eds.). *Scientific Inquiry and Nature of Science: Implications for Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Schwartz, R. S. & Lederman, N. (in press). What scientists say: Scientists' views of nature of science and relation to science discipline. *International Journal of Science Education*.

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.

Volkmann, M., & Zgagacz, M. (2004). Learning to teach physics through inquiry: The lived experience of a graduate teaching assistant. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41*(6), 584-602.

Williamson, K., Schauder, D., Wright, S. & Stockfield, L. (2002). Oxymoron or successful mixed marriage? A discussion of research within an interpretivist framework. *Qualitative Research Journal, 2(1), 7-17.*

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Table 1. Participant biographical information

	George	Hang Hwa	Robert	Fang	Brandy
Gender	Male	Female	Male	Female	Female
Degree seeking	PhD science education	PhD science education	MA science education	PhD science education	PhD science education
Home country (where educated and gained teaching experience)	Camaroon	Korea	Uganda	China	United States
Teaching experience	7 years teaching grades 6-12; Physical science and chemistry	5 years (4 Korea; 1 US) Science education: preservice elementary teachers; masters students; inservice workshops Biology: undergraduate non-majors; preservice elementary teachers; inservice elementary	8 years teaching community college level; Biology and science education	none	8 years teaching college level; biology, microbiology
Education Degrees/major/minor	;. Chemistry Graduate Diploma (Curriculum & Teaching Studies) M.S. Environmental Technology	B.S. Biology M.S. Biology Ph.D. Botany	B.Ed Biology	B.S. Engineering M.S. Higher Education	B.S. Ecology M.S. Biology
Science research experience	None	10 years botany and plant taxonomy	None	None	Mycorrhizal Fungi Nitrogen-fixers Plant Ecology
Prior experience with NOS & HPS (courses, reading, etc)	None	Brief reading within a course textbook; nothing explicit	Part of a prior course; nothing explicit	Part of a prior course; nothing explicit	HPS course; read Kuhn but book was not analyzed from a NOS perspective
Teaching assistantship (all courses are designed for elementary education majors)	Chemistry	Biology	Biology	Physics	Biology

Appendix

Initial Reflective Narrative prompts [prepared by participant researchers]

1. Describe who you are, your educational and teaching background.
2. What were your initial assumptions beliefs, thoughts, and feelings about NOS?
3. What were your first reactions to learning about NOS?
4. What are your main experiences with NOS that stand out clearly to you?
5. Who were/are main people involved in your NOS experiences?
6. What have been your difficulties with NOS?
7. What moments have been significant to you concerning NOS learning?
8. What are you capable of doing now or can do differently regarding NOS? [what have you learned?]
9. What do you think you need to help you continue to move forward with NOS?
10. What are the implications of your experiences with NOS for you in terms of learning, teaching, and research?

Final Impact Statement [guideline prepared by primary researcher; based on analysis of initial narrative and group discussions]

Through metacognitive reflection, we want to describe developments in your learning about and orientations toward NOS teaching and research. We want to describe key turning points influential elements and challenges that you experienced.

1. How do you feel you have most changed regarding your views of NOS? How did you understand this aspect before? How do you understand it now? What do you feel had the most influence on developing your understanding?
2. Teaching science in the undergraduate program: What have you been able to do regarding NOS teaching? What aspects have been easiest? What aspects have been most difficult? How have students responded to NOS? How has your teaching experience impacted your views of NOS? Views of NOS teaching?
3. Research experience: Describe the NOS research you were able to conduct this past year. Describe the impacted of this experience on your views of NOS, NOS teaching, and NOS research.
4. Methods course: Describe the impacted of this course on your views of NOS, NOS teaching, and science teaching. What experiences do you feel influenced your views regarding NOS?
5. Describe any other experiences you have had that you feel impacted your understanding of NOS, NOS teaching, NOS learning, and NOS research.