IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Comparative Analysis Of Upper Secondary Biology Curricula: A Global Perspective On Governance, Pedagogy, And Assessment Architectures

Nirali P. Patel

Assistant Professor

Department of Education,

The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodara, India

Abstract:

Biology plays a vital role in the contemporary education system worldwide by helping learners understand life processes, health, environment, and biodiversity. It fosters scientific thinking and equips students to address global challenges such as climate change, pandemics, and sustainable development. This research paper presents an exhaustive comparative analysis of upper secondary (Grades 11-12) Biology curricula across five distinct educational jurisdictions: the United States (emphasizing Next Generation Science Standards), the United Kingdom (England's A-Level framework), Japan (MEXT Course of Study), Finland (National Core Curriculum), and India (examining CBSE, NIOS, and State Board integrations). Utilizing a multi-dimensional theoretical framework grounded in social realism and didactic transformation, this study interrogates key criteria such as governing bodies, credit divisions, practical and theoretical weightage, assessment architectures, and interdisciplinary approaches etc. The analysis synthesizes data from official curriculum documents (NCERT, CBSE, MEXT, OFQUAL) and academic literature to reveal a global dichotomy between "Curriculum traditions" prioritizing content mastery and "Didactic traditions" emphasizing student-content interaction (Gericke et al., 2025). The research findings highlight significant disparities in the treatment of inquiry-based learning, with India maintaining high-stakes, content-dense models, while Finland and the USA move toward competency-based, modular structures. The report concludes with a data-driven strategic roadmap for the enrichment of India's biology curriculum, advocating for structural reforms aligned with the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 to foster scientific temper and global competitiveness.

Key Words: Comparative analysis, Senior Secondary Biology, Curriculum Design, Assessment Policy, Scientific Literacy, Powerful Knowledge, NEP 2020, NGSS, IB Diploma, A-Levels, MEXT Japan.

1. INTRODUCTION

The biological sciences are currently undergoing a paradigm shift, transitioning from a discipline rooted in descriptive taxonomy to one defined by systems biology, genomics, and computational modelling. Consequently, upper secondary education must evolve to reflect this complexity. The curriculum at this level is not merely a syllabus of topics; it is a "Purposeful construction" that reflects a nation's educational philosophy, economic priorities, and societal values (Deng, 2012).

In the global landscape, nations grapple with balancing "Academic rationalism" the transmission of specialized disciplinary knowledge with "Scientific literacy," which prepares citizens to navigate socio-scientific issues

(Gericke et al., 2025). This tension is evident in the diverse curricular models adopted by high-performing education systems. The United States has shifted towards three-dimensional learning through the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), integrating practices with core ideas (NGSS Lead States, 2013). Finland has pioneered a modular, phenomenon-based approach that emphasizes transversal competencies (Finnish National Agency for Education (FNAE), 2020). Japan balances rigorous content retention with a newfound emphasis on "Active learning" and "Zest for life" (Nakamichi et al., 2023).

Against this backdrop, the Indian education system stands at a crossroads. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 envisions a move away from rote memorization toward competency-based education and flexibility (Ministry of Human Resource Development, 2020). However, the current reality of the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) remains heavily anchored in high-stakes examinations and textbook-centric delivery (Singh & Ahmad, 2025). The National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS) offers an alternative flexible model, yet distinct differences remain in recognition and implementation compared to traditional boards (NIOS, 2024).

This research aims to dissect these systems to provide a granular, evidence-based analysis of how biology is taught, assessed, and valued globally. By comparing the "Intended curriculum" (policy documents) with the "Assessed curriculum" (examination structures), this report seeks to identify best practices that can inform the operationalization of India's NEP 2020.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Underpinnings: Powerful Knowledge and Curriculum Traditions

The theoretical framework for this comparative analysis is grounded in the concept of "Powerful Knowledge," as articulated by Michael Young and further developed within biology education by researchers such as Gericke et al. (2025). This framework distinguishes between every day, common-sense knowledge and specialized, disciplinary knowledge that provides reliable explanations and new perspectives on the world (Young & Muller, 2013).

Recent literature identifies two primary traditions in curriculum theory:

1. **The Curriculum Tradition (Anglo-American):** Dominant in England and the USA, this tradition views the curriculum as a delivery system for standards and content. It prioritizes "substantive knowledge" (the products of science) and focuses heavily on external accountability and standardized assessment (Gericke et al., 2025; Holec, 2019).
2. **The Didactic Tradition (Continental/Nordic):** Prevalent in Finland and Sweden, this tradition views curriculum as a dynamic interaction between the teacher, the student, and the content (*Didaktik*). It emphasizes "humanistic purposes" and teacher autonomy, focusing on the formation of the student (*Bildung*) rather than just content acquisition (Gericke et al., 2025).

2.2 Global Trends in Science Education

A systematic review of literature from 2020-2025 reveals several converging trends in biology education:

- **Competency-Based Learning:** There is a universal shift from "What students know" to "What students can do." The NGSS in the USA exemplifies this with its focus on "Science and Engineering Practices" (SEPs) like modelling and argumentation (NGSS Lead States, 2013). Similarly, the European Union's focus on "key competencies" has influenced curricula in Finland and the UK (Council of the European Union, 2018).
- **Interdisciplinarity:** Modern biology curricula are increasingly dissolving boundaries. The integration of mathematics (Biostatistics) and technology (Bioinformatics) is becoming standard. The IB Diploma's "Nature of Science" and Finland's "multidisciplinary learning modules" are prime examples of this trend (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2022; FNAE, 2020).
- **Sustainability and Ethics:** Reflecting global crises, biology curricula are integrating "Education for Sustainable Development" (ESD). Recent studies indicate that effective sustainability-oriented biology education is grounded in systems thinking and student-centered pedagogies (Husamah et al., 2025).

2.3 The Indian Context and Research Gap

While India has produced a significant volume of STEM graduates, literature suggests that the secondary curriculum often suffers from a "Mile-wide, inch-deep" syndrome (NCERT, 2022b). Although the NEP 2020 advocates for holistic and inquiry-based learning, there is a paucity of research detailing *how* these high-level policy goals translate into curricular mechanics compared to international benchmarks. Existing studies often compare India to a single nation (e.g., India vs. UK), but few offer a multi-lateral comparison including the unique open-schooling model of NIOS and the rigid examination structures of East Asian systems like Japan (Singh & Ahmad, 2025; Incikabi et al., 2012).

3. RESEARCH PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Purpose

The primary objective of this study is to conduct a rigorous comparative analysis of upper secondary biology curricula to identify structural and pedagogical mechanisms that facilitate "powerful knowledge." The study aims to move beyond superficial topic matching to analyze the logic of curriculum design how credits are assigned, how assessments are weighted, and how practical skills are valued.

3.2 Research Questions

1. How do the regulatory frameworks of MEXT (Japan), DfE (UK), and State Departments (USA) compare with India's MoE/CBSE structure in terms of centralization and autonomy?
2. What is the ratio of internal (school-based) to external (standardized) assessment, and how does this influence pedagogical delivery?
3. To what extent are curricula linear (unit-based) versus modular or spiral? How is "disciplinary knowledge" (inquiry skills) weighed against "substantive knowledge" (content facts)?
4. How do credit definitions (Carnegie Units vs. Guided Learning Hours vs. Credits) impact the depth of study?
5. What actionable "Best practices" can be adapted for the Indian context to align with National Education Policy 2020 goals?

3.3 Theoretical Framework

This study utilizes the Curriculum Analysis Framework developed by Deng (2012) and Gericke et al. (2025), which categorizes curriculum components into:

- **Educational Purposes:** Academic (preparation for university), Citizenship (societal participation), and Humanistic (personal development) (Gericke et al., 2025).
- **Knowledge Categories:** Substantive (facts), Disciplinary (methods), Sociocultural (applications), Pedagogical (teaching guides), and Psychological (student development) (Deng, 2015).

3.4 Research Methodology

This is a qualitative, comparative document analysis.

- **Data Sources:** Official curriculum documents including NCERT Textbooks (NCERT, 2022a; 2022b), CBSE Syllabus 2025-26 (CBSE, 2025), NGSS Frameworks (NGSS Lead States, 2013), MEXT Course of Study (Nakamichi et al., 2023), Finnish LOPS 2021 (FNAE, 2020), and examination specifications from Cambridge International and IB (Cambridge International, 2022; IBO, 2022).
- **Analytical Tool:** Content analysis was performed to extract data on credit hours, assessment weights, and topic sequencing (Neuendorf, 2002).
- **Limitations:** The analysis relies on "Intended" curricula (documents) rather than "Enacted" curricula (classroom observation).

4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

4.1 Governing Bodies and Policy Ecosystems

The governance of biology education dictates the flexibility, standardization, and philosophical orientation of the curriculum. Table 1 contrasts the centralized control of Japan and India with the federated or market-driven models of the USA and UK.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Governing Bodies and Education Policies

Criterion	India (CBSE/NIOS)	USA (NGSS/NY)	UK (England)	Japan	Finland	International (IB/CIE)
Primary Governing Body	Ministry of Education (MoE). CBSE conducts exams; NCERT designs curriculum NIOS open schooling	State Departments of Education (e.g., NYSED). No federal curriculum, but NGSS adopted by 44+ states	Department for Education (DfE) sets standards; Ofqual regulates exam boards	MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology)	Finnish National Agency for Education (EDUFI)	IBO (Geneva) & Cambridge Assessment (UK)
Curriculum Framework Document	National Curriculum Framework (NCF 2005 and NCF-SE 2023) aligned with NEP 2020	A Framework for K-12 Science Education	GCE AS and A Level Subject Content.	National Curriculum Standard (Course of Study)	National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Education	DP Biology Subject Brief / Cambridge International Syllabus
Centralization vs. Autonomy	High Centralization. NCERT textbooks are the de facto syllabus	Decentralized. States set graduation requirements Districts choose texts	Regulated Market. DfE sets content; Boards compete on service but align to Ofqual	High Centralization. MEXT authorizes textbooks and sets strict credit requirements	Low Centralization. National core is a framework; schools design local curricula	High Centralization. Global standardization of content and assessment
Key Policy Philosophy	Standardization & Access. Moving towards "Competency-Based" (NEP) but rooted in "Academic Rationalism"	College/ Career Readiness. Focus on "3D Learning" (Practices + Concepts + Core Ideas)	Specialization. "Gold Standard" of deep subject mastery. Prevention of "grade inflation"	"Zest for Life" (Ikiru Chikara). Balancing academic ability, humanity, and health	Transversal Competencies. Holistic development, sustainability, and student well-being	International Mindedness. "Theory of Knowledge" connects biology to philosophy

Analysis: The governance models reveal a spectrum of control. India and Japan represent high centralization, where the national curriculum (NCERT/MEXT) is prescriptive (Singh & Ahmad, 2025; Nakamichi et al., 2018). In contrast, Finland's model is built on trust, where the national framework is merely a skeleton for local interpretation, allowing teachers significant autonomy (Gericke et al., 2025). The US model is fragmented; while NGSS provides a common language, implementation varies wildly from New York to California (Incikabi et al., 2012).

4.2 Curriculum Design, Core Elements, and Theories

The organization of knowledge fundamentally affects how students construct biological understanding.

Table 2: Curriculum Design, Core Elements, and Theoretical Focus

Criterion	**India (Class 11-12)**	**USA (Grades 11-12)**	**UK (A-Level)**	**Japan (Upper Sec)**	**Finland (Upper Sec)**	**IB Diploma (HL)**
Design Structure	Linear/Unit-Based. 5 Units (Class 11) + 5 Units (Class 12)	Integrated/ Storylines. Phenomena-driven units (e.g., "Antibiotic Resistance" to teach evolution)	Modular Content/ Linear Exam. Topics 1-4 (AS) + 5-8 (A-Level)	Two-Tier System. "Basic Biology" (General) vs. "Advanced Biology" (Specialized)	Modular (Credits). BI1-BI3 (Compulsory), BI4-BI6 (Optional)	Thematic. 4 Themes: Unity & Diversity, Form & Function, Interaction, Continuity
Core Elements	Diversity, Structure, Cell Biology, Physiology (Plant/Human), Genetics, Evolution, Biotech, Ecology	Structure/ Function, Matter/Energy, Ecosystems, Heredity, Evolution	Bio-molecules, Cells, Exchange, Genetics, Energy, Response, Evolution	Advanced Biology: Evolution/ Phylogeny (First), Life Phenomena, Genetics, Environment	Life & Evolution, Ecology, Human Biology, Cell/Heredity, Biotechnology	Molecular Biology, Genetics, Ecology, Evolution, Physiology + Nature of Science
Theoretical Focus	Substantive Knowledge. Heavy focus on facts, taxonomy, and definitions	Disciplinary Knowledge. Focus on "How we know" via Science & Engineering Practices	Mechanistic Depth. Deep dive into biochemical mechanisms	Conceptual Unity. Evolution is taught first to frame all biology. "Unity and Diversity"	Holistic/ Societal. Application of biology to ethics, society, and sustainability	Inquiry & Nature of Science. Epistemology of science is explicit

Deep Comparison of Core Elements:

- **Evolution as an Organizing Principle:** Japan's curriculum places Evolution *first* in the "Advanced Biology" course, using it as the lens for all biology (Nakamichi et al., 2023). In contrast, India places Evolution in Class 12, Unit 7, treating it as a discrete unit after genetics (NCERT, 2022b).
- **Physiology vs. Molecular Biology:** The UK A-Level and IB Diploma place immense weight on molecular mechanisms (Cambridge International, 2022). India maintains a strong traditional focus on "Human Physiology" (an entire unit in Class 11), which encompasses digestion, breathing, and circulation in detail (NCERT, 2022a).
- **Flexibility:** Finland's modular system (BI1-BI6) is unique, allowing students to choose optional biotech modules (FNAE, 2020). This contrasts with the rigid Indian stream where a biology student must consume the entire syllabus (CBSE, 2025).

4.3 Assessment Architectures: Internal vs. External

The "Washback effect" of assessment determines classroom pedagogy.

Table 3: Assessment and Examination Divisions

Feature	India (CBSE)	USA (NY Regents)	UK (A-Level)	Japan	Finland	IB Diploma
External Exam Weight	70% (Theory Paper). High stakes	100% of Regents Score	100% of Grade. (3 Written Papers at end of Year 13)	High Stakes. University Entrance (Common Test) is MC-based	Matriculation Exam. Digital, open-book elements.	80% (Papers 1 & 2)
Internal/ Practical Weight	30% (Practical Exam). External examiner visits school	Lab Requirement. 1200 minutes of documented lab work required to sit the exam	0% of Grade. "Practical Endorsement" is Pass/Fail reported separately	Internal assessment by teacher. No national practical exam	Internal course assessment. Matriculation is theoretical	20% (Internal Assessment - Individual Investigation)
Question Typology	MCQs (10-20%), Assertion-Reasoning, Case-based, Short/Long Answer	MCQs, Constructed Response. Data analysis focus	Structured questions, Critical analysis of data, Essay	Multiple Choice (Common Test). Universities add descriptive exams	Digital. Data mining, synthesis, essays	Data-based, MCQs, Extended Response

Critical Insight:

- **The "Practical Endorsement" (UK):** The UK decoupled practical grades from the final A-Level grade. Students must pass "Core Practical" to get a "Pass" endorsement, but 15% of the *written* exam marks test practical knowledge (Cambridge International, 2022).
- **The "Individual Investigation" (IB):** The IB requires students to design their own experiment (IBO, 2022), a level of autonomy absent in the Indian "prescribed experiment" model (CBSE, 2025).

4.4 Credit Systems and Delivery Methods

Table 4: Credit Divisions and Curriculum Delivery

Criterion	India	UK	USA	Finland	Japan
Credit System	No formal credits in CBSE. NIOS 240 hours	Guided Learning Hours (GLH). A-Level = 360 GLH	Carnegie Units. 1 Unit = ~120-180 hours	1 Credits = ~14h 15m teaching. Biology = 2-4 compulsory Credits + options	Basic Biology (2 Credits), Advanced Biology (4 Credits)
Delivery Method	Lecture + Lab. Textbook-centric (NCERT). "Chalk and Talk" dominates	Seminar/Lab. Small class sizes. Focus on analysis/ evaluation.	Inquiry-Based. 5E Model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate)	Phenomenon-Based. "Multidisciplinary Learning Modules"	Lecture + Activity. Increasing "Active Learning" focus

4.5 Interdisciplinary and Emerging Approaches

- **USA (NGSS):** Uses "Crosscutting Concepts" (e.g., Energy and Matter) to link Biology to Physics and Chemistry (NGSS Lead States, 2013).
- **Finland:** Mandates "Multidisciplinary Learning Modules" where Biology interacts with Geography or History (FNAE, 2020).
- **India:** While NEP 2020 promotes interdisciplinarity, the current structure creates rigid silos (Singh & Ahmad, 2025). A biology student in India rarely engages with the mathematical modelling of biological systems, unlike in the UK where 10% of biology marks are reserved for mathematical skills (Cambridge International, 2022).

5. GLOBAL BEST PRACTICES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Table 5: Best Practices and Improvement Areas

Country/Board	Best Practices (To be Emulated)	Improvement Areas (To be Avoided)
Finland	Flexibility & Trust: Modular curriculum allows personalization. Digital Assessment: Exams reflect modern tools	Lack of Standardization: Local curricula can lead to variance in content coverage
UK (A-Level)	Practical Competency: The "Endorsement" model ensures genuine skill acquisition	Narrowness: Students specialize too early (age 16)
USA (NGSS)	Three-Dimensional Learning: Assessing practices alongside content	Implementation Gaps: "Local control" leads to inequality in resources
Japan	Sequence of Instruction: Placing Evolution first provides a logical scaffold	Content Overload: "Advanced Biology" is incredibly dense (500+ terms)
IB Diploma	Internal Assessment: Student-led research fosters autonomy	High Cost: Often inaccessible to the general public-school population.

6. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR INDIA'S CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

6.1 Detailed Research Findings

1. **The "Process" Gap:** While Indian students are exposed to high-level Substantive Knowledge, they lag in Disciplinary Knowledge (process). They know *what* biology is, but less about *how* biological knowledge is constructed compared to IB/US students (Gericke et al., 2025).
2. **Assessment as a Constraint:** The high-stakes nature of CBSE/NEET forces a "teach-to-the-test" pedagogy. In contrast, the US and Finnish models use assessment to demonstrate *competency* (Singh & Ahmad, 2025; FNAE, 2020).
3. **Practical Work is Performative:** In India, practicals are often "recipes" followed to get full marks. In the UK and IB, practicals are investigative tools (Cambridge International, 2022).

6.2 Table for Curriculum Development and Suggestions

Table 6: Strategic Roadmap for Indian Biology Curriculum Enrichment

Area of Curriculum	Current Status (India)	Proposed Improvement (Actionable)	Global Benchmark Source
Curriculum Design	Linear units. Topic-heavy	Adopt a Spiral/Modular Approach. Introduce optional modules (e.g., Bioinformatics) to allow depth over breadth.	Finland (Modules), IB (Themes).
Practical Assessment	30 Marks External Exam.	Implement "Practical Endorsement." Decouple the practical grade. Require a logbook of skills.	UK (A-Level Endorsement), IB (IA).
Assessment Typology	Recall & Application	Increase Data-Response Questions. Mandate 20-30% of the paper requires analyzing unseen data/graphs.	IB (Paper 2), US (NGSS Assessments).
Interdisciplinary Focus	Segregated subjects.	Mandate Quantitative Biology**.** Integrate basic statistics (Chi-Squared, t-test) into genetics/ecology units.	UK (10% Math rule), NGSS.
Content Sequencing	Evolution is Unit 7 (Class 12)	Move Evolution to Class 11. Teach evolution first as the unifying theme to explain diversity.	Japan (Advanced Biology Sequence).

7. CONCLUSION

This comparative study elucidates that while the Indian Biology curriculum is theoretically robust and content-rich, it operates within a "Curriculum Tradition" that prioritizes the *transmission* of facts over the "Didactic Tradition" of *constructing* knowledge (Gericke et al., 2025). The global trajectory is moving toward competency-based, inquiry-driven frameworks. For India to realize the vision of NEP 2020, a structural overhaul is required. By adopting the UK's statistical rigor, the US's inquiry-driven practices, and Finland's modular flexibility, India can transform its biology education from "Learning biology" to "Doing biology."

REFERENCES

1. Achieve, Inc. (2013). *Next generation science standards: High school life sciences*. The National Academies Press.
2. Asogwa, V. C. (2024). Global best practices in education: A conceptual definition and criticisms. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, *8*(3), 1-15.
3. Biesta, G. (2011). Disciplines and theory in the academic study of education: A comparative analysis of the Anglo-American and Continental construction of the field. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *19*(2), 175-192. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2011.582255
4. Cambridge International. (2022). *Syllabus Cambridge International AS & A Level Biology 9700 (2025-2027)*. Cambridge Assessment International Education.
5. CBSE. (2025). *Biology curriculum senior secondary (Class XI-XII) 2025-26*. Central Board of Secondary Education.
6. Council of the European Union. (2018). *Council recommendation on key competences for lifelong learning*.
7. Dempster, E. R. (2023). What is 'powerful knowledge' in school biology? *Journal of Biological Education*, *57*(2), 245-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2023.2190269
8. Deng, Z. (2012). School subjects and academic disciplines: The differences. In A. Luke, K. Weir, & A. Woods (Eds.), *Curriculum, syllabus design and equity: A primer and model* (pp. 40-73). Routledge.
9. Deng, Z. (2015). Organization and sequencing of subject matters. In M. F. He, B. D. Schultz, & W. H. Schubert (Eds.), *Sage guide to curriculum in education* (pp. 78-86). Sage.
10. Djokić-Ostojić, A., Miljanović, T., Pribićević, T., Parezanovic Ristić, S., & Topuzović, M. (2014). Biology contents in curricula of compulsory education in Serbia, Finland and England. *Archives of Biological Sciences*, *66*(2), 859–866. https://doi.org/10.2298/ABS14028590
11. Finnish National Agency for Education. (2020). *National core curriculum for general upper secondary education 2019*.
12. Gericke, N., Tani, S., Newall, E., & Deng, Z. (2025). A framework for curricular analysis of powerful knowledge: Comparing school biology in England, Finland and Sweden. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *57*(4), 441–465. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2025.2512323
13. Hodson, D. (2014). Learning science, learning about science, doing science: Different goals demand different learning methods. *International Journal of Science Education*, *36*(15), 2534-2553. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2014.899722
14. Holec, J. (2019). A comparative study of biology curricula in England, Scotland and the Czech Republic. *Scientia in Educatione*, *10*(3), 125–142. https://doi.org/10.14712/18047106.1296
15. Husamah, H., Rahardjanto, A., & Permana, T. I. (2025). Trends and coverage of strengthening literacy in biology learning: Systematic literature review of the Scopus database in four decades. *E-Saintika*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.36312/2z9cbt64
16. Incikabi, L., Ozgelen, S., & Tjoe, H. (2012). A comparative analysis of numbers and biology content domains between Turkey and the USA. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, *7*(4), 523–536.
17. International Baccalaureate Organization. (2022). *Diploma programme subject brief: Sciences: Biology*.
18. K, A., & K, S. (2023). Content analysis of biology textbooks across selected educational boards of Asia for misconceptions and elements of conceptual change towards learning 'Cell Structure'. *Cogent Education*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2283640
19. Lederman, N. G. (2013). Nature of science: Past, present, and future. In S. K. Abell & K. Appleton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education* (pp. 831-879). Routledge.
20. MEXT. (2018). *National curriculum standard for upper secondary schools*. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

21. Ministry of Human Resource Development. (2020). *National education policy 2020*. Government of India.
22. Muller, J., & Young, M. (2019). Knowledge, power and powerful knowledge re-visited. *The Curriculum Journal*, *30*(2), 196-214. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2019.1570292
23. Nakamichi, T., Saigo, T., & Katayama, N. (2023). Latest upper secondary school national curriculum standard and basic biology textbooks in Japan. *Asian Journal of Biology Education*, *15*, 13–xx. https://doi.org/10.57443/ajbe.15.0_13
24. Nakamichi, T., & Katayama, N. (2018). Biology education in upper secondary schools at present in Japan. *Asian Journal of Biology Education*, *10*, 2-10.
25. National Research Council. (2012). *A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas*. The National Academies Press.
26. NCERT. (2022a). *Biology: Textbook for Class XI*. National Council of Educational Research and Training.
27. NCERT. (2022b). *Biology: Textbook for Class XII*. National Council of Educational Research and Training.
28. Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Sage.
29. NGSS Lead States. (2013). *Next generation science standards: For states, by states*. The National Academies Press.
30. NIOS. (2024). *Curriculum of senior secondary course in biology (314)*. National Institute of Open Schooling.
31. Nwoke, E. S., Uitto, A., & Lavonen, J. (2022). A comparative study of upper secondary school biology curricula in two countries: Finland and Nigeria. *Science Education International*, *33*(1), 38-49. https://doi.org/10.33828/sei.v33.i1.4
32. Ofqual. (2015). *GCE AS and A Level subject content for biology*. UK Government.
33. Osborne, J., & Dillon, J. (2008). *Science education in Europe: Critical reflections*. Nuffield Foundation.
34. Parr, J. V., & Jeffery, J. M. (2021). We are similar, but different in writing curriculum and instruction. In *International perspectives on writing curricula and development* (pp. 217-235). Taylor & Francis.
35. Rudolph, J. L. (2024). Scientific literacy: Its real origin story and functional role in American education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *61*(3), 519-532. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21890
36. Ryder, J. (2001). Identifying science understanding for functional scientific literacy. *Studies in Science Education*, *36*(1), 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057260108560166
37. Simon, B. (1981). Why no pedagogy in England? In B. Simon & W. Taylor (Eds.), *Education in the eighties: The central issues* (pp. 124-145). Batsford.
38. Singh, M., & Ahmad, A. (2025). Analysis of education boards options in India. *RA Journal of Applied Research*, *11*(3), 162–167. https://doi.org/10.47191/rajar/v11i3.11
39. Sjöström, J. (2024). Vision III of scientific literacy and science education: An alternative vision for science education emphasising the ethico-socio-political and relational-existential. *Studies in Science Education*, 1-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2024.2405229
40. Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
41. Uljens, M. (1997). *School didactics and learning*. Psychology Press.
42. Walker, D. F., & Schaffarzick, J. (1974). Comparing curricula. *Review of Educational Research*, *44*(1), 83-110. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543044001083
43. Westbury, I. (2000). Teaching as a reflective practice: What might didaktik teach curriculum? In I. Westbury (Ed.), *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition* (pp. 15-39). Erlbaum.

44. Young, M. (2008). Bringing knowledge back in: From social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education. Routledge.
45. Young, M., & Muller, J. (2013). On the powers of powerful knowledge. *Review of Education*, *1*(3), 229-250. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3017