

- Dagiene, V., & Dolgopulovas, V. (2022). Short tasks for scaffolding computational thinking by the global Bebras challenge. *Mathematics*, 10(17), 3194.
- Dori, Y. J., & Hameiri, M. (2003). Multidimensional analysis system for quantitative chemistry problems: Symbol, macro, micro, and process aspects. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(3), 278–302.
- Eidin, E., Bielik, T., Touitou, I., Bowers, J., McIntyre, C., & Damelin, D. (2020). Characterizing advantages and challenges for students engaging in computational thinking and systems thinking through model construction. *The Interdisciplinarity of the Learning Sciences, 14th International Conference of the Learning Sciences*, Volume 1 (pp. 183–190). Nashville, Tennessee: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Gouvea, J., & Passmore, C. (2017). ‘Models of’ versus ‘Models for’ Toward an Agent-Based Conception of Modeling in the Science Classroom. *Science & Education*, 26, 49–63.
- Johnstone, A. H. (1993). The development of chemistry teaching: a changing response to changing demand. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 70, 701–705.
- Levy, S. T., & Wilensky, U. (2009). Crossing levels and representations: The connected chemistry (CC1) curriculum. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 18(3), 224–242.
- Margel, H., Eylon, B. S., & Scherz, Z. (2008). A longitudinal study of junior high school students’ conceptions of the structure of materials. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 45(1), 132.
- Peel, A., & Irgens, G. (2024). Characterizing natural selection contextual transfer with epistemic network analysis: A case for unplugged computational thinking. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 1–13.
- Puntambekar, S., & Hubscher, R. (2005). Tools for scaffolding students in a complex learning environment: What have we gained and what have we missed? *Educational Psychologist*, 40(1), 1–12.
- Saig, R., & HersHKovitz, A. (2024). Expanding digital literacies beyond the digital: Infusing computational thinking into unplugged pedagogical tools—Two case studies from mathematics education. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, 42, 100703.

- Samon, S., & Levy, S. T. (2017). Micro–macro compatibility: When does a complex systems approach strongly benefit science learning? *Science Education*, 101(6), 985–1014.
- Schwarz, C. V., Ke, L., Salgado, M., & Manz, E. (2022). Beyond assessing knowledge about models and modeling: Moving toward expansive, meaningful, and equitable modeling practice. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 59, 1086–1096.
- Schwarz, C. V., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Kenyon, L., Achér, A., Fortus, D., ... Krajcik, J. (2009). Developing a learning progression for scientific modeling: Making scientific modeling accessible and meaningful for learners. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 46(6), 632–654.
- Shute, V. J., Sun, C., & Asbell-Clarke, J. (2017). Demystifying computational thinking. *Educational Research Review*, 22, 142–158.
- Weintrop, D., Beheshti, E., Horn, M., Orton, K., Jona, K., Trouille, L., & Wilensky, U. (2016). Defining computational thinking for mathematics and science classrooms. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 25, 127–147.