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The original publication of this article contained several incorrect citations, the incorrect and correct citations are shown in this correction article. The original article has been updated.

Incorrect.

– This awareness has resulted in a magnitude of studies focused on improving preservice teachers’ confidence in teaching science (e.g. Author, 2018; Cinici, 2017; Kinskey & Callahan, 2021; Trauth-Nare, 2015).
– Literature regarding why teachers make specific decisions about their science instruction often includes self-reported low confidence with abilities to facilitate science content (Menon & Sadler, 2016), a lack of time to enact complex science lessons (Author, 2021b), or the belief that young children are not capable of engaging in cognitive demanding science, despite empirical evidence suggesting otherwise (Roth, 2014).
– Despite concerns regarding young children’s abilities to engage in complex scientific thinking, there is empirical and practitioner-based evidence of successful SSI in elementary (Author, 2021b; Dolan & Zeidler, 2009; Kahn, 2019) and secondary classrooms (see Zeidler et al., 2011, 2014).
– Alternatively, when Author (2021b) had elementary preservice teachers write SSI lesson plans, the challenge was incorporating science content with a hands-on activity.
– An exception to the practice of separating content from the controversial issue within content course contexts is illustrated in a study of TCs enrolled in an environmental science course that used wolf management in California as an SSI to teach ecology and develop socioscientific perspective taking (SSPT) (Author, 2020).
– Additionally, Author (2023) examined the use of immersive virtual reality fieldtrips using virtual reality headsets in a science content course for preservice teachers to consider the mitigation of and resiliency to climate change on the Outer Banks of North Carolina, USA. Analysis of the data indicated that students were highly engaged with the issue and developed a more sophisticated understanding of the issue.

Correct.

– This awareness has resulted in a magnitude of studies focused on improving preservice teachers’ confidence in teaching science (e.g. Cinici, 2017; Kinskey, 2018; Kinskey & Callahan, 2021; Trauth-Nare, 2015).
– Literature regarding why teachers make specific decisions about their science instruction often includes self-reported low confidence with abilities to facilitate science content (Menon & Sadler, 2016), a lack of time to enact complex science lessons (Author, 2021b), or the belief that young children are not capable of engaging in cognitive demanding science, despite empirical evidence suggesting otherwise (Roth, 2014).
– Despite concerns regarding young children’s abilities to engage in complex scientific thinking, there is empirical and practitioner-based evidence of successful SSI in elementary (Author, 2021b; Dolan & Zeidler, 2009; Kahn, 2019) and secondary classrooms (see Zeidler et al., 2011, 2014).
– Alternatively, when Author (2021b) had elementary preservice teachers write SSI lesson plans, the challenge was incorporating science content with a hands-on activity.
– An exception to the practice of separating content from the controversial issue within content course contexts is illustrated in a study of TCs enrolled in an environmental science course that used wolf management in California as an SSI to teach ecology and develop socioscientific perspective taking (SSPT) (Author, 2020).
– Additionally, Author (2023) examined the use of immersive virtual reality fieldtrips using virtual reality headsets in a science content course for preservice teachers to consider the mitigation of and resiliency to climate change on the Outer Banks of North Carolina, USA. Analysis of the data indicated that students were highly engaged with the issue and developed a more sophisticated understanding of the issue.
to facilitate science content (Menon & Sadler, 2016), a lack of time to enact complex science lessons (Kinskey & Zeidler, 2021), or the belief that young children are not capable of engaging in cognitive demanding science, despite empirical evidence suggesting otherwise (Roth, 2014).

– Despite concerns regarding young children’s abilities to engage in complex scientific thinking, there is empirical and practitioner-based evidence of successful SSI in elementary (Dolan & Zeidler, 2009; Kahn, 2019; Kinskey & Zeidler, 2021) and secondary classrooms (see Zeidler et al., 2011, 2014).

– Alternatively, when Kinskey & Zeidler (2021) had elementary preservice teachers write SSI lesson plans, the challenge was incorporating science content with a hands-on activity.

– An exception to the practice of separating content from the controversial issue within content course contexts is illustrated in a study of TCs enrolled in an environmental science course that used wolf management in California as an SSI to teach ecology and develop socioscientific perspective taking (SSPT) (Newton & Zeidler, 2020).

– Additionally, Newton et al. (2023) examined the use of immersive virtual reality fieldtrips using virtual reality headsets in a science content course for preservice teachers to consider the mitigation of and resiliency to climate change on the Outer Banks of North Carolina, USA. Analysis of the data indicated that students were highly engaged with the issue and developed a more sophisticated understanding of the issue.
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