THE ROLE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION IN ADDRESSING SCIENTIFIC MISCONCEPTIONS

[1]Anazodo Onyinye Stella & [2]Chukwuemeka Chisom Vivian

Department of Science Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.
os.anazodo@unizik.edu.ng, cv.chukwuemeka@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract
Science communication serves as a crucial bridge between scientific knowledge and public understanding. With the widespread dissemination of information through various media, scientific misconceptions have become increasingly prevalent. This paper explores the essential roles of science communication in correcting and preventing these misconceptions. The paper concludes that effective science communication is indispensable in combating misconceptions and promoting informed decision-making in society.
Keywords: Science, communication, Science Communication, scientific misconceptions.

Introduction

Scientific knowledge plays an indispensable role in shaping the various facets of contemporary society, influencing sectors such as healthcare, agriculture, environmental management, and technological innovation (Ashraf *et al*., 2021). Despite these benefits, the transmission of scientific knowledge to the general public is often hindered by the unclear nature of scientific language and processes. This disconnect contributes to widespread public misunderstandings and the persistence of scientific misconceptions in certain scientific areas; (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine [NASEM], 2017).

Science communication not only facilitates public engagement with science but also fosters informed decision-making, trust in scientific institutions, and resistance to misinformation (Scheufele & Krause, 2019). As scientific knowledge becomes increasingly relevant in daily life, the need for effective science communication is of essence.

Meaning of Science

Science can be broadly defined as a systematic and methodical process through which knowledge about the natural world is acquired, organised, and refined (Rautela, 2024). Science operates within a structured methodology that includes identifying problems or questions, formulating hypotheses, conducting experiments, analysing data, and drawing conclusions that are then subjected to peer review (Dźwigoł&Dźwigoł-Barosz, 2018). This methodological rigour distinguishes scientific inquiry from other ways of understanding the world, such as philosophical reasoning, religious belief, or artistic interpretation. Science is not only a body of knowledge but also a human endeavour shaped by social, cultural, and ethical contexts. It thrives in an environment of scepticism, inquiry, and openness to alternative explanations, reinforcing its role as a cornerstone of modern civilisation and intellectual progress (Kaplan, 2017).

Meaning of Communication

Communication is a fundamental human process through which individuals exchange information, thoughts, emotions, and messages using various channels and symbolic systems. At its core, communication involves a sender transmitting a message through a medium to a receiver, who then interprets and provides feedback, thereby completing the communication loop (Fatimayin, 2018). This process can occur through verbal (spoken or written words), non-verbal (gestures, facial expressions, body language), and visual or electronic means, depending on the context and the purpose of the interaction (Fatimayin, 2018).

Effective communication occurs when the intended message is not only delivered but also accurately understood and interpreted by the receiver in the way the sender intended. This requires clarity of expression, appropriate medium selection, cultural sensitivity, and feedback mechanisms that ensure mutual understanding (Prabavathi and Nagasubramani, 2018). Ineffective communication, on the other hand, can lead to misunderstanding, conflict, and misinformation, particularly in complex or high-stakes environments such as healthcare, education, science, and governance.

Communication also serves multiple functions beyond information exchange; it facilitates social interaction, influences behaviour, builds relationships, and enables collective decision-making. As such, communication is not just a technical act, but a deeply social engagement.

Meaning of Science Communication

Science communication refers to the broad and interdisciplinary practice of conveying scientific knowledge, processes, and implications to audiences who are not professional scientists. It involves the effective transmission of complex scientific ideas in a way that is comprehensible, engaging, and relevant to the public, with the goal of fostering understanding, informed decision-making, and trust in scientific institutions (Rautela, 2024).

According to National Academies of Sciences (2017), science communication can be understood through three interconnected functions: *transmission* of scientific content, *engagement* that involves dialogue between scientists and the public, and *awareness*, which promotes appreciation of science's role in society. This definition highlights that science communication is not merely about disseminating facts, but also about facilitating mutual understanding between science and society through public lectures, science exhibitions, museum displays, educational outreach programs, science journalism, documentaries, podcasts, and social media content (Bucchi & Trench, 2014). These platforms allow scientific information to be contextualised within societal and cultural frameworks, making it more accessible and relatable to diverse audiences.

Moreover, science communication is crucial in addressing scientific misconceptions, especially on contentious issues such as climate change, health, vaccinations, and genetically modified organisms (GMOs) (Rautela, 2024). Hence, effective science communication is not a one-way process but a flexible act to clearly pass scientific messages to non scientists.

Importance of Science Communication

Science communication importance spans educational, political, social, and cultural dimensions, making it a necessary tool for fostering a scientifically informed and engaged populace.

1. Enhancing Public Understanding of Science

One of the primary functions of science communication is to translate complex scientific information into accessible knowledge for non-experts (Heidrich-Wilhelms, 2024). Many scientific topics, such as climate change, biotechnology, or artificial intelligence, are often abstract, or technical, making them difficult for the general public to grasp. By simplifying these concepts without compromising accuracy, science communication helps build scientific literacy, enabling individuals to understand the processes, significance, and limitations of scientific research (Engberg, 2023). Increased understanding, in turn, contributes to a more informed and critically thinking society.

2. Facilitating Informed Decision-Making

Effective science communication empowers citizens to make better personal, health-related, and societal decisions (National Academies of Sciences, 2017). For example, individuals equipped with accurate scientific information are more likely to make informed choices regarding vaccinations, nutrition, environmental sustainability, and the use of technology. By providing clear, relevant, and timely information, science communication ensures that both individuals and communities can engage in evidence-based reasoning.

3. Informing Policy and Legislation

Science communication also plays a strategic role in shaping public policy and governance (Besley and Dudo, 2022). Policymakers frequently rely on scientific evidence to draft legislation and formulate responses to emerging issues such as pandemics, climate change, and energy crises. Furthermore, it helps bridge the gap between scientific expertise and political action, promoting policies that are grounded in empirical research rather than ideology or misinformation.

4. Combatting Misinformation and Scientific Misconceptions

In an era marked by the rapid spread of misinformation, particularly through digital and social media, science communication serves as a crucial defense mechanism. Pseudoscientific claims, and distorted facts can erode public trust in science and lead to harmful behaviours, such as vaccine hesitancy or climate change denial. By proactively correcting falsehoods and providing accurate, evidence-based alternatives, science communicators help safeguard public discourse and reinforce the credibility of scientific knowledge (Lewandowsky, Ecker, & Cook, 2017).

5. Inspiring Future Scientists and Promoting Scientific Careers

Science communication also plays an essential role in inspiring interest in science among students and young people. By making science relatable and engaging, communicators can ignite curiosity and motivate the pursuit of careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Exposure to compelling narratives about scientific discoveries or the real-world impact of research can nurture future generations of scientists, innovators, and informed citizens (Dudo & Besley, 2016). This has broader implications for national development, and innovation capacity.

Forms of Science Communication

Science communication manifests in a variety of forms, each tailored to specific audiences, contexts, and goals. The diversity of communication channels reflects the interdisciplinary nature of science communication and the need to reach audiences of varying literacy levels, interests, and demographics (Bucchi & Trench, 2014).

1. Formal Education

Formal science education is one of the foundational forms of science communication (Riccardi, 2023). It occurs within structured academic environments such as primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions, where students are introduced to scientific concepts through curricula designed to build literacy and inquiry skills (Stocklmayer and Rennie, 2017). Teachers act as science communicators by translating complex theories into age-appropriate lessons that foster understanding, critical thinking, and curiosity. While formal education primarily serves young learners, it also includes adult education and lifelong learning programs that aim to cultivate informed citizens capable of engaging with scientific issues.

2. Science Journalism

Science journalism plays a vital role in disseminating scientific information to the public through traditional and digital media platforms (Dunwoody, 2021). It involves the translation of scientific research findings into news reports, feature articles, and documentaries that are accessible to general audiences (Heyl, 2019). By covering new discoveries, health risks, environmental concerns, and technological developments, science journalists serve as intermediaries between scientists and society. However, the quality of science journalism can vary, and challenges such as sensationalism, oversimplification, and misinformation remain significant (Farid, 2023).

3. Public Lectures and Science Cafés

Public lectures and science cafés are dialogical platforms that facilitate direct engagement between scientists and lay audiences. These forums are often hosted in universities, libraries, cafés, or community spaces and are designed to promote two-way communication about scientific issues (Grand *et al*., 2015). Scientists present their research in an accessible manner, followed by question-and-answer sessions that allow public participation. These interactions can help build trust, address misconceptions, and humanise the scientific enterprise.

4. Social Media and Digital Platforms

With the rise of Web 2.0 technologies, social media has become a powerful tool for science communication. Platforms such as Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok offer scientists, educators, and institutions the ability to share content widely and interactively (Bik & Goldstein, 2013). Digital media allows for the creation of blogs, podcasts, infographics, short videos, and livestreams, expanding the reach and immediacy of science communication efforts. Additionally, social media fosters real-time dialogue and community building around science topics, although it also requires strategies to manage misinformation and audience fragmentation.

Scientific Misconceptions: Examples, Causes, and Consequences

Scientific misconceptions, erroneous beliefs or understandings about scientific facts or processes are widespread and persistent across many domains of public knowledge. These misconceptions are often deeply rooted and resistant to correction, even in the face of strong scientific evidence.

Examples of Common Scientific Misconceptions

Several well-documented misconceptions illustrate the challenges faced in science communication, they include:

1. **Vaccines Cause Autism**

   A pervasive and dangerous misconception is the belief that vaccines, particularly the measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccine, cause autism. This myth originated from a discredited study by Andrew Wakefield in 1998, which was later retracted due to ethical violations and flawed methodology (Soodejan*et al*., 2021). Despite extensive research disproving any causal link (Taylor, Swerdfeger, & Eslick, 2014), this misinformation has led to vaccine hesitancy and declining immunisation rates, resulting in outbreaks of preventable diseases.

2. **Climate Change is a Hoax**

   Another persistent misconception is that climate change is either a natural fluctuation or an outright fabrication. Despite overwhelming scientific consensus that human activities—particularly the emission of greenhouse gases—are driving global warming (IPCC, 2021), a significant portion of the public remains sceptical. This disbelief is often fuelled by misinformatio, political ideologies, and vested economic interests (Nabegu and Naibbi, 2016).

3. **Antibiotics Kill Viruses**

   Many people incorrectly believe that antibiotics are effective against viral infections, such as the common cold or influenza. In reality, antibiotics are only effective against bacterial infections and have no impact on viruses (CDC, 2021). This misconception contributes to the misuse of antibiotics, accelerating the global threat of antimicrobial resistance (WHO, 2020).

4. **Bacteria are bad**

   A lot of bacteria photograph we see depict scary looking organisms that make us sick, but not all bacteria are bad for us. While some bacteria are germs and spread disease, other bacteria are good and can help our bodies digest food and absorb nutrients.

5. **Certain miscarriages are due to *'ogbanje'***

   In the olden days till now, in some part of the society, babies die in the womb and individuals term it as an '*ogbanje*', due to misconceptions. This condition is as a result of rhesus factor incompatibility. This happens in a woman with a negative factor (A negative) if the right injection is not administered and at as when due.

Causes of Scientific Misconceptions

Understanding these causes is critical for developing strategies to address and correct misinformation.

1. Cognitive Biases

One primary cause of scientific misconceptions is the influence of cognitive biases, which are systematic patterns of deviation from rational judgment. Individuals tend to process new information through the lens of their preexisting beliefs and values, a phenomenon known as confirmation bias (Rautela, 2024). This bias leads people to selectively accept information that aligns with their worldview while dismissing contradictory evidence. Kahan (2015) further elaborates on this by describing the concept of cultural cognition, wherein individuals' cultural values shape their perceptions of risk and scientific facts, often resulting in polarised attitudes toward controversial issues such as climate change and vaccination. These biases make correcting misconceptions challenging because individuals may resist information that threatens their identity or belief system.

2. Media Misinformation

The role of media, particularly digital and social media, in spreading misinformation has become increasingly significant. Sensationalised or inaccurate reporting can distort scientific facts, contributing to public misunderstanding (Scheufele & Krause, 2019). The rapid dissemination of information online, combined with algorithmic prioritisation of emotionally engaging content, often amplifies false or misleading scientific claims (Vosoughi, Roy, & Aral, 2018). Moreover, the blurring of lines between credible scientific reporting and opinion or pseudoscience makes it difficult for the public to discern trustworthy sources (Lewandowsky, Ecker, & Cook, 2017). This media environment fosters confusion and perpetuates misconceptions.

3. Educational Gaps

Inadequate science education also plays a significant role in the persistence of scientific misconceptions. Many educational systems emphasise old methods over critical thinking and inquiry-based learning, which limits students' ability to understand and apply science. When foundational scientific principles are misunderstood or taught superficially, misconceptions can become entrenched from an early age (Rautela, 2024). Furthermore, the lack of continuous adult science education and public outreach exacerbates these gaps, leaving many adults without the tools to critically evaluate scientific information.

4. Cultural and Religious Beliefs

Cultural and religious worldviews can sometimes conflict with scientific explanations, influencing acceptance or rejection of scientific knowledge. For instance, some religious beliefs may oppose evolutionary theory or certain medical interventions, such as vaccination (Anders, 2016). These belief systems provide alternative frameworks for understanding the world, which may not align with scientific consensus. When scientific facts challenge deeply held cultural or religious values, individuals may reject or reinterpret scientific evidence to maintain cognitive consistency (Bardon, 2019). This dynamic highlights the importance of culturally sensitive communication strategies that respect diverse perspectives while promoting scientific literacy.

Consequences of Scientific Misconceptions

The consequences of scientific misconceptions are profound and wide-ranging, impacting individual health, public policy, and environmental sustainability.

1. **Public Health Risks**

   Belief in vaccine myths has led to reduced vaccination rates and outbreaks of diseases like measles and pertussis, which had previously been under control (Phadke *et al*., 2016). Misuse of antibiotics due to misconceptions contributes to antimicrobial resistance, now recognised as a major global health threat.

2. **Policy Resistance and Inaction**

   Misunderstanding or denial of climate change hampers efforts to implement environmental regulations and international agreements, delaying critical action needed to mitigate its impacts (Ekberg *et al*., 2022).

3. **Erosion of Scientific Trust**

   Persistent misconceptions can erode public trust in science and scientific institutions. When people perceive scientists as biased or untrustworthy, they are less likely to accept evidence-based recommendations (Funk, Tyson, & Kennedy, 2020).

4. **Educational Backwardness**

   Inaccurate scientific beliefs impede learning and reduce interest in scientific careers. Students who enter higher education with deeply entrenched misconceptions often struggle to adapt to more accurate scientific models and frameworks (Rapp and Braasch, 2023).

5. **Environmental Degradation**

Scientific misconceptions also contribute to environmental degradation, particularly through the denial or minimisation of anthropogenic climate change. Climate change denial, often fuelled by misinformation and ideological resistance, undermines public support for policies aimed at mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and promoting sustainable practices (Bardon, 2019).

6. **Poor Individual Decision-Making**

Misunderstandings of scientific concepts can lead to poor individual decision-making with direct adverse effects on health and well-being. For instance, the misconception that antibiotics are effective against viral infections leads to their misuse and overuse, contributing to the alarming rise of antibiotic resistance (Ventola, 2015). This misuse jeopardises the efficacy of antibiotics, threatening the ability to treat common infections and increasing healthcare costs and mortality rates (World Health Organisation, 2020). Similarly, erroneous beliefs about nutrition, mental health, or alternative medicine can result in harmful behaviours or delayed treatment.

7. **Distrust in Science and Experts**

   Finally, pervasive scientific misconceptions foster distrust in science and experts, which poses a significant challenge to evidence-based decision-making. When misinformation spreads unchecked, it erodes public confidence in scientific institutions, researchers, and health authorities (Chowdhury *et al*., 2023). This distrust can manifest as scepticism towards scientific consensus, reluctance to follow expert recommendations, and susceptibility to pseudoscience (Jensen, 2017). The erosion of trust complicates efforts to manage public crises, such as pandemics or environmental disasters, by reducing compliance with scientifically informed guidelines (Van der Linden, Leiserowitz, & Maibach, 2017).

Roles of Science Communication in Addressing Scientific Misconceptions

Science communication serves as a critical bridge between the scientific community and the public, playing multiple pivotal roles in correcting misunderstandings and fostering informed decision-making. The following elaborates on these roles;

1. Clarifying Misunderstood Concepts

One of the primary functions of science communication is to simplify complex scientific information. By breaking down technical jargon and using relatable examples, communicators can correct false beliefs and reduce confusion around scientific topics (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine [NASEM], 2017); and place it within relevant contexts to facilitate public understanding.

2. Combating Misinformation

Science communication actively counters misinformation by providing evidence-based, accurate explanations that challenge false narratives circulating in public discourse. Given the rapid spread of misinformation through social media and other channels, timely and factual communication is crucial to combat the effects of science denialism and conspiracy theories (Lewandowsky, Ecker, & Cook, 2017). Effective communication not only presents facts but also addresses the emotional and psychological factors that sustain misinformation.

3. Improving Science Literacy

By promoting basic scientific literacy, science communication equips individuals with the skills to critically evaluate scientific claims encountered in everyday life (Prabavathi and Nagasubramani, 2018). This enhancement of science literacy enables people to distinguish credible information from misleading or false statements (Kubota, 2019). A scientifically literate public is better positioned to engage thoughtfully with scientific issues, making informed choices based on sound reasoning.

4. Interactive Engagement

Science communication increasingly embraces interactive, two-way communication models such as public forums, Q&A sessions, and social media dialogues (Kaplan, 2017). These formats allow for direct engagement with individuals' questions and concerns, fostering a more personalised approach to addressing misconceptions (Marker, 2018). Interactive engagement also promotes a sense of inclusion and respect for diverse perspectives, which can enhance receptivity to scientific information.

5. Directing Messages to Audiences

Recognising the diversity of public audiences, effective science communication directs messages to fit the cultural values, educational backgrounds, and interests of different groups (Chang, 2021). Audience-specific strategies improve the relevance and impact of scientific messages, making them more persuasive and understandable across varying demographics.

Establishing and maintaining public trust in science and scientific institutions is another crucial role of science communication (National Academies of Sciences, 2017).

Training Scientists in Communication

To improve the accuracy and effectiveness of public science discourse, it is vital to train scientists in communication skills. Equipping researchers with tools to clearly articulate their work and engage with non-specialist audiences enhances the quality of science communication and helps prevent the spread of misinterpretations (Dudo & Besley, 2016). Encouraging scientists to participate actively in outreach fosters a culture of openness and accountability.

Conclusion

Science communication is more than a mere dissemination of facts; it is a strategic and empathetic engagement with society to foster understanding, correct misconceptions, and promote rational decision-making in science. In an era where misinformation spreads rapidly, the role of science communication in addressing scientific misconceptions cannot be overstated.

References

Anvari, S. (2024). Studying the Process of Changing Religious Beliefs Inspired by the Rejection and Acceptance of Scientific Paradigms. *Science and Religion Studies*, *15*(1). 1-9.

Ashraf, S. A., Siddiqui, A. J., Abd Elmoneim, O. E., Khan, M. I., Patel, M., Alreshidi, M., ... & Adnan, M. (2021). Innovations in nanoscience for the sustainable development of food and agriculture with implications on health and environment. *Science of the Total Environment*, *768*, 144990.

Bardon, A. (2019). *The truth about denial: Bias and self-deception in science, politics, and religion* (p. 352). Oxford University Press.

Besley, J. C., & Dudo, A. (2022). *Strategic science communication: a guide to setting the right objectives for more effective public engagement*. JHU Press.

Bik, H. M., & Goldstein, M. C. (2013). An introduction to social media for scientists. *PLoS Biology*, 11(4), e1001535.

Bucchi, M., & Trench, B. (2014). *Routledge handbook of public communication of science and technology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2021). *Antibiotic prescribing and use*. https://www.cdc.gov/antibiotic-use/index.html

Chowdhury, N., Khalid, A., & Turin, T. C. (2023). Understanding misinformation infodemic during public health emergencies due to large-scale disease outbreaks: a rapid review. *Journal of Public Health*, *31*(4), 553-573.

Davies, S. R., & Horst, M. (2016). *Science communication: Culture, identity and citizenship*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Dudo, A., & Besley, J. C. (2016). Scientists' prioritization of communication objectives for public engagement. *PLoS ONE*, 11(2), e0148867.

Dunwoody, S. (2021). Science journalism: Prospects in the digital age. In *Routledge handbook of public communication of science and technology* (pp. 14-32). Routledge.

Dźwigoł, H., &Dźwigoł-Barosz, M. (2018). Scientific research methodology in management sciences. *Financial and credit activity problems of theory and practice*, *2*(25), 424-437.

Ekberg, K., Forchtner, B., Hultman, M., & Jylhä, K. M. (2022). *Climate obstruction: How denial, delay and inaction are heating the planet*. Routledge.

Engberg, J. (2023). Between infotainment and citizen science: Degrees of intended non-expert participation through knowledge communication. In *Digital scientific communication: Identity and visibility in research dissemination* (pp. 149-170). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Farid, A. S. (2023). Changing the paradigm of traditional journalism to digital journalism: Impact on professionalism and journalism credibility. *Journal International Dakwah and Communication*, *3*(1), 22-32.

Fatimayin, F. (2018). What is communication? *National Open University of Nigeria*.

Funk, C., Tyson, A., & Kennedy, B. (2020). *Trust in scientists*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org

Grand, A., Davies, G., Holliman, R., & Adams, A. (2015). Mapping public engagement with research in a UK university. *PLoS ONE*, 10(4), e0121874.

Heidrich-Wilhelms, F. (2024). Technical communication between experts and non-experts as a barrier. In *Handbook of Accessible Communication* (pp. 657-676). Frank & Timme, Berlin.

Heyl, A. (2019). *Science communication vs. public relations: The potential effect of university press releases and the changing media landscape on science journalism in South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University).

Jensen, E. (2017). Public scepticism of science: Why do some people distrust experts? *Science Communication*, 39(4), 482–488.

Kahan, D. M. (2015). What is cognitive science? Cultural cognition and the politicization of science. In *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Science* (pp. 735–760). Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, A. (2017). *The conduct of inquiry: Methodology for behavioural science*. Routledge.

Kubota, M. (2019). What is" Communication"?-Beyond Shannon & Weaver's Model. *International Journal for Educational Media and Technology*, *13*(1). 1-6.

Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the "post-truth" era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6(4), 353–369.

Nabegu, A. B., &Naibbi, A. (2016). Climate Change: the scientific basis, misconceptions, impacts and global response. *Environmental Pollution. Retrieved from https://www. ResearchGate. net/publication/310844052_Climate_Change_the_scientific_basis_misco* *nceptions_impacts_and_global_response*.

Phadke, V. K., Bednarczyk, R. A., Salmon, D. A., & Omer, S. B. (2016). Association between vaccine refusal and vaccine-preventable diseases in the United States: A review of measles and pertussis. *JAMA*, 315(11), 1149–1158.

Prabavathi, R., &Nagasubramani, P. C. (2018). Effective oral and written communication. *Journal of Applied and Advanced Research*, *3*(1), 29-32.

Rapp, D. N., & Braasch, J. L. (Eds.). (2023). *Processing inaccurate information: Theoretical and applied perspectives from cognitive science and the educational sciences*. MIT Press.

Rautela, G. S. (2024). Science Communication and Sustainable Development. In *Role of Science and Technology for Sustainable Future: Volume 1: Sustainable Development: A Primary Goal* (pp. 347-360). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

Riccardi, P. (2023). Integration of formal and informal education enabling connections among scientific research and science education, and communication. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2727, No. 1). AIP Publishing.

Scheufele, D. A., & Krause, N. M. (2019). Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(16), 7662–7669.

Soodejani, M. T., Basti, M., Tabatabaei, S. M., &Rajabkhah, K. (2021). Measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccine and COVID-19: a systematic review. *International journal of molecular epidemiology and genetics*, *12*(3), 35.

Stocklmayer, S. M., & Rennie, L. J. (2017). The attributes of informal science education: A science communication perspective. *Preparing informal science educators: Perspectives from science communication and education*, 527-544.

Van der Linden, S., Leiserowitz, A., & Maibach, E. (2017). Scientific consensus on climate change as a gateway belief: Experimental evidence. *PLoS ONE*, 12(2), e0172313.

Ventola, C. L. (2015). The antibiotic resistance crisis: Part 1: Causes and threats. *Pharmacy and Therapeutics*, 40(4), 277–283.