



**HAL**  
open science

## Gender effects in children's development and education

Tom G.K. Bryce, Eric Blown

► **To cite this version:**

Tom G.K. Bryce, Eric Blown. Gender effects in children's development and education. International Journal of Science Education, 2007, 29 (13), pp.1655-1678. 10.1080/09500690701278420 . hal-00513341

**HAL Id: hal-00513341**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00513341>**

Submitted on 1 Sep 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



### Gender effects in children's development and education

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2006-0324.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	developmental research, gender-related, earth science education, survey, science education
Keywords (user):	children's cosmologies, in-depth interviews, diverse ethnicities



### Abstract

This paper attempts to clarify several lines of research on gender in development and education, inter-relating findings from studies on intuitive/informal knowledge with those from research on achievements and attitudes in science. It acknowledges the declining proportions of male teachers world-wide and examination successes which indicate a reversal of educational disadvantage from female to male; as well as the recent evidence on the effects of the gender of teachers upon student success. An empirical contribution to the literature is offered, drawing from the gender-related findings from research on children's cosmologies in China and New Zealand with 346 boys and 340 girls (of whom 119 boys and 121 girls participated in the current study). The investigation focused on children's concepts of the motion and shape of the Earth through observational astronomy and gave children opportunities to express their ideas in several modalities. The in-depth interviews allowed children to share their meanings and gender differences became apparent (e.g. girls' superior ability to visually represent their cosmologies and boys' greater awareness of gravity). However, these differences were not universal across genders or cultures and marked similarities were apparent both in the content of children's responses and in their reasoning processes. By comparing boy/girl cosmological concept categories and by tracking their developmental trends by age, statistical evidence revealed the extent of the similarities within and across these diverse cultures. The findings reinforce those from the authors' knowledge restructuring and cultural mediation studies and provide support for the view that boys and girls have similar, holistic-rather-than-fragmented, cosmologies which have features in common across cultures and ethnic groups.

### *Gender controversies continue*

Gender<sup>1</sup> continues to be an important issue for researchers and teachers alike. It can easily be contentious as evidenced by the storm of controversy which followed the pronouncements of Lawrence Summers when, in January 2005 (then as President of Harvard University), he voiced the view 'that men outperform women in maths and sciences because of biological difference, and discrimination is no longer a career barrier for female academics' (Goldenberg, 2005). Amongst the reactions was a ten-page feature article in *Time* magazine (7.3.05) written by Amanda Ripley ('Who says a woman can't be Einstein?') taking Summers to task for his 'provocative statements'. Some of the research relating to Ripley's observations is considered later in this paper, but at the outset we can say that such contentious debate underlines our need to know whether boys' and girls' scientific ideas (whether learned as everyday knowledge or through formal schooling), and their dispositions to pursue science, differ markedly, if at all. Despite limited and conflicting evidence from the literature, our own experience as teachers and researchers had certainly led us to identify gender as a potential factor in concept acquisition, an empirical study of which we report as part of this article. It is important, however, to recognise that several different lines of research are intertwined in the arguments about gender as it relates to development and education. This paper endeavours to clarify the links between them, thereby contextualising the empirical contribution we offer.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this paper, we have used the term 'gender' in the now accepted manner. As Caplan, Crawford, Hyde and Richardson (1997) note, the expression 'gender differences' is preferred to 'sex differences' in acknowledgement that 'gender' marks a sociological distinction between men and women. In most psychological research 'gender differences' is the appropriate term ...because participants are usually categorized in terms of their outward appearance and behaviour, not on the basis of biological characteristics" (p. 7).

1  
2  
3 Firstly, we consider what has been recently revealed in the research literature about the  
4 differences between the developing brains of boys and girls from brain scanning technology, for  
5 the emerging patterns help (a) to make sense of the accumulated and somewhat contradictory  
6 experimental evidence on children's mental capabilities; (b) to scotch simplistic assertions about  
7 biological deficits; while (c) suggesting that differences in scientific understandings between male  
8 and female children might indeed be anticipated.  
9

10  
11 Secondly therefore, we examine whether any gender differences are apparent in the  
12 development of children's understanding of commonly encountered phenomena in their  
13 pre-school and school years (in what children acquire by way of general knowledge). That  
14 learning has the potential to relate to the scientific ideas they are taught in schools, either directly  
15 (in which case there might be conflicts with ideas prevailing in their local ethnic groups and  
16 communities), or indirectly through the influences of role models and expectations that are  
17 sometimes held differently for boys and girls. This paper presents evidence, using data from the  
18 field of children's cosmologies, that gender does *not* play an important part in such basic thinking.  
19 Boys' and girls' development and intuitive understandings are similar. This is important since:  
20  
21

22  
23 Thirdly, significantly changed patterns of achievement in formal school learning have  
24 nevertheless taken place among boys and girls over recent decades, and these tell us about  
25 world-wide cultural change and improved professional expectations (and, arguably, account for  
26 what teachers have been able to do through more equitable instruction). We review the extent to  
27 which girls have overtaken boys in regard to science achievements and the gender differences  
28 apparent in interests and attitudes to science in school.  
29  
30

31  
32 Fourthly, however, we take into account the very recent research into how the gender of  
33 teachers relates to pupil achievement, arguing its significance in relation to the growing gender  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 imbalance amongst the numbers of schoolteachers (world-wide). There is now strong quantitative  
4 data to show that teacher gender does influence school students' learning and therefore we should  
5  
6 be concerned about the diminishing numbers of male teachers.  
7  
8

9  
10 ***Gender research: developing brains***  
11

12 The wide range of research raised by Ripley (2005) includes:  
13

14 (a) *neurological studies* where, with advancing technologies, brain differences between men  
15 and women are known to be *greater* than previously understood, some of them affecting behaviour  
16 in unexpected ways. Women's brains are now known to be better interlinked with more parts  
17 involved in specific tasks, men's thinking taking place in more focused areas. Brain-imaging  
18 techniques by Giedd, Blumenthal, Jeffries, Rajapakse, Vaituzis, Liu, Berry, Tobin, Nelson and  
19 Castellanos (1999) reveal that different anatomical regions of the brain mature differentially in  
20 childhood, and typically by several years, e.g. favouring earlier development in girls for those  
21 areas which handle verbal fluency, handwriting and face recognition; favouring earlier  
22 development in boys for those which handle spatial and mechanical reasoning and visual targeting.  
23 This can be compared with pre-brain imagery research by, for example, Bradshaw & Nettleton,  
24 1983, and the conflicting findings between Annett, 1985; Casey, 1995; Siegel, 2000; detecting  
25 male superiorities on the one hand with Ueker & Obrzut, 1993; Walter, Roberts & Brownlow,  
26 2000; Anokhin, Lutzenberger, Nikolaev, & Birbaumer, 2000; finding to the contrary.  
27  
28

29 (b) *neuro-physiological developmental research* where we now know that 'the brain is  
30 *constantly changing* in response to hormones, encouragement, practice, diet and drugs' (Amanda  
31 Ripley, 2005, p.52) and that the interaction between nature and nurture *continues* from conception  
32 (cf. Matt Ridley's 'Nature *via* Nurture', 2004).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (c) *developmental/educational research* which explores how young people are taught, and by  
4 whom, and just *how much* change has become detectable in gender-related achievements  
5  
6  
7  
8 (considered in detail below).

9  
10 (d) *sociological research* on scientific career patterns where leading researchers stress that  
11  
12 ‘biological factors would not play a role unless they *interacted* with social conditions’ (see Xie &  
13  
14 Shauman, 2003).

15  
16  
17 Two further areas of research can also be highlighted:

18  
19 (i) The relationship between motor development, language ability, and cognitive development  
20  
21 has been found to be mediated by gender (see Kershner & Chyczij, 1992). This is critical to the  
22  
23 multi-modal methodology used in the research reported later;

24  
25 (ii) The reports of manifestly higher rates of mental and learning disabilities in males (see De  
26  
27 Courten-Myers, 1999) should not be ignored; they underline how intertwined the nature/nurture  
28  
29 influences can be. And there is evidence that much research remains unpublished because it  
30  
31 reports *gender similarity* as opposed to *gender difference* in a literary climate which is sensitised to  
32  
33 the latter. Hence “...there is no research literature of gender similarities, only a research literature  
34  
35 of gender differences” (Richardson, 1991, p. 273).

36  
37 Taken together, all of these branches of investigation suggest that there are strong grounds for  
38  
39 anticipating gender-related patterns in children engaged in tasks designed to show their grasp of  
40  
41 basic scientific concepts; concepts which they acquire (in a variety of complex ways) from their  
42  
43 families and teachers. If the brains of maturing boys and girls are so detectably different, and  
44  
45 children’s later, educational achievements have changed - more accurately, have been changed -  
46  
47 relative to each other so much (as indicated below) we might expect conceptual differences  
48  
49 between genders to be revealed. In the long run, insights might be provided into the factors  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 influencing any gender mediation, to the benefit of boys and girls in all cultures alike.

4  
5  
6 Commentary is first required however about the wider context of various socio-cultural factors and  
7  
8 how these relate to student outcomes and teaching input.

### 9 10 ***The gender of teachers***

11  
12 Firstly, with regard to the numbers of teachers in both New Zealand and China, concern has  
13  
14 been raised as the proportion of male teachers has declined dramatically, particularly in primary  
15  
16 schools. Recent statistics for the gender of primary teachers, *internationally*, are fairly striking. In  
17  
18 2003 only about 7% of primary teachers in Scotland were male (see Scottish Executive, 2005).  
19  
20 Similarly, in the USA, in 1995-96, only 16% of primary teachers were male (see National  
21  
22 Education Association, 1997); and by 1999 that had declined to only 13% (see Livingstone, 2004).  
23  
24 The situation in China is similar and longstanding. According to Zhao Wei, Director of the  
25  
26 Students' Affairs Division at Shenyang Normal University (where teachers receive their  
27  
28 professional preparation): "We have more female students than male ones. That's the way it's  
29  
30 always been; a ratio of about 7:3": and some provinces have even lower percentages of male  
31  
32 teachers (see Zhang, 2005). While in New Zealand men make up only 18% of primary teachers  
33  
34 (see New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2003). OECD figures show an international trend of  
35  
36 declining male primary school teachers confirming the alarming statistics from other sources  
37  
38 which depict a trend which shows no sign of abating. According to Livingstone (2004) "...the  
39  
40 average across 23 OECD countries for which data were available was 23 percent" (p. 2). Before  
41  
42 we consider teacher gender effects, it is important to comment upon student success rates.

### 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 ***Gender patterns in achievement***

50  
51  
52 Turning first to comparative studies of school student achievement, gender differences in  
53  
54 scientific literacy were compared in the international surveys recently carried out by the OECD  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



(Programme for International Student Assessment [PISA] 2003). According to the Executive Summary, there were no systematic differences between the performances of males and females among the 29 OECD countries involved in PISA. “In the minority of countries where gender differences exist, they are small” (OECD, 2003). A closer examination indicates that there were more countries with scores for males higher than for females, but that in only 11 of these countries were these differences statistically significant. In two of the three countries where females scored higher than males, the differences were also statistically significant (see OECD, 2003). However, evidence from statistical analyses of science results by gender in national, school leaving examinations in the UK, indicates that girls are surpassing boys in all areas (see for example Kelly, 1987; and Riddell, 2003). Referring to the national Higher examinations taken by 17 and 18-year-old pupils in Scotland, Riddell (2003) has recently concluded that: “From a position of performing worse than boys at Higher grade in the mid-1970s, girls of all social classes are now performing better than boys of similar social class in all subject areas, although gender differentiation in the curriculum remains stubbornly in place. In the late 1970s, however, this was not what was predicted” (p. 895). Indicative figures on pass rates generally are that 55% of males compared with 61% of females completed the final two years of secondary school with three or more Higher grade passes at A-C in 1999. Data from that year showed that female candidates performed better than males in every subject, apart from Physical Education, Economics and General Science (the latter a minority subject taken by least able pupils).

Interpretative analyses for these changes have focused upon changes in society, changes in teaching, and structural changes in schooling itself. The Centre for Educational Sociology at Edinburgh University has maintained that the comprehensive re-organisation of schooling during the 1960s and 1970s was associated with a general improvement in standards of attainment, with

1  
2  
3 girls and pupils of low socio-economic status being the main beneficiaries (see Croxford, Tinklin,  
4 Ducklin & Frame, 2001; Furlong & Cartmel, 1997; Powney, 1997). Early indications confirm the  
5 continuing trend for girls to outperform boys at several levels in the sciences following the  
6 implementation, post 2000, of new National Qualifications (which incorporate the Highers as part  
7 of a multi-level system of certificates). The extent of the reversal has reached a point where  
8 schools in the UK and elsewhere now actively strive to find ways to help boys to study more  
9 effectively. In New Zealand, 'Approximately equal proportions of males and females score the  
10 top grades in School Certificate science, while in Sixth Form Certificate females outperform males  
11 in all science subjects. In Bursary biology and physics, females have a slight edge, while in  
12 chemistry males have traditionally outperformed females' (Pratt, 1999, p.2). Pratt also argues,  
13 however, that culture is a major factor on gender mediation (particularly evident in exploring the  
14 differences *within* 'boys' or 'girls' when ethnicity - NZ European, Maori, Pacific Islanders - is  
15 considered). This concern for boys from ethnic minorities is echoed in a recent review of student  
16 outcomes (see New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2006); and New Zealand school leaving  
17 statistics which show that in 2005 more than half of Maori boys left school with no qualifications  
18 (see Bishop, 2007). There is other evidence in China and New Zealand that, given equality of  
19 opportunity, girls frequently excelled boys in all subject areas including the traditional domains of  
20 male "superiority" such as maths and physics. For example, in New Zealand, there was equal  
21 participation by boys and girls (by merit in mathematics and physics) in the Winter Schools of  
22 Astronomy at University of Canterbury. Similar trends have been evident in other countries; for  
23 example, Hacker (1986), in Australia, found "no evidence to support the claim that girls are  
24 disadvantaged in the science classroom" (p. 69).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This background of gender mediation by social change of such an order that, in a period of little  
4 more than 50 years, traditional gender roles and manifest (as opposed to latent) performances can  
5 be reversed, invites the question of why this has been possible, what factors are responsible, and  
6 could knowledge of these be used to bring about true gender equality, including extra resources for  
7 teaching boys - or, bearing Pratt's (1999) observations in mind, *which* boys are not reaching their  
8 potential?  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 If the altered pattern of achievement can be put down to changes in teachers and teaching, we  
19 must also consider a further complication however. Recently published research by Dee (2006;  
20 forthcoming) presents new evidence which indicates that having a same-gender teacher influences  
21 educational outcomes. His research focused on a nationally representative, cross-sectional sample  
22 of 13-14 year old school students in Grade 8 of the USA (corresponding to year 9, Key stage 3 in  
23 England and S2/S3 in Scotland) numbering some 25,000. A key feature of that National  
24 Education Longitudinal Study, base year 1988, was that for each student it also surveyed *two* of  
25 their subject teachers (their background and how they viewed the performance of the student; how  
26 the student viewed the subject). Thus Dee was able to statistically relate student achievement to the  
27 gender of their assigned teachers in a large sample of teenagers close to the age when the gender  
28 gaps in achievement seem to grow most rapidly. The results indicate that the gender interactions  
29 had statistically significant effects on a number of educational outcomes, including achievements,  
30 and were quite large. In science, social studies and English, the overall effect of having a woman  
31 teacher instead of a man raised girls' achievements by 4% of a standard deviation and lowered  
32 boys' achievements by about the same amount. To quote Dee (forthcoming):  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 For example, assignment to an opposite-gender teacher lowers student achievement by at  
54 least 0.042 standard deviations. This effect size implies that just one year with a male  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 English teacher would eliminate nearly a third of the gender gap in reading performance  
4  
5 among 13 year olds and would do so by improving the performance of boys and  
6  
7 simultaneously harming that of the girls. Similarly, a year with a female teacher would  
8  
9 close the gender gap in science achievement among 13 year olds by half and eliminate  
10  
11 entirely the smaller achievement gap in mathematics (p. 26).  
12  
13

14  
15 [Dee cites the US Department of Education's 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey as  
16  
17 indicating that by 8<sup>th</sup> grade, some 83% of reading teachers are female; more than 50% of maths and  
18  
19 science teachers are female.] Importantly, Dee readily concedes that it is not clear whether these  
20  
21 gender effects arise from interactions within classrooms or from role-model effects (or both) and  
22  
23 does not move to conclude that single-gender classrooms would necessarily change things (for the  
24  
25 gender dynamics there may differ from those within co-educational settings).  
26  
27

28  
29 Baker (2006) has recently reported that although there has been very little research on boys'  
30  
31 education in New Zealand there is substantial evidence of a gender gap in achievement scores of  
32  
33 about 10% in favour of girls. Besides gender bias in the curriculum he found, "How we teach –  
34  
35 pedagogy – is also not gender free. There has been a shift from closed, structured,  
36  
37 information-dense learning activities, which boys did better at, to open-ended, experiential,  
38  
39 reflective activities...an example of the 'effeminized curriculum' (Baker, 2006;  
40  
41 [www.boysforward.com](http://www.boysforward.com)).  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 The situation in England is similar where the Department of Education and Skills (2006) report  
47  
48 a trend of boys falling behind girls as they get older leading to a gender gap of nearly 10% in  
49  
50 favour of girls at GCSE level. As in New Zealand, gender is only one of several factors  
51  
52 contributing to boys failing: demographics such as social class, background, and ethnic origin are  
53  
54 all determining factors (see Warden, 2002). However the groups at risk differ between cultures and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 societies: Pratt (1999) identifies Maori and Pacific Island boys as being vulnerable, whereas  
4  
5 Ahmed & Townsend (2003) report that at GCSE level “Poorer white boys are outstripped  
6  
7 academically by Indian, Pakistani, Bangaladeshi and Chinese boys”. In this case it is  
8  
9 socio-economics which are the major obstacle to boys success under ‘feminised teaching’ (p. 1), a  
10  
11 point raised earlier by Tim Hames in *The Times*: “The underlying dilemma in the British education  
12  
13 system is now, as it has been for a hundred years, if not more, still social class not gender (*Times*,  
14  
15 18 August, 2000).  
16  
17  
18

### 19 20 ***Gender in relation to interests and attitudes*** 21

22 Gender effects are also apparent in the interests and attitudes to science displayed by school  
23  
24 students. Where gender differentials have been detected amongst secondary school age students, it  
25  
26 is apparent that topics which are seen as having relevance to their lifestyles and possible careers  
27  
28 are considered to be more attractive, with girls being “much more drawn to those [physics] themes  
29  
30 that are perceived to have high social relevance, while boys are attracted to those themes that are  
31  
32 perceived to have a high mechanical or practical relevance” (Reid and Skryabina, 2003, p.533).  
33  
34 The particular applications in the ‘applications-led’ physics courses (which have been relatively  
35  
36 successful in the Netherlands and in Scotland for 14 – 16 year olds) have *very* different gender  
37  
38 appeals, with consequences for the numbers who continue to study the subject and who seek to  
39  
40 pursue scientific careers. Bell’s research into exam performance shows that the differences in  
41  
42 attitudes and prior experience translate into differential exam performances in ‘declarative  
43  
44 knowledge’ (but not ‘procedural knowledge’); favouring boys for content associated with  
45  
46 mechanics and earth and space; favouring girls for human biology (Bell, 2001; and see also Dresel,  
47  
48 Ziegler, Broome & Heller, 1998; Christidou, 2006). These recent findings interestingly echo  
49  
50 Gardner’s summary some 30 years ago: “Sex is probably the single most important variable  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 related to pupils' attitudes to science... Although social forces are undoubtedly powerful, the  
4  
5 possibility remains that there are innate cognitive differences between males and females which  
6  
7 might influence attitudes and enrolment patterns" (Gardner, 1975, pp. 22-24). Ten years later the  
8  
9 same writer considered that researchers internationally recognised that that gender was an  
10  
11 important variable in *quantitative* aspects of science education and attitudes to science (Gardner  
12  
13 1985). The *qualitative* features of interest in science have received attention with gender as a  
14  
15 critical variable. For example, in their study of science student types in a study involving 5361  
16  
17 students age 12-16, Häussler, Hoffman, Langeheine, Rost & Sievers (1998) were able to classify  
18  
19 physics students into three main types: Type A students - with particular interest in physics and  
20  
21 maths - tend to be boys; Type B students - who are interested in practical aspects of physics such as  
22  
23 technology - tend to be both boys and girls; and Type C students - who are particularly interested in  
24  
25 the application of physics to improving human life such as through medicine - tend to be girls (see  
26  
27 Häussler et al., 1998, pp. 234-235).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

#### 34 ***Gender and conceptual development: current debate on children's cosmologies***

35  
36 Turning now to children's intuitive understandings of common scientific phenomena, we  
37  
38 consider the domain of children's cosmologies. This area has long attracted the attention of  
39  
40 science educators and developmental psychologists because of the conflicts which children have  
41  
42 to overcome as they mentally re-orient from a geocentric to a heliocentric perspective of the  
43  
44 Earth-Sun-System. And of course there has been debate over whether or not it is possible or  
45  
46 educationally sound to teach young children the scientific interpretation of the world; or whether  
47  
48 children essentially have to navigate (what is for them uncharted waters in a new world) alone. For  
49  
50 many decades, this debate has ignored inter-cultural and gender differences: "the world" was  
51  
52 assumed to be where and with whom "he" grew up. Nevertheless researchers have endeavoured to  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 categorize and developmentally sequence the features of children's cosmologies. In Bryce and  
4  
5 Blown (2006) we have recorded the very many attempts to do this, including cross-cultural  
6  
7 research, on the basis of what has been revealed of children's holistic cosmologies through  
8  
9 Piagetian interviews without any visual prompts (such as model Earth globes), prominent  
10  
11 investigations being those by Nussbaum and Novak (1976); Nussbaum (1979); Sneider and Pulos  
12  
13 (1983); Vosniadou and Brewer (1992, 1994), and Vosniadou, Skopeliti, & Ikospentaki (2004).  
14  
15 These studies have been challenged by several groups of researchers who have found no evidence  
16  
17 of children having holistic cosmologies, rather that children's concepts are inconsistent and their  
18  
19 cosmological schemata disorganised and fragmented. In Blown and Bryce (2006) we have argued  
20  
21 that the reason for these profound differences in interpretation is not to be found in children's  
22  
23 responses alone, but rather in the research methodologies of the researchers; in particular interview  
24  
25 technique and the use of researcher-selected models as props. This view has recently been  
26  
27 supported by work by Agan and Sneider (2004) who also identified differences in interview  
28  
29 methods as a critical difference between the traditional Piagetian-Socratic method originally  
30  
31 exemplified by the work of Nussbaum and Novak (1976); and the more modern expository  
32  
33 teaching approach exemplified by the work of Schoultz, Säljö and Wyndhamn (2001). Contrary to  
34  
35 the advice of Nussbaum and Novak, Schoultz et al. introduced children to the scientific concept of  
36  
37 the Earth in the form of a globe at the outset and did not detect any alternative models. Similarly,  
38  
39 we have argued, the use of a range of researcher-designed models of the Earth as props within the  
40  
41 interview schedule is not conducive to children sharing their intuitive, cultural or scientific  
42  
43 cosmologies. Nor are interview techniques that are too dependent on a single medium such as  
44  
45 verbal language; or on media, such as drawing, which can be misinterpreted without three  
46  
47 dimensional modelling by the child using clay (see Brewer, Herdrich & Vosniadou, 1987);  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 play-dough (see Vosniadou, Skopeliti, & Ikospentaki, 2004); or computer graphics (see Baxter &  
4  
5 Preece, 1999). From the perspective of the current studies, it is not surprising that researchers who  
6  
7 have used a less open-ended strategy have failed to find evidence of intuitive and synthetic  
8  
9 cosmologies (or the holistic cosmological schemata of which they are part) in children of other  
10  
11 cultures. For example, Nobes, Moore, Martin, Clifford, Butterworth, Pangiotaki, & Siegal (2003),  
12  
13 who investigated European and Gujurati children in London; Siegal, Butterworth & Newcombe  
14  
15 (2004), with children in England and Australia; Nakashima (1995) and Takahashi (2000) in Japan;  
16  
17 and Jipson (2001) in USA; found no such evidence. Whereas those researchers who followed in  
18  
19 the tradition of Nussbaum & Novak (1976) found evidence in favour of Earth Notions or Mental  
20  
21 Models in a variety of cultures; e.g., Hayes, Goodhew, Heit, & Gillan (2003), in Australia; Agan  
22  
23 and Sneider (2004), in USA; Vosniadou, Skopeliti, & Ikospentaki (2004), in Greece.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Analysis of the literature on children's cosmologies over the past century or more (Table 1 in  
30  
31 Bryce and Blown (2006) indicates that of 69 studies, only 36 give details of the gender of their  
32  
33 participants; and of these only 21 report approximately equal numbers of boys and girls. It is  
34  
35 therefore not surprising that there have been few studies of the influence of gender mediation on  
36  
37 concept acquisition or development in this domain. The reasons, where they have been given or  
38  
39 ascertained, indicate that to many researchers in this field, gender is simply not an issue. For  
40  
41 example, Diakidoy states that "gender was not a relevant variable", in her illuminating study (see  
42  
43 Diakidoy, Vosniadou & Hawks, 1997) of the cosmologies of American-Indian children (I.-A.  
44  
45 Diakidoy, personal communication, 27 June, 2001). Similarly, Samarapungavan, who studied the  
46  
47 cosmologies of Indian children (see Samarapungavan & Vosniadou, 1988; Samarapungavan,  
48  
49 Vosniadou & Brewer, 1996) reported that "We have consistently found no gender effects in  
50  
51 children's cosmologies" (A. Samarapungavan, personal communication, 27 June, 2001). Where  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



gender has been addressed, the evidence of gender mediation in cosmological conceptual development is conflicting. For example, Oakes (1947, 153 children, unspecified gender, aged 4-13) in the USA, found no evidence of gender mediation in his own studies of children's cosmologies, nor in his extensive review of the literature extant at that time. However, Sadler (1992), in a study of 658 boys and 609 girls, aged 14-18, in USA, over a 4- year period (1988-1992) found that boys had greater understanding of astronomical concepts than girls. Similarly, Schoon (1989), also in USA, found gender differences in his investigation of the astronomy and Earth science concepts of 619 males and 594 females, aged 11-18+, males having fewer misconceptions than females. Sneider and Pulos (1983), compared 159 children, aged 9-14, of unspecified gender, from their own study in USA, with children from Israel (Nussbaum, 1979, 240 children, unspecified gender, aged 10-14; Nussbaum & Sharoni-Dagan, 1981, 114 children, unspecified gender, aged 7-8), USA (Nussbaum & Novak, 1976, 52 children, unspecified gender, aged 8), and Nepal (Mali & Howe, 1979, 133 boys and 123 girls, aged 8-12). Sneider and Pulos found that gender influenced attainment with boys demonstrating deeper cosmological understanding than girls. From another perspective, Sneider, Eason and Friedman (1979) in the USA, report that the cosmologies of children are directly influenced by their personal experience with astronomy, and that these experiences are mediated by gender. For example, fewer girls owned telescopes. Lightman, Miller and Leadbeater (1987), in the USA, also found that males tended to know more about astronomy than females. Za'rour (1976) in Lebanon, in a comparative study of the cosmologies of Christian and Moslem children, aged 4-9, with 55 boys and 55 girls in each group, found that boys had more advanced concepts. More recently Trumper (2001), in Israel, investigated the astronomy concepts of 448 junior high school students, aged 13-15, using a

written questionnaire and found that "Boys scored significantly better (38.7%) than girls (34.6%) [ $t = 3.08, p\text{-value} = 0.002$ ]" (p. 1116).

### *The empirical study*

This rather complex pattern of findings and reports on the influence of gender on children's ideas and concept acquisition invites clarification by research. While it seems increasingly certain that particular school topics and teaching emphases do have differential effects upon males and females, our review of the literature shows that it is less clear whether ordinary 'common knowledge' is gender related. As part of the longitudinal, cross-cultural research on the astronomical concepts of children from two contrasting cultures, China and New Zealand (NZ), described in Bryce and Blown (2006) and Blown and Bryce (2006), we searched for evidence of mediation by gender and other factors using an interview guide specifically designed to probe all levels of children's conceptual organisation. The studies were conducted over a 13-year-period from 1987 to 2000. There were six surveys in all: the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> NZ Surveys (1987, 1989); two Main Surveys in NZ and China (1993 and 1994); and two Follow-up Surveys with Control Groups in NZ and China (1998 and 2000), the various studies covering all aspects of children's cosmologies. These included the motion and shape of the Earth, Sun and Moon; habitation of Earth and identity with Earth; and concepts of time and gravity. Knowledge of conceptual development in the field of children's cosmologies has been dominated by one methodological strategy, namely, the almost universal adoption of Piagetian clinical interviews. Table 1 in Bryce and Blown (2006) gives a detailed summary of all of the published research to date. Such studies with  $N > 100$  are rare (see Sadler, 1992) and cross-cultural, longitudinal studies with survey and control groups with  $n > 100$  (as in these studies) are unreported. We chose to continue in the Piagetian research tradition while probing for the richest range of concepts from the youngest

1  
2  
3 accessible children (to investigate initial intuitive concepts); with boys and girls in two dissimilar  
4  
5 cultures (to explore gender and cultural mediation); and longitudinally (to illuminate  
6  
7 developmental trends and the gradual assimilation of the scientific world view). This required an  
8  
9 anthropological-ethnological rationale involving long-term field work by the researcher (2<sup>nd</sup>  
10  
11 author) in the cultures of kindergartens (pre-school or nursery), schools and local communities, for  
12  
13 a period of several years. This was necessary because it was recognised from the outset that:  
14  
15

16  
17 (a) To gain knowledge of the totality of an individual child's cosmology, something that Piaget,  
18  
19 despite his great skill, did not do (see Oakes, 1947), would require at least an hour of interview  
20  
21 time using a sensitive instrument capable of being tuned interactively to children's responses  
22  
23 reflective of intuitive, cultural and scientific conceptual levels.  
24  
25

26  
27 (b) To do this with large enough samples to counteract longitudinal losses and facilitate robust  
28  
29 statistical analysis of ordinal data would entail aiming for  $n > 100$  in all eight main groups  
30  
31 summing to  $N > 800$  overall. In the event, losses were greater than expected, so that although both  
32  
33 Main Surveys (1993, 1994) had 127 and 113 children respectively, by the time of the Follow-up  
34  
35 Surveys (1998, 2000) the number of accessible children had reduced to 82 and 89 respectively,  
36  
37 which determined that the number of children in the Control Groups would also be 82 and 89  
38  
39 respectively. Nevertheless, with the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Surveys, and a long term Pilot Longitudinal Group  
40  
41 (1987-1998), the total number of children interviewed was 686, which was sufficient to meet the  
42  
43 needs of the research design.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 (c) Detecting concepts and subtle differences in their dynamic and static representation by boys  
50  
51 and girls of differing culture and ethnicity, required a multi-modal approach with triangulation of  
52  
53 measurement across three media (Interview verbal responses, Drawing, and Play-dough modelling)  
54  
55 and their associated modalities (see Bryce and Blown, 2006 and Blown and Bryce, 2006).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Three specific research questions were raised:

1. Are there any statistically significant differences (at an alpha level of .05) between boys and girls conceptual acquisition in the domain of astronomy and earth science?
2. Do boys and girls follow similar trends in their cosmological development?
3. Are patterns of knowledge acquisition, cognitive development, and conceptual change in this domain similar for boys and girls across cultures and ethnic groups?

### **Method**

The methodology focused on ascertaining children's concepts of the Motion and Shape of the Earth, and associated concepts of Gravity. The studies utilised three media (Interview verbal responses, Drawing, and Play-dough modelling) with corresponding modal interactions which were triangulated, making the interview technique particularly sensitive to small variations in multi-modal skills and performance which might be associated with gender based ability.

### ***Participants***

The total New Zealand sample was composed of 217 boys and 227 girls (aged 2 to 18); and the total China sample similarly consisted of 129 boys and 113 girls (aged 2-18). Of these, 127 New Zealand children (aged 2-12) including 62 boys and 65 girls; and 113 Chinese children (aged 2-12) including 57 boys and 56 girls participated in the Main Survey (1993-1994).

### ***Apparatus***

The apparatus for the motion study consisted of a metre ruler screwed to a block of wood and a pencil to observe the apparent motion of the Sun. The materials and props required for the Shape, Identity, and Habitation Studies were: (a) coloured play-dough for modelling, (b) A4 cartridge paper and coloured felt pens for drawing the shape of the Earth, Sun and Moon, and (c) small model people, representing "self" and a "friend" who lives a long way away. The gravity studies

1  
2  
3 were supported by a sketch of the Earth with a hole through and a similar play-dough model  
4  
5 (which were only introduced to children who held a spherical Earth cosmology).  
6  
7

### 8 ***Interview design***

9  
10 A comprehensive set of questions was designed as a guide or structure to ensure that all of the  
11  
12 key elements of children's cosmologies were explored without restricting the possible outcomes.  
13  
14 The questions and the interview framework were designed to maximise flexibility to permit  
15  
16 children to share their cosmological concepts over a wide age range (from 2 to 12 years). The  
17  
18 instrument was originally written in English which was translated into *Hanyu* (Mandarin).  
19  
20  
21

### 22 ***Control group design***

23  
24 Of several research designs considered by the authors Solomon's Four Group Design with two  
25  
26 pre-test (Survey) groups and two non-pre-test (Control) groups was selected as the most suitable to  
27  
28 ascertain the impact of repeated interviews (see Isaac & Michael, 1981).  
29  
30  
31

## 32 **Results and discussion**

### 33 ***Categorisation of responses to interview questions, drawings, and play-dough models***

34  
35 A tentative category was given to each response in each element of children's cosmologies and  
36  
37 their name was entered alongside that category to form an *Identified Subject Histogram* in each  
38  
39 element with the categories in ordered rows on the "y" axis, and the child's name, in age columns,  
40  
41 on the "x" axis. Each category was identified by a descriptor and a thumb-nail sketch. In each case  
42  
43 the category scheme was ordered from least scientific (category row 1) to most scientific  
44  
45 (commonly category 12) forming an ordinal scale according to the relationship category 12 >  
46  
47 category 11 > category 10, and so on (see Siegel & Castellan, 1988, p. 25). For example,  
48  
49 considering the cosmological element Earth Motion, the ordinal ranking would be Earth rotating  
50  
51 and revolving > Earth moving in some way > Earth stationary. Similarly, in the case of Earth  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Shape, the ordinal ranking would be: spherical > disc > flat. To ensure validity and reliability of coding of the categorisation scheme a sample of the interview transcripts and drawings were checked by educators in the field and coefficients of agreement determined with average Cohen's  $\kappa$  values of 0.89 as detailed in Blown and Bryce (2006). The categorisation scheme for Earth motion, Earth shape, and other cosmological concepts are illustrated in Authors 2006a.

### ***Main Findings***

The results support the hypothesis that children's cosmological concepts are influenced by gender but the effects are subtle and not universal within or across genders and cultures. The groups were compared by analysis of: (a) cosmological concept categories of boys and girls both within and across cultures using the *Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test [K-S]*; and (b) developmental trends of cosmological concept category by age of boys and girls within and across cultures using the *Spearman rank correlation [r<sub>s</sub>] test*.

### ***Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample [K-S] tests***

With an alpha level of .05 no significant differences were detected when comparing cosmological concepts between groups by gender or culture: e.g., Earth Motion Triangulation: NZ Males:  $M = 7.73$ ,  $SD = 3.56$ ; NZ Females  $M = 7.66$ ,  $SD = 3.56$ ; China Males:  $M = 8.21$ ,  $SD = 3.21$ ; China Females:  $M = 7.32$ ,  $SD = 3.50$ . Earth Shape Triangulation: NZ Males:  $M = 8.76$ ,  $SD = 4.02$ ; NZ Females  $M = 8.14$ ,  $SD = 4.30$ ; China Males:  $M = 10.18$ ,  $SD = 2.73$ ; China Females:  $M = 9.07$ ,  $SD = 3.91$ . Gravity Triangulation: NZ Males:  $M = 6.82$ ,  $SD = 4.79$ ; NZ Females  $M = 6.66$ ,  $SD = 4.84$ ; China Males:  $M = 6.66$ ,  $SD = 4.89$ ; China Females:  $M = 7.50$ ,  $SD = 4.16$ .

### ***Results of Spearman rank correlation [r<sub>s</sub>] tests***

In all cases the correlations of age against cosmological concept category were statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ): e.g., Earth Motion Triangulation: NZ Males:  $r_s = .76$ ; NZ Females  $r_s = .64$ ;

China Males:  $r_s = .71$ ; China Females:  $r_s = .76$ . Earth Shape Triangulation: NZ Males:  $r_s = .71$ ; NZ Females  $r_s = .72$ ; China Males:  $r_s = .59$ ; China Females:  $r_s = .65$ . Gravity Triangulation: NZ Males:  $r_s = .87$ ; NZ Females  $r_s = .83$ ; China Males:  $r_s = .84$ ; China Females:  $r_s = .77$ .

### ***Evidence of gender as a factor***

In general it was found that girls' in both cultures were better able to describe their Earth shape concepts: Earth Shape Interview: NZ Males:  $r_s = .71$ ; NZ Females  $r_s = .73$ ; China Males:  $r_s = .34$ ; China Females:  $r_s = .61$ . Girls were also more able at visually representing their cosmologies: Earth Shape Drawing: NZ Males:  $r_s = .73$ ; NZ Females  $r_s = .77$ ; China Males:  $r_s = .35$ ; China Females:  $r_s = .64$ . Whereas boys displayed greater awareness of gravity. However, the overall trend was one of surprising similarity between boys and girls across cultures.

### ***Interview transcript excerpts and sample categorisation method***

The following extracts from the interview transcripts show one boy and one girl from each culture are shown discussing their cosmologies with the researcher (the second author). Gender, age (in years and months), culture and ethnicity are given in parenthesis. Further comprehensive protocols of the research instrument (interview guide) may be found in Bryce and Blown (2006) and Blown and Bryce (2006).

### ***Motion and Time studies***

Environment: Outdoors in sunshine observing the divergence of shadows between a shadow-stick and a pencil. Media: A4 paper, pencil, to draw motion of Earth, Sun and Moon; daytime and night-time. [The experimental/observational situation was introduced and the child was invited to place a pencil so that the tip was at right-angles to and touching the ruler shadow.]

### ***Motion of a ruler shadow and the apparent motion of the Sun: New Zealand***

Researcher: *What causes the shadows?*

Nikolai (Boy; 10, 7; NZ; Maori): *The Sun shines down to (the Earth) – and it's blocking – the Sun's rays to the grass and the concrete.*

Researcher: *Is anything moving?*

Nikolai: *The shadow – because the wind's blowing it – the shadow (is moving away) –from the pencil.*

Note. Nikolai concentrates on what he is immediately observing rather than following his original train of thought about the motion of the Earth with respect to the Sun. There is a slight breeze blowing causing the ruler to shake.

Researcher: *Why is it moving?*

Nikolai: *Because we're moving away from the Sun.*

Note. Nikolai returns to his original idea. He is probably thinking of both causes at the same time and decides that the rotation of the Earth is the most likely cause.

Researcher: *Has what is happening got anything to do with the Sun?*

Nikolai: *Yes.*

Researcher: *Is the Sun moving?*

Nikolai: *No.*

Researcher: *Has what is happening got anything to do with the Earth?*

Nikolai: *Yes.*

Researcher: *Is the Earth moving?*

Nikolai: *Yes.*

Researcher: *How is the Earth moving?*

Nikolai: *It's going around a circle.*

Note. Before probing further the researcher has to determine Nikolai's Earth Shape concepts because the researcher does not want to be the first to introduce a spherical Earth model.

Researcher: *What shape is the Earth?*

Nikolai: *Round.*

Researcher: *Round like...?*

Nikolai: *Round like a ball.*

Note. Now that the researcher knows that Nikolai believes that the Earth is ball-shaped, there can be discussion of concepts such as spinning, rolling, and revolving to clarify what Nikolai meant when he said the Earth went "around a circle."

### ***Motion of a ruler shadow and the apparent motion of the Sun: China***

Researcher: *What causes the shadows?*

Feng Yan (Boy; 4, 7; China; Han): *The Sun.*

Researcher: *Is anything moving?*

Feng Yan: *The (ruler) shadow moves.*

Researcher: *Why is it moving?*

Feng Yan: *Because the wind is blowing the ruler.*

Note. There is also a slight breeze (in China) which is shaking the shadow stick.

Researcher: *Has what is happening got anything to do with the Sun?*

Feng Yan: *Yes – and the Earth.*

Researcher: *Is the Sun moving?*

Feng Yan: *Yes.*

Researcher: *How is the Sun moving?*

Feng Yan: *(Indicates circular motion with hand).*

Researcher: *Does it go around something (revolve) or does it go around itself (spin)? (Researcher uses hands to model motion).*

Feng Yan: *It moves like this (moves hand in a circle motion) – when we (China) are at night-time – America is in daytime.*

Researcher: *Has what is happening got anything to do with the Earth?*

Feng Yan: *Yes.*



1  
2  
3 Researcher: *Is the Earth moving?*

4 Feng Yan: *Yes.*

5 Researcher: *How is the Earth moving?*

6 Feng Yan: *The Earth goes around the Sun.*

7 Note. Although Feng is only 4-years-old he has a scientific concept of the Earth-Sun system.

8 ***Shape studies***

9 Environment: A small room or library with a view of the ground and sky from a window.

10 Media: A4 paper and coloured felt pens for drawing the Earth, Ground and Sky.

11 ***Shape of the Earth: New Zealand***

12 Researcher: *Tell me about the Earth?*

13 Kaelah (Girl; 5, 7; NZ; Euro): *It's next to the Moon.*

14 Researcher: *What is the Earth?*

15 Kaelah: *A round ball.*

16 Researcher: *What is the Earth made of?*

17 Kaelah: *I don't know.*

18 Researcher: *Where is the Earth?*

19 Kaelah: *In space.*

20 Researcher: *What shape is the Earth?*

21 Kaelah: *Round.*

22 Researcher: *Round like a disc or round like a ball or round in some other way?*

23 Kaelah: *Round like a ball.*

24 ***Shape of the Earth: China***

25 Researcher: *Tell me about the Earth?*

26 Jia Li Li (Girl; 5, 3; China; Han): *The Earth is in the sky – and it doesn't need human  
27 beings to move it – it can go by itself.*

28 Researcher: *What is the Earth made of?*

29 Jia Li Li: *I'm not sure.*

30 Researcher: *Where is the Earth?*

31 Jia Li Li: *In the sky.*

32 Researcher: *Point to where the Earth is?*

33 Jia Li Li: *Up above us (points to the sky).*

34 Researcher: *What shape is the Earth?*

35 Jia Li Li: *A circle (round).*

36 Researcher: *Round like a disc or round like a ball or round in some other way?*

37 Jia Li Li: *Like a ball.*

38 Note. Children also modelled the shape of the Earth in play-dough; and drew and modelled the  
39 shape of the Sun and Moon in a similar manner.

40 ***Comment on categorisation of responses:*** Nikolai's interview responses, drawings and

41 play-dough modelling confirmed that he believed that the Earth moved and the Sun was stationary;

42 but he was uncertain of the Earth's rotation or its revolution around the Sun. This placed him in

43 Earth Motion *Cosmological Concept Category 8* for Interview, Drawing, and Play-dough

1  
2  
3 modelling modalities (see Appendix B1 in Bryce and Blown, 2006). Similarly Feng Yang, who  
4  
5 was aware of the Earth's revolution around the Sun, was placed Earth Motion *Cosmological*  
6  
7 *Concept Category* 9. Jia Li Li's verbal responses to questions about the motion and shape of the  
8  
9 Earth, combined with her drawing showed that she held a dual-Earth concept, with a flat ground on  
10  
11 which she lived, and a spherical Earth in the sky which was uninhabited (these latter details being  
12  
13 confirmed in her later interview on Habitation of Earth and Identity with Earth). By triangulation,  
14  
15 these results placed her in Earth Motion *Cosmological Concept Category* 8 for Interview and  
16  
17 Drawing modalities; and Earth Shape *Cosmological Category* 6 for Verbal Language and Drawing  
18  
19 modalities (see Appendix B3 in Bryce and Blown, 2006); a finding which was later confirmed by  
20  
21 play-dough modelling. Similarly, Kaelah's responses and drawing also indicated a dual-Earth  
22  
23 cosmology with a spherical Earth in space and a flat ground below which placed her in Earth  
24  
25 Motion *Cosmological Concept Category* 8 for Interview and Drawing modalities; and Earth Shape  
26  
27 *Cosmological Concept Category* 6 for Verbal Language and Drawing modalities, like Jia Li Li.  
28  
29 However, later, in the interview on Habitation of Earth and Identity with Earth, unlike Jia Li Li,  
30  
31 Kaelah believed that she lives on the Earth, which placed her in a higher Habitation *Cosmological*  
32  
33 *Concept Category*: Jia Li Li was placed in Habitation *Cosmological Concept Category* 6, whereas  
34  
35 Kaelah was placed in Habitation *Cosmological Concept Category* 8 (see Appendix B3 in Bryce  
36  
37 and Blown, 2006). Kaelah's placement was confirmed by later triangulation from play-dough  
38  
39 modelling when she made a ball-shaped Earth.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 **Conclusions**

49  
50 The three research questions which guided the study were all answered in favour of similarity  
51  
52 between boys and girls within and across cultures as follows:  
53  
54

- 55 1. There were no statistically significant differences (at an alpha level of .05) between boys  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and girls conceptual acquisition in the domain of astronomy and Earth science.

4  
5  
6 2. Boys and girls follow similar trends in their cosmological development.

7  
8 3. The patterns of knowledge acquisition, cognitive development, and conceptual change, are  
9  
10 similar for boys and girls across cultures and ethnic groups.

11  
12 These studies took place over a period of more than a decade with boys and girls from two  
13  
14 diverse cultures in the expectation that there would be significant differences in children's  
15  
16 cosmological concepts at all ages between cultures and possibly, though less certainly, between  
17  
18 ethnicities, and boys and girls. In the event, the results have shown remarkable similarity at all  
19  
20 three phases of conceptual organisation – intuitive, cultural and scientific – within and across  
21  
22 cultures, ethnicities and genders. They have also shown that such differences as there are can only  
23  
24 be revealed by a refined interviewing technique incorporating multimedia-multimodal procedures  
25  
26 with triangulation of measurement to detect their fine texture. There is therefore good reason to  
27  
28 believe that the results are not unique to Chinese and New Zealand children and that, were the  
29  
30 same methods to be used to interview children in other cultures, a similar pattern of results would  
31  
32 be obtained. Since it is apparent from the literature review that studies in this field using Piagetian  
33  
34 interviews with boys and girls from differing cultures are not new, it seems reasonable to believe  
35  
36 that there would have been similar differences in those groups but either they were not detected or  
37  
38 because they were considered to be unimportant they were not reported. This raises three  
39  
40 important questions. The first relates to differences in the literature on the apparent relevance of  
41  
42 gender as a factor. The explanation that the current authors were specifically looking for gender  
43  
44 effects, although true, is not sufficient. Nor is the full answer to be found in the interview technique  
45  
46 which owes much to Piaget (1929, 1930); Nussbaum and Novak (1976); Nussbaum (1979); and  
47  
48 other researchers. It seems that the real answer lies in the way in which this research was  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 approached as an anthropological-ethnological study involving *adoption* by the culture, and  
4  
5 necessitating the allocation of adequate *time* – the major limitation of all Piagetian studies. By  
6  
7 allowing time for children and teachers to accept the researcher not as a stranger or visitor but as a  
8  
9 member of the culture of the kindergarten or school, it was possible for children to share their ideas  
10  
11 in a way that they would never do with a stranger (for a variety of reasons). A younger child might  
12  
13 simply be following the sound advice of all parents and teachers to be wary of strangers. An older  
14  
15 child might fear ridicule by expressing inner thoughts that conflict with what they have been  
16  
17 taught by parents or teachers. Even older children might be reluctant to be seen talking with an  
18  
19 adult (any adult), one-to-one, because it isn't the done thing. The anthropological-ethnological  
20  
21 researcher has to be aware of these difficulties and to overcome them, and the easiest way to do so  
22  
23 is to spend time with the young people in other roles before trying to interview them. In the  
24  
25 introduction much was said about the structure of the interview design and setting. What was not  
26  
27 said, and what is of paramount importance, is that interviewers should not go in “cold” as visiting  
28  
29 researchers and expect children to share their ideas. They won't. Not in great depth anyway. The  
30  
31 researcher learned this very early in the 1<sup>st</sup> NZ Survey. As a junior class teacher he had learned to  
32  
33 play with children and several hours were spent just playing – especially at kindergarten – until he  
34  
35 was accepted as someone who belonged and could be trusted so it would be alright to sit down and  
36  
37 talk to him. Another simple idea learned from kindergarten teachers in New Zealand – and also  
38  
39 later known to have been used by Hall (1883) in USA – was that of interviewing young children in  
40  
41 the natural setting of the kindergarten with their friends running around and even coming over to  
42  
43 see what was going on (without interrupting to any great degree – and without critically  
44  
45 influencing validity). So that the young people felt at ease and were willing to share their deepest  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 intuitive ideas. The idea of interviewing children one-to-one in a quiet room out of contact with the  
4  
5 living activity of the school is not conducive to finding out what young people really think.  
6  
7

8 A second question that needs to be addressed is that of the remarkable similarity of children's  
9  
10 intuitive ideas in dissimilar cultures and environments. The answer appears to be closely related to  
11  
12 what has been said about play. Children in China and New Zealand play similar games. They also  
13  
14 have similar toys and are told similar stories (fairy tales) by their parents and teachers. The  
15  
16 characters may differ, but the moral is the same. When they investigate nature, such as studying an  
17  
18 insect or a flower or clouds, they do so in similar ways. And from their perspective, their everyday  
19  
20 environments, because they are nature centred, are also very similar. Conceptual dissimilarity does  
21  
22 not come from nature; it comes from people. So at the intuitive level, where children are  
23  
24 interacting directly with their environments with minimal interference or guidance or control, the  
25  
26 worlds of Chinese and New Zealand children have much more in common than in difference. And  
27  
28 their initial concepts and cosmologies reflect this similarity. Cultural influences are there from the  
29  
30 time a child is born, but they do not become significant until the child is old enough to listen with  
31  
32 meaning and to talk fluently, by which time they attend kindergarten (at age 2 or 3 in China and  
33  
34 New Zealand). Once at kindergarten any cultural influence from the home or other sources has to  
35  
36 compete with the scientific world view of teachers, who regardless of culture, have to attend  
37  
38 university or teachers college where they are taught by people who are unlikely to be bound by  
39  
40 traditional cultural ideas. So from about age 3-years children in China and New Zealand who  
41  
42 attend kindergarten (and the majority do) are exposed to a universal world view – that of science –  
43  
44 which over-rides – or at least sits alongside (and sometimes conflicts with) whatever they may  
45  
46 learn from their local traditional culture. And by the time they attend school (at age 5 in New  
47  
48 Zealand, and age 7 in China) they are submerged in the world of science which is reflected in their  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cosmologies, which often show elements of cultural mediation at this age. But by the age of 11 or  
4  
5 12 years, children's cosmologies are almost invariably similar to those of scientifically  
6  
7 knowledgeable adults.  
8  
9

10 The final question to be answered is the place of gender in these patterns of similarity despite  
11  
12 cultural diversity. Here, the most significant factor is thought to be the way in which children in  
13  
14 China and New Zealand are valued in gender-free ways. In China, because the one child policy  
15  
16 de-emphasises gender. And in New Zealand, for a similar reason: although not compulsory, New  
17  
18 Zealanders prefer small families, so there is a high proportion of single child, and two-child  
19  
20 families, and a strong tendency towards treating boys and girls equally. It is also significant that  
21  
22 both countries are essentially egalitarian with a strong aversion to social class structures and the  
23  
24 gender bias that adherence to such outdated feudal traditions entail. More work has to be done to  
25  
26 ascertain whether or not the findings reported here are typical of other cultures and to identify the  
27  
28 factors contributing to subtle differences in the abilities of boys and girls for the benefit of *all*  
29  
30 children, regardless of culture, ethnicity or gender.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 ***Implications for teacher training, teaching, and learning science***

37  
38 The main implications of these studies are that student teachers and in-service trained teachers  
39  
40 who are planning to teach science either at primary (elementary) level or at secondary level should  
41  
42 be taught astronomy and Earth science by specialists in the field who should introduce students to  
43  
44 a wide range of astronomical experiences as a foundation for future teaching utilising the local  
45  
46 environment. These experiences should include (a) multi-media approaches to teaching astronomy  
47  
48 and Earth science in the classroom including use of computer graphics, (b) naked eye observation  
49  
50 on a daily basis of the position of rising and setting of the Sun (possibly as homework in summer)  
51  
52 and the effect of seasonal change, (c) similar observation of the phases of the Moon, (d)  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 determining the North-South meridian line, local noon, and time by use of shadow sticks and  
4 elementary sundials, (e) night-time naked-eye observation of the heavens with the assistance of  
5 parents and local astronomers, (f) similar observations using telescopes supplied by local  
6 astronomers or educational resource centres, (g) field trips to astronomical observatories,  
7 planetariums, and science museums to view telescopes, the heavens, and if possible a Foucault  
8 pendulum (to give direct experience of the rotation of the Earth), (h) with children age 10 or older  
9 consider making Newtonian telescopes as an extension activity at school or in an extra-curricular  
10 club. In all cases all children should be involved, and in planning field trips, extra-curricular  
11 activities, and evening observation sessions, as many teacher colleagues and parents as possible  
12 should be involved (e.g., in supervising the observation of Jupiter, Saturn or Mars through a  
13 telescope).

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Returning to the relationships between common, intuitive scientific knowledge and formal learning in science at school, we can conclude (from this study) that the former seems *not* to be gender-related and (from literature reviewed at the start of this article) that the latter, particularly at secondary school levels, *is* gender-related (with clear indications that educational disadvantage has swung from female to male over recent years). We would argue that these are not incompatible findings and underline what dedicated and determined professional teachers have achieved in modern times and what, from an evidence-based practice argument, they must turn to now. Assuming Dee's (2006; forthcoming) research on teacher-gender effects is borne out in other cultures, it will be for increasing numbers of *female* teachers to find ways of countering the negative trend. What governments themselves might do to tackle the 'feminisation' of society in general and teaching in particular would seem intractable.

**References**

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Agan, L., & Sneider, C. (2004). Learning about the Earth's shape and gravity: A guide for  
7 teachers and curriculum developers. *Astronomy Education Review*, 2(2), 90-117.  
8
- 9 Ahmed, K. & Townsend, M. (2003). Poor white boys flounder under 'feminised' teaching.  
10 *The Observer*, Sunday August 17, 2003.  
11
- 12 Annett, M. (1985). *Left, right, hand and brain: The right shift theory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.  
13
- 14 Anokhin, A. P., Lutzenberger, W., Nikolaev, A., & Birbaumer, N. (2000). Complexity of  
15 electrocortical dynamics in children: developmental aspects. *Developmental*  
16 *Psychobiology*, 36(1), 9-22.  
17
- 18 Baker, P. (2006). Understanding the gender gap – part 1. *New Zealand Herald*, 19 April, 2006.  
19 Auckland: APN Holdings NZ Ltd.  
20
- 21 Baxter, J. H., & Preece, P. F. W. (1999). Interactive multimedia and concrete three-  
22 dimensional modelling. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 15, 323-331.  
23
- 24 Bell, J. F. (2001) Investigating gender differences in the science performance of 16-year-old  
25 pupils in the UK. *International Journal of Science Education*, 23(5), 469-486.  
26
- 27 Bishop, R. (2007). Half of Maori boys leave school with no qualification. *New Zealand Herald*,  
28 12 February, 2007. Auckland: APN Holdings NZ Ltd.  
29
- 30 Blown, E.J. and Bryce, T.G.K. (2006) Knowledge Restructuring in the Development of  
31 Children's Cosmologies. *International Journal of Science Education*. 28.12, 1411–1462.  
32
- 33 Bradshaw, J. L., & Nettleton, N. C. (1983). *Human cerebral asymmetry*. Englewood Cliffs,  
34 NJ: Prentice-Hall.  
35
- 36 Brewer, W. F., Herdrich, D. J., & Vosniadou, S. (1987, January). *A cross-cultural study of*  
37 *children's development of cosmological models: Samoan and American data*. Paper  
38 presented at the Third International Conference on Thinking, Honolulu, HI.  
39
- 40 Bryce, T.G.K. and Blown, E.J. (2006) Cultural Mediation of Children's Cosmologies: A  
41 longitudinal study of the astronomy concepts of Chinese and New Zealand children.  
42 *International Journal of Science Education*. 28.10, 1113–1160.  
43
- 44 Caplan, P. J., Crawford, M., Hyde, J. S., & Richardson, J. T. E. (1997). *Gender differences in*  
45 *human cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
46
- 47 Casey, M. B. (1995). Empirical support for Annett's conception of the heterozygotic  
48 advantage. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive*, 14(5), 520-528.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Christidou, V. (2006) Greek Students' Science-related Interests and Experiences: Gender  
4 differences and correlations. *International Journal of Science Education*. 28(10), 1181 –  
5 1199.  
6  
7  
8 Croxford, L., Tinklin, T., Ducklin, A., & Frame, B. (2001). Gender and pupil performance.  
9 *Interchange 70*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.  
10  
11 De Courten-Myers, G. M. (1999). The human cerebral cortex: Gender differences in structure  
12 and function. *Journal of Neuropathology & Experimental Neurology*, 58(3), 217-226.  
13  
14  
15 Dee, T. S. (2006). The Why chromosome: How a teacher's gender affects boys and girls.  
16 *Education Next*. Fall 2006, 69-75.  
17  
18  
19 Dee, T. S. (forthcoming). Teachers and the gender gap in student achievement. *Journal of*  
20 *Human Resources*.  
21  
22 Department of Education and Skills (2006). Gender and achievement in schools.  
23 ([http://findoutmore.dfes.gov.uk/2006/07/gender\\_and\\_achi.htm](http://findoutmore.dfes.gov.uk/2006/07/gender_and_achi.htm)).  
24  
25  
26 Diakidoy, I-A., Vosniadou, S., & Hawks, J. D. (1997). Conceptual change in astronomy:  
27 Models of the earth and of the day/night cycle in American-Indian children. *European*  
28 *Journal of Psychology of Education*, 12 (2), 159-184.  
29  
30  
31 Dresel, M., Ziegler, A., Broome, P., Heller, K.A. (1998) Gender Differences in Science  
32 Education: The double-edged role of prior knowledge. *Roepers Review*, 21(2), 101-106.  
33  
34  
35 Furlong, A. & Cartmel, F. (1997). *Young people and social change: Individualism and risk*  
36 *in late modernity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.  
37  
38  
39 Gardner, P.L. (1975). Attitude to science: a review. *Studies in Science Education*, 2, 1-41.  
40  
41 Gardner, P. (1985). Students' interest in science and technology. An international overview.  
42 In M. Lehrke, L. Hoffman and P. Gardener (Eds.), *Interests in Science and Technology*  
43 *Education*, 12th IPN-Symposium. Keil: IPN, 15-34.  
44  
45 Giedd, J., Blumenthal, J., Jeffries, N., Rajapakse, J., Vaituzis, C., Liu, H., Berry, Y., Tobin,  
46 M., Nelson, J., Castellanos, F. (1999). Development of the human corpus callosum during  
47 childhood and adolescence: a longitudinal MRI study. *Prog. Neuro-Psychopharmacol &*  
48 *Biol Psychiat.*, 23: 571-588.  
49 (see also: [www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/teenbrain/work/adolescent.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/teenbrain/work/adolescent.html))  
50  
51 Goldenberg, S. (2005, January 18) Why women are poor at science, by Harvard president.  
52 *The Guardian*.  
53  
54  
55 Hacker, R. G. (1986). Class gender and science teaching process. *European Journal of*  
56 *Science Education*, 8(1), 57-71.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Hall, G. S. (1883). The contents of children's minds. *Princeton Review*, 11, 249-272.  
4  
5  
6 Hames, T. (2000). [Title unknown]. *The Times*, 18 August, 2000.  
7 (<http://www.nationalliteracytrust.org.uk/database/boys/boysviews.html>).  
8  
9 Häussler, P., Hoffman, L., Langeheine, R., Rost, J., & Sievers, K. (1998). A typology of  
10 students' interest in physics and the distribution of gender and age within each type.  
11 *International Journal of Science Education*, 20(2), 223-38.  
12  
13  
14 Hayes, B. K., Goodhew, A., Heit, E., & Gillan, J. (2003). The role of diverse instruction in  
15 conceptual change. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 86, 253-276.  
16  
17  
18 Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego: EdITS.  
19  
20 Jipson, J. L. (2001). It's like a big, blue, ball: Parent-child conversation and children's  
21 understanding of the shape of the earth. *Dissertatiocn Abstracts International: Setion B:*  
22 *The Sciences & Engineering*, 62(2-B), pp. 1115.  
23  
24  
25 Kelly, A. (Ed.). (1987). *Science for girls?* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.  
26  
27 Kershner, J., & Chyczij, M. (1992). Lateral preference in six to nine year old children:  
28 Relationships to language lateralization and cognitive ability. *Learning and Individual*  
29 *Differences*, 4(4), 347-367.  
30  
31  
32 Lightman, A., Miller, J., & Leadbeater, B. (1987). Contemporary cosmological beliefs. In J.  
33 D. Novak (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Misconceptions and*  
34 *Educational Strategies in Science and Mathematics*, (Vol. 3, pp. 309-321). Ithaca, NY:  
35 Cornell University.  
36  
37  
38 Livingstone, I. (2004). *Going, going...? Men in primary teaching in New Zealand.*  
39 (Occasional Papers). Wellington: New Zealand Educational Institute  
40  
41  
42 Mali, G. B., & Howe, A. (1979). Development of Earth and gravity concepts among Nepali  
43 children. *Science Education*, 63 (5), 685- 691.  
44  
45  
46 Nakashima, N. (1995) A Study on how to relate "observational knowledge" and "knowledge  
47 from scientific information": The case of the concept of the Earth's shape. Paper  
48 presented at the 15<sup>th</sup> biennial meeting of the International Society for the Study of  
49 Behavioural Development, July 1-4, Berne, Switzerland (in English).  
50  
51  
52 National Education Association, (1997). *Status of the American public school teacher 1995-*  
53 *96*. West Haven, CT: NEA Professional Library.  
54  
55  
56 New Zealand Ministry of Education (2006). *Student outcome overview 2001-2005*. Wellington:  
57 NZ Ministry of Education.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 New Zealand Ministry of Education (2003). *School statistics: School Staff*. Wellington:  
4 NZ Ministry of Education.  
5  
6  
7 Nobes, G., Moore, D. G., Martin, A. E., Clifford, B. R., Butterworth, G., Panagiotaki, G., &  
8 Siegal, M. (2003). Children's understanding of the earth in a multicultural community:  
9 Mental models or fragments of knowledge? *Developmental Science*, 6 (1), 72-85.  
10  
11  
12 Nussbaum, J. (1979). Children's conceptions of the earth as a cosmic body: a cross age study.  
13 *Science Education*, 63, 83-93.  
14  
15  
16 Nussbaum, J., & Novak, J. D. (1976). An assessment of children's concepts of the earth  
17 utilizing structured interviews. *Science Education*, 60, 535-550.  
18  
19  
20 Nussbaum, J., & Sharoni-Dagan, N. (1981). *Changes in second children's perceptions and*  
21 *alternative frameworks about the earth as a cosmic body resulting from a short series of*  
22 *audio-tutorial lessons*. Israel Science Teaching Centre, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.  
23  
24  
25 Oakes, M. E. (1947). *Children's explanations of natural phenomena* (Contribution to  
26 Education, No. 926). New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University.  
27  
28  
29 OECD (2003). *First Results from PISA 2003*, Executive Summary,  
30 (<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/63/34002454.pdf>)  
31  
32  
33 Piaget, J. (1929). *The child's conception of the world*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.  
34  
35  
36  
37 Piaget, J. (1930). *The child's conception of physical causality*. London: Routledge & Kegan  
38 Paul.  
39  
40  
41  
42 Powney, J. (1997). *Gender and attainment: A review*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for  
43 Research in Education.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 Pratt, A. (1999) *Gender Differences in student achievement and in rates of participation in the*  
53 *school sector, 1986 – 1997: A Summary Report*. The Research Bulletin, 10, Research  
54 Division. Wellington: Ministry of Education, New Zealand.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Edinburgh University Press.

- Ridley, M. (2004) *Nature via Nurture: Genes, Experience and what makes us human*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Ripley, A. (2005) Who says a woman can't be Einstein? *Time*, 7 March, 2005, 51-60.
- Sadler, P. M. (1992). *The initial knowledge state of high school astronomy students*. D. Ed. thesis, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.
- Samarapungavan, A., & Vosniadou, S. (1988, April). *What children from India know about observational astronomy: a cross-cultural study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Samarapungavan, A., Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1996). Mental models of the earth, sun, and moon: Indian Children's Cosmologies. *Cognitive Development*, 11, 491-521.
- Schoon, K. J. (1989). *Misconceptions in the earth and space sciences: A cross-age study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, Illinois.
- Schoultz, J., Säljö, R., & Wyndhamn, J. (2001). Heavenly talk: discourse, artifacts, and children's understanding of elementary astronomy. *Human Development*, 44, 103-118.
- Scottish Executive, (2005). Gender Balance of the Teaching Workforce in Publicly Funded Schools in Scotland. *Insight 24*. Edinburgh: Author.
- Siegal, M., Butterworth, G., & Newcombe, P. A. (2004). Culture and children's cosmology. *Developmental Science*, 7 (3), 308-324.
- Siegel, H. R. (2000). Laterality of mental rotation processing and its application to standardised tests of mental rotation. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 61(6-B), 3292.
- Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J. Jr., (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sneider, C. I., Eason, L. P. & Friedman, A. J. (1979). Summative evaluation of a participatory science exhibit. *Science Education*, 63 (1), 25-36.
- Sneider, C., & Pulos, S. (1983). Children's cosmographies: Understanding the earth's shape and gravity. *Science Education*, 67, 205-221.
- Takahashi, I. (2000). Children's understanding of their own vs. scientific views of the earth's shape. *Japanese Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 11(2), 89-99.
- Trumper, R. (2001). A cross-age study of junior high school students' conceptions of basic

1  
2  
3 astronomy concepts. *International Journal of Science Education*, 23(11), 1111-1123.

4  
5  
6 Uecker, A., & Obrzut, J. E. (1993). Hemisphere and gender differences in mental rotation.  
7 *Brain and Cognition*, 22(1), 42-50.

8  
9 Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1987). Theories of knowledge restructuring in development.  
10 *Review of Educational Research*, 57 (1), 51-67.

11  
12 Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1992). Mental models of the Earth: a study of conceptual  
13 change in childhood. *Cognitive Psychology*, 24 (4), 535-585.

14  
15  
16 Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1994). Mental models of the day/night cycle. *Cognitive*  
17 *Science*, 18 (1), 123-183.

18  
19  
20 Vosniadou, S., Skopeliti, I., & Ikospentaki, K. (2004). Modes of knowing and ways of  
21 reasoning in elementary astronomy. *Cognitive Development*, 19 (2), 203-222.

22  
23  
24 Walter, K. D., Roberts, A. E., & Brownlow, S. (2000). Spatial perception and mental rotation  
25 produce gender differences in cerebral hemovelocity: A TCD study. *Journal of*  
26 *Psychophysiology*, 14(1), 37-45.

27  
28  
29 Warden, K. (2002). Bridging the gap. *Teachers* (23).  
30 ([http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/teachers/issue23/secondary/features/Bridgingthegap\\_Secondary](http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/teachers/issue23/secondary/features/Bridgingthegap_Secondary)).

31  
32 Xie, Y. & Shauman, K. A. (2003) *Women in Science: Career Processes and Outcomes*.  
33 Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

34  
35  
36 Za'rour, G. I. (1976). Interpretation of natural phenomena by Lebanese school children.  
37 *Science Education*, 60 (2), 277-287.

38  
39  
40 Zhang, Y. (2005). *Female teachers dominate lower education*. China through a lens. Beijing.  
41 (<http://www.china.org.cn/english/2005/Sep/142979.htm>).