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Identification of positions in literature using Thematic Network Analysis: The case of early childhood inquiry-based science education

Reviews of literature often summarise research within a given field to provide succinct and accessible information about state of the art as well as gaps for future research to address. In educational research such information may include different positions within a field; for example, theoretical positions underpinning empirical studies. Such theoretical positions may influence interpretations of research results, and they remain a challenge to map and present. In this paper, we show how to use thematic analysis combined with network analysis to construct maps, analyse, and synthesize theoretical positions within educational research. We use early childhood inquiry-based science education (ECIBSE) literature as a case, because of its historical roots in Dewey’s educational philosophy. This allows us to discuss our findings in light of a well-known theoretical framework. Using our methodology, we identify and analyse four theoretical positions for teaching and learning: (1) that science should be learned/understood through inquiry, (2) that teaching should model scientific practices, (3) that children should develop science-related competencies, and (4) that the child’s exploration and experience should take precedence. After discussing these positions in relation to Dewey, we turn to the methodological possibilities and challenges of using thematic network analysis for literature reviews.
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# Introduction

In educational research theoretical standpoints are important to understand the reasoning behind a particular intervention. For instance, in inquiry-based science education (IBSE) literature, an understanding that knowledge is constructed on the basis of experience often lies at the heart of any intervention (Minner et al 2010, Pedaste et al 2015; Rönnebeck et al 2016). Other interventions rely on other theoretical standpoints, such as direct instruction (Hattie, 2017) or cognitive evaluation theory (Plass, Moreno, & Brünken, 2010) leading to very different teaching strategies and recommendations (see for example, the classic dispute between Kirshner, Sweller, & Clark (2006) and Hmelo-Silver, Duncan, & Chinn, 2007). Even within a field in education, such as IBSE, different theoretical standpoint might co-exist and sometimes compete; inquiry has been defined and understood in a multitude of ways as evidenced by systematic reviews (eg. Minner et al., 2010; Pedaste et al 2015; Rönnebeck et al 2016). The purpose of this article is to illustrate a novel method for extracting, analysing, visualising, and synthesising different standpoints in a body of literature. This is a form of review of the literature, which would often be conducted by a critical review (see e.g. Alake-Tuenter et al, 2012), where authors may draw on literature to derive new theory or model, or a review relying on thematic analysis (Grant & Booth, 2009).

Critical reviews rely on the authors’ careful and extensive reading of a sub-field of research and are generative with regards to theory and future research questions (Grant & Booth, 2009). However, in line with AUTHORS (2019), we argue that such readings may overlook important relationships in the textual presentations, which in turn could have led to different interpretations and theory. A method, which explicitly aims at revealing such relationships, might help generate theory that can encompass more nuances.

The purpose of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) is to develop patterns of meaning, themes, across a set of data. The process entails data familiarisation, coding of data, development of themes, revisions, and weaving an analytical narrative from themes and data extracts (Braun & Clarke, n.d.). This approach to reviewing has found some use in educational research (e.g. Cremin, Glauert, Craft, Compton, & Stylianidou, 2015; Horntvedt, Nordsteien, Fermann, & Severinsson, 2018), sometimes in parallel with systematic reviews (e.g. Darbyshire & Baker, 2012).

As a qualitative method, thematic analysis is very flexible, which means that it has a wide range of application. It also means that it is hard if not impossible to reproduce and great care has to be taken in order to ensure transparency. While reproducibility is not the intention for such an analysis, transparency certainly is. Recently, reviews utilizing networks of article keywords have emerged (e.g. Heradio, de la Torre, Galan, Cabrerizo, Herrera-Viedma & Dormido, 2016;Valverde-Berrocoso, Garrido-Arroyo, Burgos-Videla, & Morales-Cevallos, 2020). These reviews could be seen as a kind of quantitative counterpart to thematic analysis, in that they produce what can be called *thematic networks* (Heradio et. al, 2016). The method is inherently transparent and reproducible in the sense that it is clear, how authors arrive at thematic networks, and researchers using the same data set and the same method, should arrive at the same results. However, the purpose of these *mapping* reviews (Grant & Booth, 2009, p. 94) are rather to map and categorise a field than to extract meaningful themes.

In this paper we illustrate a novel method of literature review, which combines thematic analysis with recent mapping review techniques. In doing so, we expand on keyword network analysis by using textual excerpts as our data. The method is inspired by previous work from the authors on other types of textual data (AUTHORS 2019, AUTHORS, in press). Our purpose is not only to map and describe themes, but to synthesize, analyse, and map different positions in a subfield of education.

## Early childhood inquiry-based science education as an exemplar

We have chosen recent literature in the field of early childhood inquiry-based science education (ECIBSE) as our illustrative example. More precisely, we are interested in the theoretical bases of empirical studies in ICIBSE.

There are several reasons for using ECIBSE as an exemplar for our methodology. First, IBSE has a century long history where well-known positions have been proposed and discussed. Thus, we aim to compare and contrast themes and positions synthesized from our analysis of recent work with well-known educational philosophies and arguments. Often the work of John Dewey (1859–1952) is highlighted as the origin of inquiry with a focus on fostering curiosity and relating that to scientific practice (Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

Second, we expect that there are different theoretical positions to be identified. IBSE is conceptualised and implemented in different ways across different contexts and domains, as Rönnebeck et al. (2016) illustrate for the upper secondary level. Even within a single domain and context, IBSE may be conceptualised differently in terms of theoretical stance as is illustrated for middle and secondary school by Martin-Hansen (2002). Thus, we would expect our new method to find patterns that can be distinguished as different positions.

Third, IBSE is an important area of research in science education. Educational policies around the world emphasise inquiry-based science (IBSE) approaches to teaching as vital ingredients in building a scientifically literate community for all age groups and educational levels (Harlen & Allende, 2006), including early childhood levels. We argue particularly for the importance of focusing on early childhood IBSE (ECIBSE) studies encounters with science learning likely shape children’s future attitudes towards science and science learning (Eshach, H., & Fried, M. N. 2005). In this vein, we argue that it is worthwhile to focus on the theoretical bases of empirical studies, because the theoretical bases underpin the design and recommendations of such studies.

## Research questions

The purpose of this article is to provide an illustrative example of a review, which investigates and synthesises theoretical positions in recent literature on the nature of inquiry. To this end, we construct and analyse maps of theoretical expositions in recent empirical studies in early childhood inquiry-based science education (ECIBSE) literature by combining word-adjacency networks with thematic analysis.

The research questions addressed by the review:

1. Which themes and meanings arise in analysing such maps, and how can these themes and meaning be interpreted in light of the literature they were derived from?
2. Which theoretical positions about the nature of inquiry can be synthesized from maps and meanings, and how do these relate to historical developments in the literature.

To frame our later interpretations, analyses, and synthesis, the next section provides an overview of the origins of IBSE with a focus on Dewey’s perspective. We then present and provide methodological arguments for our methodology, thematic network analysis, which combines thematic analysis with network analysis to identify theoretical and empirical conceptualisations. The thematic network analysis leads to a network map of interconnected themes, where themes represent different aspects of theoretical conceptualisations. We analyse the map in detail and proceed to use our methodology to synthesize different theoretical positions, which can be found in recent ECIBSE literature. In our subsequent discussion, we begin by relating the synthesized theoretical positions to ECIBSE and implications. Then, we discuss the methodology in terms how it integrates qualitative and quantitative ways of analysing and synthesizing and what kind of knowledge it may produce.

# The origins of inquiry-based education

IBSE has deep roots in pragmatism, and John Dewey developed pragmatism from the perspective of education (Biesta & William, 2003). He saw thinking as an instrument for action. From this perspective, thinking and knowledge were tools to solve scientific and everyday problems. Dewey advocated “experiential teaching”, in which the learner is viewed as active, instead of passive receptors (Dewey, 2011). Dewey stressed that learning must be rooted as experience and awaken a curiosity about information and new ideas. Learning experiences are viewed as situations where children create and recreate knowledge as part of the educative process. For Dewey, this is the underlying idea of inquiry (Dewey, 1938/2015).

Dewey’s idea of inquiry is related to both contemporary IBSE conceptualisations and the practice of scientific inquiry. For example, for Harlen & Allende (2006), IBSE encompasses experiences that enable children to develop understanding about scientific aspects of the world through the development and use of scientific inquiry skills. For them, a key element of inquiry is the active participation of children in the thinking processes and investigations of scientific phenomena. *Scientific inquiry* refers to the varied ways in which scientists work, the process of investigating how, why, and what, making sense and evidence of data, and interpreting results (Biesta et al. 2003). Dewey (2005) outlines fundamental conceptual phases, such as defining a problem, formulating a hypothesis, and conducting tests, and most inquiry cycles can be seen as elaborations of these phases (Johnson & Christensen, 2014; Biesta et al., 2003).  Importantly, neither scientific inquiry nor IBSE are linear processes - aspects of inquiry interact in complex ways (Alake-Tuenter et al., 2012).

One major difference between scientific inquiry and IBSE is that teachers often know what children may learn, whereas the attained knowledge in scientific inquiry by nature is unknown. Dewey defined inquiry for both children and scientists as “*the controlled or directed transformation of an indeterminate situation into one that is so determinate in its constituent distinctions and relations as to convert the elements of the original situation into a uniﬁed whole”* (Dewey, 2013, p. 108). Combining these perspectives, IBSEmay be said to foster situations in which learners develop coherent scientific understanding through building relations between elements and experiences, which they perceived as unconnected beforehand.

Experiential education relies on the theory of experience, which is central to Dewey’s work. With a ‘philosophy of experience’, he mediates between traditional education and progressive education. Dewey regards both as mis-educative, because neither apply a carefully developed philosophy of experience (Dewey, 1938/2015). For Dewey, experience consists of three mutually dependent categories; situation, interaction, and continuity (Dewey, 1938/2015). ‘Situation’ refers to the fact we interact with other individuals and with objects in a concrete world and our lives here consist of a series of situations. Within a series of situations, continuity needs to emerge before it can contribute to the fulfilment of an educative experience. ‘Interaction’ refers equally to interactions between individuals and objects and interactions between individuals (Dewey, 2005).

Contemporary literature consistently provides evidence that hands-on experience with science phenomena is a necessary (but not sufficient) component for conceptual learning, especially when coupled with guidance from a teacher (Minner et al., 2010). Dewey advocated the facilitation of creative learning environments in which children may undergo development through educative experiences.  In this child-centred approach, adults must pay attention to what children are curious about and interested in to gauge and use the possibilities for children’s development. Activities should not only be based on children’s interest, but attention to children’s interests should guide the adults in choosing instructional strategies and materials to use. For that reason, questions or problems arising from the child’s everyday experiences are meaningful because they are driven by genuine curiosity. From this child-centred perspective then, it is essential to inquiry-based approaches that educative experiences and learning always include values, emotions, the act of doing, and cognition.

# Materials and methods for literature review with thematic network analysis

One possible strategy when using thematic analysis is to conduct a search for relevant and representative literature, analyse and code that literature in order to produce thematic networks (Attride-Stirling, 2001). In fact, Braun and Clarke (2006) illustrates how such networks (or maps) develop and serve as tools for understanding during analyses. We expand on thematic analysis by integrating network analysis. As shown by AUTHORS (2019) and AUTHORS (in press), integrating network analysis with qualitative forms of analyses highlights relational aspects of the data and may aid in finding patterns otherwise hidden.  Here, we first describe how we performed this study’s literature search and then how we performed our thematic network analysis.

## Literature search

We performed a literature search to identify studies with relevant ECIBSE focus inspired by Petticrew & Roberts (2008, p. 27) stages for systematic reviews. We started by carefully reading previous reviews of IBSE and ECIBSE. We focused on Alake-Tuenter (2012); Furtak et al. (2012); Minner et al. (2010); Pedaste et al. (2015) and Rönnebeck et al. (2016). These reviews provided information about gaps in the field and relevant keywords, which we used to identify relevant papers. We selected 2 strings i) Population ii) Intervention. We omitted search string iii) Outcome and iv) Comparison because our research questions do not pertain to outcomes or relation between intervention and outcome.

IBSE approaches to teaching are varied both in formats, in terms used and in names given to approaches. We argue that there are several terms for the same overall core ideas.  For example, the United States official bodies have moved away from using the term ‘inquiry’ and now refers to scientific practices instead (National Research Council, 2012). Thus, to not lose important information, in our search, we included inquiry-based education as well as related terms.

Table 1. Summary of literature search criteria

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Publication dates | 01.01.2008-31.01.2019 | Literature language | English |
| Database | EbscoHost (Education): Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, ERIC, Psychology and Behavioural Sciences Collection and SocINDEX with Full Text. | | |
| Search string name | Keywords in string | | Syntax |
| POPULATION | Primary school, Kindergarten, Primary education, Child\*, Preschool, Early childhood, Preschool class | | "OR” separated items in block |
| INTERVENTION | Inquiry based teaching, Inquiry based science education, Inquiry cycle\*, Inquiry-based learning\*, Inquiry phases, (IBL), (IBSE), Inquiry learning process\*, Inquiry based instruction, Inquiry model, Scientific inquiry, Scientific practices, (IBI), Inquiry based learning framework. | | "OR” separated items in block |
| Search syntax | POPULATION keywords “AND” INTERVENTION keywords | | |

Table 1 summarizes our search criteria, indicating date range, language keywords and database. We chose a recent period of publication in order to find theoretical positions as they appear in recent work. The POPULATION and INTERVENTION keywords were combined to yield the intersection between ECE and IBSE. We limited ourselves to English-language literature because preliminary searches indicated very few non-English publications. In doing so, we accept the possible exclusion of regions without strong traditions for publishing internationally.
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Figure 1. A visualisation of the process leading to the final corpus.

Figure 1 summarizes how we arrived at the final corpus of articles used in this study. We excluded more than a fifth of the initial papers based on reading headlines (Petticrew & Roberts, 2008): We excluded papers which concerned primarily age groups of 8 years and above, children with disabilities, and cooperation with parents. For the remaining 386 papers, we read abstracts and further excluded papers without an empirical basis, papers addressed solely to practitioners, and non-scientific research (e.g. papers which had not undergone peer-review). Applying these criteria resulted in a corpus of 35 peer-reviewed research articles, all of which featured theoretical sections and empirical descriptions of an intervention, where a teacher taught/facilitated learning for 4-8-year-olds.

## Selection of excerpts

We made a strategic choice to focus on sections and passages which were clearly part of a theoretical positioning and sections and phrases which were clearly part of an empirical exposition. For this illustrative example, the first author read through each article multiple times and extracted theoretical excerpts and passages.

Some articles, such as Bruce & Casey (2012), featured a section which could readily be identified as a theoretical exposition on inquiry. Bruce & Casey (2012) does mention inquiry teaching in the introduction, but do not begin their theoretical exposition here. Rather, they advocate inquiry “as a lens through which classroom pedagogy can be both analyzed and effected.” (p. 191). In other cases, theoretical claims appeared other places as well, for instance in an introduction. We included passages, which pertained clearly to inquiry-learning and focused on the goals and possibilities of inquiry rather than limitations. For instance, Enyedy et al. (2012) writes (our highlight):

Young children can, under the right circumstances, learn more complicated ideas than we currently ask of them in early elementary science education. *With support, early elementary students can engage in productive inquiry, collect and analyze data, produce models, and learn complex concepts.* However, one argument against ‘ambitious’ science instruction is that aspects of classical experimental design such as controlling variables and separating hypotheses from evidence have proven difficult for young children (Klahr 2000; Schauble 1996; Siegler and Liebert 1975). (p. 347).

In the quote above, we only included the highlighted sentence. The first sentence is not inquiry-specific – other theoretical frameworks could make the same claim. The third sentence states an argument against inquiry learning, which may be relevant, but does not directly state anything about the nature of inquiry.

All excerpts and references can be found as supplemental material.

## Thematic network analysis

We analysed the selected excerpts via a modification of thematic discourse network analysis (TDNA). TDNA is an iterative methods approach to analysing and visualising relationships in textual data (AUTHOR et al., 2019; AUTHOR et al. in press). Our modified approach mirrors Braun & Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis in that we seek to “minimally organise and describe [our] data set in [rich] detail” (p. 79), and want to couple that organisation and description with our reading of the literature to create a convincing narrative about theoretical and empirical descriptions of ECIBSE.

In contrast to Braun & Clarke (2006), we rely on using computer software for creating linguistic networks and maps. Thus, the phases of our approach differ somewhat from Braun (2006). While the description below appears ordered in a linear fashion, our movement from phase to phase was not. For example, we at times went through multiple small loops of generating networks and generating algorithmic rules for changing texts, before generating new thematic maps.

Throughout our analyses, we have used software Gephi 0.9.2 (Bastian, Heymann,& Jacomy, 2009), R (R Core Team, 2019), and RStudio (R StudioTeam, 2020). In R, we have used packages: Igraph (Csardi & Nepusz, 2006) and tm (Feinerer & Hornik, 2019). Our detailed work can be found at GitHub [repository name released upon acceptance of present manuscript; directory attached as supplemental file].

### Familiarising with data and generating linguistic networks

In this study, this step was closely connected to the selection of excerpts. The first author built on her reading and selection to identify candidate themes and connections in the data.

As a precursor to generating the linguistic networks, we first implemented any grammatical reductions decided upon (see below). Then, we created weighted and directed linguistic networks where “a directed link is established from *Word A* to *Word B* if *Word B* follows *Word A* in the pre-processed [text]” (Bruun et al. 2019, p. 323). We created two linguistic networks, a ‘theoretical’ and an ‘empirical’. Each network was an amalgamation of excerpts from articles. For example, the combined theoretical network contained all connections in all pre-processed theoretical excerpts from all articles.

### Generate algorithmic rules for changing texts

In this critical phase, we decided on grammatical reductions (AUTHOR et al., 2019), such as removing words and deciding on simplified forms.  The rationale for these reductions came from our evolving qualitative analysis. In both early and later stages of the analytical process, we would return to the excerpts before making decisions to see how words were used in the contexts of the different articles.

### Generate thematic maps

The purpose of this phase was to reduce the complexity of the network representation of the data while still preserving critical relationships. Inspired by AUTHOR et al. (2019), we used ‘fast-and-greedy community detection’ (Clauset et al., 2004) to find clusters of tightly knit words. These clusters were seen as representations of candidate themes. We then calculated links between clusters/candidate themes by counting the number of word-links between themes. We visualised the map showing only the most prevalent connections (Foti et al., 2011) and, applying community detection again but now on the thematic map, were able to find clusters of themes (represented in colour in Figure 2).
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Figure 2. Thematic map for excerpts. Each circle represents a cluster of words/candidate theme, and each arrow represents word-connections between clusters. Size of circles indicates the number of words contained in that cluster. Circle colours represent clusters of themes found by applying community detection on the map.

### Critical review of themes and thematic maps

This phase involved close comparison between the original excerpt texts and both the thematic maps and the internal structure of themes (each theme is a sub-network of the original network). We scrutinized connections between words and themes, questioned why particular words appeared central or prevalent in the network, and why particular words had been clustered together. This led to new algorithmic rules that were implemented; the results scrutinized again.

### Naming and describing themes and between theme patterns

To name a theme, we looked for the most prevalent connections between words and used our evolving understanding as well as less prevalent connections to guide the naming. For example, the theme *Learn science through inquiry* on Figure 2, contained the prevalent connections *science -> learn* and *learn->inquiry,* but also less prevalent ones such as *guide->inquiry* and *understand -> science,* as well as numerous minor connections supported that interpretation. This interpretation corresponded with our reading of the original articles.

### Producing report

In reporting our findings, we found that a theme was too prevalent. The theme *Learning science through inquiry* drew attention away from possible underlying hidden patterns relevant for understanding positions. Therefore, in later analyses, we removed this theme from the thematic map and worked with the most prevalent remaining connections between themes. In this paper then, we report on our integrated understanding of the final thematic maps, the network structure of themes, and our careful reading and re-reading of the excerpts.

# Results of illustrative thematic network analysis of ECIBSE

Here, we report on our thematic network analysis (TNA) of theoretical excerpts. We present our final thematic network map and then elaborate on themes shown in the map and their connections, including our final thematic map for the theoretical excerpts (Figure 3).
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Figure 3. This study’s final network map of theoretical excerpts. Overarching themes are colour coded. Size of circles represent the number of words within each (overarching) theme, and the size of arrows represent the number of connections between each (overarching) theme.

Using community detection, we were able to group themes into three clusters of overarching themes shown in colour in Figure 3 that contains of 19 themes:

* The orange-coloured themes comprise the themes: Instruction models and evidence, Child inquiry agency, Open-ended investigation, Previous and new knowledge, Inquiry not linear, Scientific practices, Hands-on authentic experiences, Child-centred approach, and Influences of mental function. As we will argue below, this overarching theme seems to capture a group of theoretical descriptions of inquiry that aims at modelling science education practice through a phase-driven instructional model. We have named this overarching theme: *Modelling scientific practice*.
* The second overarching theme is composed of the three green themes: *Process skill, Problem solving,* and *Share products with others*. Together, these themes highlight a position, which places emphasis on the ability to solve problems by using process skills and being able to share with others. Interestingly, these elements are very often part understandings of competencies as they appear in science education literature (see eg. Ropohl et al., 2018, p. 10). However, competencies in this understanding involve both knowing and doing, individually and with others. Thus, the elements of competencies which we can see only partially covers the concept of competencies in science education, so we have named the corresponding overarching theme: *Developing competencies*.
* The purple themes constitute the third overarching theme: Young child explores, Development, Reflective action, Pedagogical tools, Allow student expressiveness, Experiential education, and Surrounding world. These themes emphasise a notion of inquiry, in which the experiences, development, and curiosity of the child takes centre stage as a starting point for inquiry, and in which the child’s playful exploration of the world is central. We named this overarching theme Child exploration/experience.

We argue that the three overarching themes represent theoretical positions with regards to ECIBSE in the literature. In order to relate the map to the literature in detail, we now analyse each conceptualisation in turn linking network representations to the literature with overarching themes in *italicized and underlined*, themes and words are *italicized*.

## The Modelling scientific practice position

Almost all themes in the overarching theme point at the central *Instructional models and evidence*. One way to interpret this structure is to view themes that point to the central theme as elaborations of important aspects of that theme. With this interpretation*, Agency of children during inquiry, Open-ended investigations, Previous and new knowledge, Scientific practices,* and *Hands-on experiences* are important aspects to consider when applying inquiry instruction models. If we interpret the size of the circles (the number of words in the underlying theme networks) as an indicator of importance, these are roughly equally important. Thus, the three smaller orange themes are not prevalent in the theoretical positioning in the literature. Overall, the patterns in *Modelling scientific practice* draw attention to aspects of inquiry processes used by real scientists. García-Carmona et al. (2017, p. 990) provides an example of how references to scientific practice that is consistent with this conceptualisation:

They [the children] use skills employed by scientists such as raising questions, collecting data, reasoning and reviewing evidence in the light of what is already known, drawing conclusions and discussing results. (p. 990).

Many studies make use of phase-driven instructional models adapted to ECIBSE-contexts. For example, Desouza (2017) modifies the 5E model by Bybee et al. (2006) to be suitable for ECEIBSE.Three-phase models appear in seven papers as condensed versions of the 5E model. Phase-driven instructional models are implemented to help model scientific practice, and they act as a pedagogical structure to underpin planning of science activities.

*Agency of children during inquiry* represents how the child can be seen as an agent in an inquiry lesson. For example, Marget & Witherington (2011) compares what pre-schoolers do with what adults would do.

*Open-ended investigation* covers the view of inquiry through which adults allow students to investigate a prescribed problem, which has more than one correct solution, using their own methods as described in Leonard et al. (2009). Open-ended investigations are often seen as a landmark in instructional models like 5E (Bybee et al., 2006).

*Previous and new knowledge* is part of an instructional approach to inquiry. The theme contains the word *construct* and the link *construct->knowledge.* However, words and connections in the theme also suggest that there are constraints on the new knowledge which fit with modelling scientific practice.

*Scientific practices* contain links such as *collect->data*, *ask->questions*, *make->observation*, and *interpret->observation*. We take this theme to represent the idea that children should engage in science-like practices as part of inquiry instruction.

*Hands-on and authentic experiences* may be seen as an elaboration of the nature of the activities, which children should learn from. Other ways of wording this sentiment include “real life” and “phenomena from every-day life.” The theme also highlights that time is a necessary component for such activities.

## The Developing competencies position

This position concerns the development of skills, literacy, and affect, which children should learn through inquiry. As a concept, competence has a long and murky history, but in science education, most definitions involve knowledge and skills, and the ability to use this in complex situations (Ropohl et al 2018). In addition to this, our understanding of competence also includes affective terms (such as curiosity and the will to act), collaboration, and participation in relevant decision-making processes (Dolin 2003; AUTHORS 2012). Note that this understanding of competencies may have a much broader scope than science.

The theme *Process skill* includes the words *process*, *skill*, *literacy*, *thinking skill*, *communication*, and *knowledge*. *Process* may refer to ways by which to learn and experiment; in iterative cycles, in which skills are gradually learned. Process skills may also refer to the skills that need to be developed in order to engage in science-like practices (e.g., Bell & St.Clair 2015).

*Problem solving* as a theme appears as a many-faceted process that may involve constructing solutions to given tasks (Wu & Lin, 2016), detecting and solving life-related problems in [the children’s] own ways” (Wu & Lin, 2016, p. 846), and “as a means for supporting children to construct nuanced meanings of the world that surrounds them” (Philippou et al., 2015).  Solving problems is often seen as part of inquiry and scientific literacy and can be connected to aesthetic, intellectual, and emotional states (Bruce & Casey, 2012), and may involve dialogical and collaborative elements (Bruce & Casey, 2012; Siry et al., 2012).

*Sharing products with others* is a small but central theme. In early childhood, it can be a challenge for teachers to facilitate sharing, “since early childhood students are [just] beginning to build early literacy skills” (Eckhoff, 2017, p. 220). We believe that this theme represents an important bridge, since it is important to focus on the child’s ability to even participate in the processes of inquiry as part of *Developing competencies*. If children in a class do not have a concept of how one shares work or engage productively in a communicative process, then peer-discussions may not teach them to draw conclusions based on evidence.

## The Child exploration/experience position

Two arrows point from the central *Young child explores*. One points to *Experiential education,* another to *Surrounding world*. This could signify that the *Young child explores* theme somehow modifies or informs these two other themes.

As a theme, *Young child explores* is characterised by thick connections from *young* to *child* and from *child* to *explore*. The word *child* iscentral in the sense that many words connect to it either directly or through other connections. As such, in this theme, *child* can be associated with encouragement, inciting, stimulating, empowering, assisting, and enabling. Likewise, the word *engage* is central and can be associated with engagement, open and focused exploration, inquisitiveness, progression, and motivation. In this theme, the curiosity, experience, language and decisions of the child seem to take prevalence. For instance, Enyedy et al. (2012) mentions participatory simulations, in which students make and evaluate rules that underlie a simulation and Siry et al. (2012) argues that children’s “science-related talk” often is “at the origin” of “standardized canonical discourse” (p. 314).

*Development* is characterised by two main connections: From *starting* to *point* and from concept to *develop(ment)*. In line with Dewey, the starting point of exploration in this position is seen as the child’s interest (e.g. Bruce & Casey, 2012) and exploration (e.g. Enyedy et al., 2012).  Conceptual development is seen as a long-term endeavour (Decristian et al., 2015; Gropen et al., 2017), which may involve many aspects, such as children developing and exploring their own explanations, models, and concepts. At the same time, children are seen as developing as we believe is captured by McNerney & Hall (2017, p. 207):

“For scientific thinking to develop through childrens’ exploratory play and observations, children should, at some stage, be able to interpret and make sense of their experiences so that they can gain a better understanding of the world around them.”

Children should develop their thinking by actively trying to develop their interpretations of experiences. Here, curiosity can drive action so that the engaged learner comes to own the inquiry process (Bruce & Casey, 2012; Samarapungavan et al., 2009; Senocak et al., 2013; Van hook & Huziak-Clark, 2008). The importance of curiosity is highlighted by Ilhan & Tosun (2016) who point out that science in ECE should be directed toward satisfying the curiosity of children, rather than providing information on scientific concepts.

*Allow student expressiveness* is built on the network connection *allow ->* *student* andrepresents the varied ways in which children as active learners are allowed hands-on experiences, participation in socio-dramatic role play, or even to initiate and lead the inquiry activity (Enyedy et al., 2012; Hollingsworth & Vandermaas-Peeler, 2017). In addition, *Allow student expressiveness* mirrors the challenges of ECEIBSE found in *Share with others*; finding alternative ways to encourage young children to express and visualise their own thinking can be an important element of ECIBSE (Eckhoff, 2017). Specific media include visual arts media, drawings, use of play doh, and digital photography (Eckhoff, 2017; Enyedy et al. 2012; Fridberg et al., 2018; Leuchther et al., 2014)

The strong connection from *Young child explores* to *Surrounding world* is unsurprising in that it resembles what children should explore; the strongest link in *Surrounding world* goes from *world* to *around*. The S*urrounding world* includes the material, natural, social, and individual world. Thus, we interpret the link from *Young child explores* to *Surrounding world* as a prescription of what should be explored. The *Young child explores* theme also has a strong connection to the *Experiential education* theme in Figure THEORETICAL MAP.  The strongest connection in the theme is *early* -> *childhood*, and from childhood links go to *teacher* and *education*. Furthermore, links make up the chain: *experiential* -> *education* -> *context*. Both *teacher* and *context* are central words in this theme. Taken together with our reading of the theoretical excerpts, we see this theme as representative of the broader educational context for ECIBSE that emphasises the young child’s exploration, experience-making and reflection.

## Summary of thematic network analysis of theoretical excerpts

Diagram

Description automatically generated

Figure 4.A map of the three theoretical positions described above. Each coloured circle represents one of the three positions we have identified; they are collections of the themes with corresponding colours in Figure 3. The arrows represent the collected connections from themes representing one position to themes representing another position.

Figure 4 also shows a link from *Modelling scientific practice through teaching*  to *Child exploration and experience of the world*. This is mainly due to the direct connection from Instruction models and evidence to *Young child explores*.

# Discussion

Our discussion falls in two parts. First, we discuss how our illustrative results relate to ECIBSE literature. Then, we turn to discussing our developed methodology.

## Discussion of the ECIBSE-example of thematic network analysis

The origins of inquiry as seen from a Deweyan perspective is an experiential education which aims at creating educative situations with active participants. Even at the origins of inquiry there seemed to be a tension between inquiry as scientific practice, where the aim is to make sense and evidence of data and child-centred experiential education, where the aim is to underpin meaningful learning with the curiosity of the child.  We believe that our findings illustrate that this tension is still present.

The four different positions we found in excerpts and the difference between their prevalence and connections, merit a discussion of a theory-practice gap and a science-pedagogy gap. The theory-practice gap appears as a lack of the *Developing science-related competency* as mediating between *Modelling scientific practice through teaching* and *Child exploration and experience of the world* positions when ECIBSE is implemented. The science-pedagogy gap appears as the non-reciprocal connections between *Modelling scientific practice through teaching*, representing science, and *Child exploration and experience of the world* position representing the field of pedagogy. In this interpretation, *Developing science-related competency* may represent the field of science education. This could lead to a discussion of whether practical implementations in ECIBSE tend to place too much weight on either achieving science knowledge or the child’s interest and exploration and not on bridging the two through a contemporary view of competency development.

In addition, the positions warrant a discussion of what should be learned in ECE and what should be learned later in school. For example, with respect to the cognitive and executive level of development (Hollingworth & Vandermaas-Peeler, 2017), letting the children experience how to cooperate before asking them to discuss may be beneficial. For the same reasons, letting children learn to observe, classify, and ask their own questions might be a part of a science-related competency to be developed before learning to draw conclusions based on evidence.

However, we argue that this analysis contributes to a deeper understanding of ECIBSE and raises questions worth reflecting on with regards to the role played by scientific practice, when implemented in ECE settings.  The positions we found may expand discussions about whether children should learn scientific practice like real scientists or explore the world as creative beings, which in many cases take on a dichotomous nature. We can now add to those discussions by pointing out that development of science-related competencies might be at the nexus of developing children’s capacity to initiate their own explorations and gain agency in learning science.

The different positions may give rise to very different pedagogical emphasis and thus very different teaching and teacher competencies. The *Modelling scientific practice through teaching* position would emphasise teachers with strong scientific grounding with a danger of diminishing the drive from genuine curiosity and thereby the child’s initiative. The *Child exploration and experience of the world* position would in contrast require teachers to value the child’s curiosity and applaud its initiative, with the danger of neglecting the child’s development of scientific knowledge and practice.

Rejecting the apparent dichotomy, we believe important questions remain: For whom, what and how is science supposed to create value? In what way is *modelling scientific practice through teaching* valuable from the child's perspective? How can a *child's exploration and experience of the world* open for qualified science experiences in early childhood? Which science-related competencies should be developed during early childhood? In answering these questions, we advocate that future research follows Dewey’s mediating path by carefully foster situations based on the philosophy of experience (Dewey 1938/2015).

## Thematic network analysis as a review method

As stated earlier, the method presented here shares many elements with recently published methods (AUTHORS 2019, AUTHORS *in press*), and thus shares methodological issues with methods. The issues include, whether the products of our thematic network analysis represent the text appropriately, whether and how the method is and can be scientifically rigorous, strengths and limitations, and how the method might be further strengthened. Instead of repeating those discussions, here we focus on issues we believe are central to this particular method.

The design and implementation of algorithmic rules are at the heart of the researcher’s decision process. These rules shape thematic networks and through that frames the whole interpretative process. Therefore, keeping track of rules and how changing them changes network representations are essential to interpretations and the final narrative (AUTHORS 2019). The final narrative should be consistent with themes, positions and connections in thematic maps. But then the question arises, whether the final maps and narrative correspond to theoretical positions as seen by researchers in the field. In our illustrative example, we compared the positions with both early inquiry-frameworks and contemporary ideas about teacher practice in inquiry and found correspondences. Another method for establishing such correspondence would be to present researchers with our findings and ask if they could recognise the theoretical positions and to judge, to which position(s) their writings would correspond. This method is inspired by von der Fehr (2016), who used it to validate respondent positions in social networks.

Our proposed method can be seen as an integration of qualitative (thematic analysis) and quantitative (network analysis) methods. We see the two as being on equal footing in the method (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2007), because they iteratively inform each other throughout the process. This means that one the method can be judged against both quantitative and qualitative standards for scientific rigor. Here we focus on the quantitative concept of *reliability* and the qualitative counterpart, dependability (Galofshani 2003). Fhe networks and maps created with the method are reliable and reproducible given the textual excerpts and our final procedure. However, the textual excerpts and procedure might change if different researchers had extracted and produced them. In order to increase *dependability* (Galofshani 2003), we have iteratively and critically gone through words that we either changed or removed, and – as discussed above – compared with other sources. A further increase of *reliability* might be to have researchers work independently on different aspects of the method: selection of excerpts, selection of words to change or exclude, naming of themes; then and on several occasions meet and compare notes and then independently prepare new versions of the analyses. If, over time researchers analyses converge, then one could say that the results were reliable.

Our example was comprised by excerpts from a limited set of papers. As such, it was a manageable data set. Depending on the aims and scope of research, both target excerpts and number of papers could vary. Had we chosen inquiry more broadly, we would have gotten a lot more papers, and had we focused on the abstract rather than theoretical expositions, we might have achieved a relational map of elements of studies rather than theoretical positions. With a larger set of papers or a broader scope, the it might not have been feasible to read each paper and weigh every “algorithmic rule” as closely as was the case here. Instead, one could draw on more of the quantitative tools available with network theory to provide overviews of data. However, following Willig (2013, 370) we argue that no reading – and indeed any interpretation – can be said to be “true” or “right”, since language is constructive and functional. In our view then, as quantitative network tools become more ubiquitous in the analyses, the qualitative parts of the analyses should intensify as well.

# Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have shown a method for reviewing literature, which is aimed at revealing standpoints embedded in each article. Which used theoretical excerpts from early childhood inquiry-based science education literature from 2008-2019 as an illustrative example. We arrived at a map and accompanying interpretations of theoretical writings in the field, which showed interwoven themes and positions relating to how young children should engage with inquiry. We used our discussion relate the map to both recent literature and Dewey’s original thoughts, arguing that thematic network analysis can help find bridges between theoretical standpoints. We further argued that the methodology can be expanded and refined in different directions, including other textual excerpts, selection of texts, and scientific rigor.
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