A Penetrating Effect: From Becquerel's Serendipity to A Scientific Knowledge

Jethromel M. Meneses

Education Department, University of the Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.70583

Received: 07 May 2023; Revised: 15 May 2023; Accepted: 18 May 2023; Published: 13 June 2023

ABSTRACT:

This paper comprehensively examines Antoine Henri Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity in 1896, a groundbreaking scientific advancement often viewed through serendipity. This case study explores the typologies of serendipity and investigates the conditions that foster its occurrence. A detailed study of Becquerel's investigations reveals that his discovery aligns with a Walpolian type of serendipity, characterized by true serendipity heavily influenced by unforeseen experimental results. This paper emphasizes the role of bisociation, a cognitive process associating previously disconnected concepts, in Becquerel's discovery, challenging the view that his discovery was merely a chance event. Instead, it argues that Becquerel's discovery represents an intricate interplay of logic and chance, exemplifying the Walpolian type of serendipity. Moreover, by examining Becquerel's experimental design, results, and innovative approach, this paper illustrates that his discovery adheres to the fundamental aspects of the scientific method, albeit executed in a non-linear and iterative manner. The process and context of Becquerel's discovery provide valuable insights into scientific knowledge inception, progression, and definition, underscoring the intertwined roles of serendipity and scientific inquiry in advancing science.

Keywords: serendipity, scientific knowledge, Henri Becquerel, discovery learning

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Scientific knowledge, the fruit of scientific inquiry, is not a fixed entity (Lebedev, 2019) but a constantly shifting and evolving construct. This complex product of human intellect weaves together threads of empirical evidence (Lebedev, 2018), theoretical understanding, and interpretative reasoning (Lederman & Lederman, 2012; Wong & Hudson, 2008). As the National Science Teaching Association underscored, scientific knowledge is intrinsically provisional, open to refinement, reevaluation, or even replacement in light of new evidence and perspectives.

A defining characteristic of scientific knowledge is its empirical foundation, built upon a robust bedrock of experimental data and observational evidence garnered through rigorous scientific methodologies (Kuo et al., 2018; Radder, 2021). However, generating scientific knowledge is not an entirely objective undertaking (Nurhayati & Widodo, 2021). It is also shaped by myriad personal and societal factors, thereby introducing an element of subjectivity into the process (Messas, 2017). The scientific process engages human capacities beyond mere logic and rationality, encompassing our abilities for imagination, creativity, and innovative thinking (Bazi et al., 2020; Bezuidenhout et al., 2018).

Furthermore, the exchange of ideas and observations among members of scientific communities is instrumental in advancing scientific knowledge (Ribeiro, 2019). These intellectual exchanges offer a platform for challenging existing ideas, refining theories, and cultivating the development of new scientific concepts and paradigms (Al-Daihani et al., 2018; Wood, 2021).

Contrary to its common portrayal as a linear, methodical progression, the practice of scientific investigation is a dynamic, adaptable pursuit (Cullinane et al., 2019). The scientific method provides a framework but is not immune to unforeseen occurrences or outcomes (Norris, 2017). Indeed, the history of science is replete with instances where deviations from the expected trajectory have resulted in transformative scientific knowledge. It is in this context that the notion of serendipity, the act of making valuable or delightful discoveries when not actively seeking them, becomes particularly relevant.

Certain discoveries stand out within the extensive catalog of scientific revelations due to their serendipitous inception. Noteworthy examples include Fleming's inadvertent discovery of penicillin and Spencer's unexpected revelation of the microwave phenomenon. Serendipity, defined as finding something valuable or delightful when not actively searching for it, plays a significant role in these instances.

This paper, therefore, embarks on an in-depth examination of serendipity's role in the evolution of scientific knowledge, with a particular focus on Becquerel's discovery. By situating Becquerel's serendipitous discovery within the broader typology of serendipity in scientific discovery, this study explores potential links between serendipity in scientific research and the burgeoning pedagogical approach of discovery learning in science education.

The aim is to contribute to the burgeoning body of research on serendipity and its role in scientific discovery, highlighting Becquerel's fortuitous discovery's significance and the broader implications of serendipity in the scientific process. Through the lens of serendipity, this study seeks to challenge and enrich the understanding of the nature of scientific discovery.

Additionally, this paper underscores the understanding that serendipity is not an outlier in the scientific discovery process but a crucial, often overlooked, facet of the epistemology of science. The acknowledgment that major scientific breakthroughs can arise from unexpected observations could have profound implications for how scientific research is conducted and how future scientists are trained.

This study advocates for a more nuanced and flexible understanding of the scientific process that recognizes and appreciates the interplay between systematic investigation and serendipity. By acknowledging and embracing the role of serendipity, this paper could pave the way for further groundbreaking advancements in various scientific fields.

Rationale

Several key considerations inform the decision to focus on Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity.

Firstly, the discovery of radioactivity marked a seminal moment in scientific history, significantly advancing our understanding of atomic physics and heralding the atomic age. Despite its monumental significance, the serendipitous nature of Becquerel's discovery has not been thoroughly explored or appreciated, thus constituting a gap in the literature this study seeks to address.

Secondly, Becquerel's discovery exemplifies the intricate interplay between systematic investigation and serendipity in the scientific process, making it an ideal case study.

Lastly, by delving into the specifics of Becquerel's discovery, this study endeavors to illuminate the potential benefits of integrating a greater recognition of serendipity into the scientific process.

In a nutshell, the purpose of this paper is not merely to retell the story of Becquerel's discovery but to use it as a vehicle to explore the broader role of serendipity in scientific discovery. By doing so, it aims to shed new light on the nature of scientific knowledge and the processes through which it is generated, offering fresh perspectives on a topic of enduring significance in the philosophy of science.

Serendipity Described

The notion of serendipity, originally articulated as the faculty of making unsought findings (Andel, 1994), has since evolved into a multi-faceted concept that encapsulates the realm of unexpected yet invaluable discoveries. The term itself was first coined by Horace Walpole, who drew inspiration from the fairy tale "The Three Princes of Serendip." This tale depicted the genesis of discoveries through a serendipitous interplay of accidents and sagacity (López-Muñoz et al., 2022).

In information studies, Agarwal (2015) characterizes serendipity as an incidental and unexpected finding of information, where the actor can be either purposive or non-purposive. This notion is further refined by Liu et al. (2021), who perceive serendipity as a distinctive and integral method of information discovery. Within the domain of innovation, de Rond (2014) delineates serendipity as a process of discerning and appropriating meaningful observations or events for strategic ends. Similarly, Cunha et al. (2010) construe serendipity as the unanticipated discovery of valuable insights in the course of organizational learning (Nguyen, 2022).

Within the scientific discourse, serendipity is identified as a catalyst for unexpected discoveries (Ge et al., 2017). It is seen as an amalgamation of chance, sagacity, and a valued outcome (Copeland, 2015), often evoking moments of revelation or "eureka" experiences (Cunha et al., 2010, p. 319). Merton and Barber (2004) conceptualize serendipity as the emergence of an "unanticipated, anomalous, and strategic datum" which potentially serves as a springboard for the development of novel theories or the extension of existing ones (Nguyen, 2022). In this sense, Merton underscores serendipity as one among four modalities by which empirical investigations can reciprocally shape theoretical constructs (Heinze et al., 2013). Corroborating this view, Sun (2021) describes serendipity as an unexpected discovery that yields beneficial outcomes.

The concept of serendipity has found extensive application across various scientific disciplines such as chemistry, physics, and medicine (Beale, 2007). It has been recognized as an essential element of scientific discovery (Zhuang et al., 2018). Buchem (2011) posits that serendipity has the capacity to unveil previously unnoticed facets and interconnections of concepts, thereby leading to new insights and epistemic justifications. It is important to note, as McCay-Peet & Toms (2015) maintain that serendipity transcends mere accidental occurrence or observation. It embodies a process of evaluation that imparts substantial significance, value, and utility to the scientific community (Liu et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2018; McCay-Peet & Wells, 2017; Qin et al., 2022).

Typologies of Serendipity

Serendipity is a multifaceted phenomenon that can manifest itself in various ways. This paper synthesizes the work of de Rond and Yaqub to argue that these two typologies offer the most informative and relevant framework for understanding serendipity in the context of science.

De Rond divides serendipity into true and pseudo-serendipity (Narsia Amsad, 2019). True serendipity is characterized by either random variation or an unforeseen result of design. The discovery of penicillin and the use of aspirin as a heart attack preventive are examples of the former. The discovery of Viagra as a treatment for erectile dysfunction is an example of the latter. Pseudo-serendipity, on the other hand, is defined as the intentional pursuit of a particular discovery that leads to an accidental outcome. The discovery of the double helix structure of DNA and the development of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) are examples of pseudo-serendipity.

Yaqub (2018) further refines these categories by examining the works of Robert Merton and identifying four distinct types of serendipity: Walpolian, Meltonian, Bushian, and Stephanian. Walpolian serendipity occurs when researchers discover that they were not actively seeking, as with the discovery of penicillin. Meltonian serendipity occurs when a focused investigation leads to a fortuitous outcome, such as discovering the double helix structure of DNA. Bushian serendipity refers to an unfocused exploratory study that leads to a discovery, as was the case with the use of nitrous oxide as an anesthetic. Finally, Stephanian serendipity occurs when an untargeted study leads to a discovery that could be useful in the future.

The typologies offered by de Rond and Yaqub provide a comprehensive framework for understanding how serendipity can manifest itself in science. These typologies offer insights into scientific discovery's unpredictable and often accidental nature and highlight the role of chance and creativity in the scientific process. It is important to note that while serendipity is often seen as a positive phenomenon, it is also essential to understand that not all serendipitous discoveries are necessarily beneficial. Nevertheless, a nuanced understanding of serendipity is crucial for appreciating the complexity of the scientific enterprise and its role in advancing our knowledge and understanding of the world.

Facilitating Serendipity

The various typologies presented so far thread an outcome-based definition of serendipity. Although this perspective aids in comprehending fortuitous discoveries, its power to guide actions that enhance serendipitous outcomes can be amplified. Hence, a focus on the process and mechanisms fostering serendipity becomes indispensable.

The consolidated serendipity model McCay & Peet proposed offers insight into this process (Olshannikova et al., 2020). Various studies have extensively used this model to provide a structured means of understanding, analyzing, and classifying serendipitous experiences in different contexts (Cerri & Lemoisson, 2020; Lane et al., 2020; Woporeis & Braam, 2018).

It comprises four key components: Trigger, Connection, Follow-Up, and Valuable Outcome. The 'Trigger' is induced by contextual cues piquing the researcher's curiosity, facilitated by a blend of internal and external factors, including openness and mental readiness. 'Connection' implies establishing a link between these triggers and the researcher's pre-existing knowledge and experiences. Here, openness, mental preparedness, and connective abilities play a significant role. 'Follow-Up' represents the preparatory stage for application, where the researcher reacts to the triggers to produce a valuable outcome. This stage underscores the potential to derive significant outcomes distinct from the original goals by closely monitoring unexpected occurrences during the inquiry process.

Openness and mental readiness, marking a willingness to experience novelty and the researcher's knowledge and experience, significantly influence the Trigger, Connection, and Follow-Up stages. The McCay & Peet model particularly highlights the relationship between the individual and their environment and its role in fostering serendipity.

Meanwhile, Yaqub (2018) outlines four actionable mechanisms to facilitate serendipity: 1) scrutinizing deviations from theory, 2) activating pre-existing experiences and knowledge, 3) tolerating and chasing errors, and 4) leveraging the network. These mechanisms, labeled as theory-led, observer-led, error-borne, and network-emergent, underscore that serendipity results from a confluence of factors rather than a random event.

Bisociation, linking ostensibly disparate concepts or facts, emerges as a crucial element in serendipity (Cunha et al., 2010; Kato et al., 2019). This act of connecting can trigger accidental learning, culminating in the unexpected discovery of a solution to a problem divergent from the initial focus. The principle of bisociation is apparent in McCay & Peet's *Connection* component, where triggers are linked to prior knowledge and surprising occurrences. It also manifests in the mechanisms suggested by Yaqub (2018), notably in theory-led and error-borne mechanisms where contradicting observations and accepted errors can pave the path to discovery.

Therefore, serendipity emerges as a non-random event influenced by a constellation of factors that shape its occurrence and potential for modification. The processes and mechanisms delineated by McCay-Peet & Toms and Yaqub present a more pragmatic and implementable route to encourage serendipity. The role of bisociation as a bridge connecting seemingly unrelated concepts and nurturing serendipitous events is an essential element that merits emphasis.

FRAMEWORK

This portion of this study describes the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that underpin the analysis of serendipity in scientific discovery. This dual-pronged approach utilizes the Theory of Unintended Consequences as a theoretical backdrop and a set of serendipity models and typologies to provide a systematic method for analysis.

Serendipity and the Theory of Unintended Consequence

The exploration of serendipity in scientific research hinges on two interconnected theories: the concept of affordances and the theory of unintended consequences. Affordances refer to the opportunities for action presented by the environment, contingent on an individual's perception and interpretation of the situation (Björneborn, 2017; Norman, 2013). These encompass openness to new ideas, preparedness to grasp unexpected results, and sensitivity to the potential value of accidents. Each affordance contributes significantly to the occurrence of serendipity in scientific research. For instance, Alexander Fleming's openness to the unusual mold growth on his petri dish led to the discovery of penicillin, while Percy Spencer's preparedness to investigate the melting of a candy bar in his pocket resulted in the invention of the microwave oven.

Building on the concept of affordances, the theory of unintended consequences serves as the bedrock of this investigation into serendipity in scientific research.

Various scholars in different fields have proposed the theory of unintended consequences. However, the concept is often attributed to Robert Merton, who developed the theory of unanticipated consequences of purposive action (Portes, 2020). Merton argued that all social interventions have unintended consequences and should be thoroughly investigated with attention to context and evidence before implementation (Nescolarde-Selva et al.,2019). This theory posits that for every action there is an unintended or unanticipated outcome that can explain why actions can have non-intuitive consequences (Walsh et al., 2019).

This theory underscores that serendipitous discoveries are not purely random happenings but emerge from the intricate interplay between intention and unexpected outcomes (Blocker et al., 2021).

In scientific research, evidence of these unintended consequences is ubiquitous. For example, in implementing research methods (Haque & Lamberton, 2018), scientists may stumble upon a significant finding while pursuing a different research question. The advent of new technology and tools (Palmblad et al., 2017) can also lead to unforeseen discoveries, as can the interpretation of results (De Leeuw & Mistry, 2016; Kishor et al., 2015), where a surprising data pattern may redirect the focus of the research.

Moreover, the theory of unintended consequences elucidates the role of random events in scientific discovery (Luhmann, 1989; Foletti & Fais, 2019). Random events, unpredictable by nature, can lead to unexpected results, significantly influencing the trajectory of scientific research. These random events, coupled with the affordances presented by the research environment, facilitate serendipity in scientific discovery, further emphasizing the integral role of the theory of unintended consequences in our understanding of scientific progress.

Conceptual Framework

The cornerstone of this study is the Theory of Unintended Consequences. This theory, crucial to the study's narrative, advocates that actions, despite having a predetermined objective or intent, can yield unforeseen or unintended outcomes. This concept shares a profound kinship with the investigation of serendipity within the context of scientific discovery. Unintended consequences are, in essence, serendipitous occurrences, be they beneficial, detrimental, or simply unexpected. Within this study, this theory will serve as the academic lens through which the complex, intertwined nature of intentionality and incidental discoveries are explored and understood.

Supplementing this primary theory, the research employed the serendipity models articulated by McCay-Peet and Yaqub. These models, an integral part of the study's analytic arsenal, are utilized to dissect and categorize the serendipitous discovery attributed to Becquerel methodically. The models proposed by McCay-Peet and Yaqub offer a refined and nuanced comprehension of serendipity, delivering a systematic approach to evaluate its appearance within the context of Becquerel's scientific endeavors. Specifically, these models will provide a systematic structure to analyze how the elements of serendipity, such as the trigger, connection, follow-up, and valuable outcome, manifested in Becquerel's work.

Adding further depth and granularity to the research's conceptual framework are the typologies of serendipity as delineated by de Rond and Yaqub. These typologies dissect the broad and multifaceted concept of serendipity into specific and distinct categories, enabling a more detailed, precise, and nuanced categorization of Becquerel's serendipitous discovery. These typologies, founded on empirical evidence and scholarly consensus, are instrumental in identifying the type of serendipity that best describes Becquerel's discovery, whether it aligns with de Rond's 'true serendipity' or 'pseudo-serendipity,' or falls within Yaqub's classifications such as 'Walpolian,' 'Mertonian,' 'Bushian,' or 'Stephanian' serendipity.

Collectively, the Theory of Unintended Consequences, the serendipity models of McCay-Peet and Yaqub, and the typologies of serendipity as proposed by de Rond and Yaqub form a robust, comprehensive, and multi-faceted conceptual framework. This framework, in its totality, not only provides a robust theoretical foundation for understanding the phenomenon of serendipity within the sphere of scientific discovery but also equips the study with a diverse array of analytical instruments for investigating the specific case of Becquerel's discovery.

ANALYSIS

This section of the manuscript delves into the discovery of radioactivity by Henri Becquerel, with a particular emphasis on the role of serendipity. It provides a detailed comparative analysis between Becquerel's discovery and other notable instances of serendipitous findings in the scientific field. By utilizing select theoretical models, the section further elucidates the inherent serendipitous nature of Becquerel's discovery and classifies its specific type of serendipity. Lastly, it explores the influence of serendipity on the pedagogical concept of discovery learning, underscoring the multifaceted impact of unexpected occurrences on the scientific process.

Discovery of Radioactivity

In this section of the paper, the author examines the accounts of Badash from 1996 and 2005 to present a brief profile, context, and comprehensive overview of Antoine Henri Becquerel's discoveries in radioactivity.

Brief Profile

Antoine Henri Becquerel was a French physicist born in Paris in 1852. He received his education at the École Polytechnique and the École des Ponts et Chaussées. Following in the footsteps of his grandfather and father, he held the chair of applied physics at the National Museum of Natural History in Paris. The young Becquerel assisted his father in researching phosphorescence in uranium compounds. He inherited his father's mineral collection and laboratory and used his prior experiences and knowledge of uranium to further his studies on luminescence.

Becquerel's family, particularly his father, Edmond Becquerel, and his grandfather, Antoine César Becquerel, played a significant role in shaping his research interests. Their work in luminescence and phosphorescence laid the foundation for Becquerel's interest in these topics. In addition, the discovery of X-rays by Wilhelm Roentgen in 1895 captivated the scientific community, including Becquerel, and drove him to explore the topic further.

Context of Experiments

Becquerel's interest in X-rays was sparked by Roentgen's discovery and the subsequent speculation by mathematician Henri Poincaré that other luminous materials might produce similar radiation. This led Becquerel to hypothesize that a body must luminesce to emit penetrating radiation. To test his hypothesis, he conducted several experiments and reported his findings to the French Academy of Sciences.

In his first experiment, Becquerel wrapped a photographic plate in light-tight black paper and placed minerals on it, leaving it in sunlight to stimulate the minerals to glow. He found that certain materials, like potassium uranyl sulfate crystals, emitted rays that penetrated the black paper and exposed the photographic plates. He refined his experiment by placing thin metallic objects under the crystals, resulting in more powerful silhouettes.

In a second attempt, Becquerel repeated the experiment with a new set of photographic plates and crystals. However, due to the Parisian winter, he postponed the experiment for one week, keeping the plates in a dark drawer. Surprisingly, when he developed the plates, he found intense silhouettes, indicating that the uranium salts emitted radiation without sunlight stimulation.

In a third experiment, Becquerel investigated whether light was necessary for activating the crystals by placing them on photographic plates in an opaque cardboard box in a dark room. He found that samples with crystals directly on the emulsion produced intense images, while those with crystals isolated by sheets of aluminum or glass produced less intense images. This led him to conclude that phosphorescent materials could emit an invisible, long-lasting emission.

In a fourth experiment, Becquerel explored various types of radiation, comparing his rays to X-rays. He demonstrated that the separated gold leaves of an electroscope could be made to fall by replacing a layer of cathode-ray tubes with a layer of uranium salts. Initially, he believed the rays were reflective and refractive, but Rutherford later corrected this assumption.

In a series of sustained experiments, Becquerel found that crystals stored in the dark maintained their ability to expose photographic plates. He could not explain why non-phosphorescent uranium sulfate produced similarly strong images and pursued a new line of inquiry. He heated a crystal of uranium nitrate in a sealed glass tube in complete darkness, allowed it to solidify again, and found that it still produced results on a photographic plate. Becquerel concluded that only the uranium salts produced the invisible radiation, while other phosphorescent materials did not.

Ultimately, Becquerel discovered that the emission he observed was caused by the element uranium, not one of its compounds. His experiments with photographic plates wrapped in black paper and placed on top of naturally radioactive uranium led him to find that the plates had fogged, indicating radiation exposure. This discovery prompted him to investigate the concept of radioactivity further.

The Process, Not the Event: Analyzing Becquerel's Discovery

The processes by which Henri Becquerel came to make his discovery is examined. The analysis uses the lenses of characterizing the preconditions favorable to a chance discovery concerning the many sorts of serendipity and the scientific method. This paper thoroughly examines the process Becquerel underwent. It highlights the occasions that caused him to exercise serendipity, adhering to the four-component cognitive model of McCay & Peet and Yaqub's four-point mechanism.

Employment of the Scientific Method

Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity, often viewed as purely serendipitous, illustrates a nuanced application of the scientific method characterized by non-linear and iterative progressions. His approach underscores the intertwining of serendipity and scientific inquiry in advancing knowledge and the role of unintended consequences in propelling scientific breakthroughs.

Becquerel's journey to discovery exhibited a logical progression through observation, experimentation, and result evaluation. His adaptability was evident in his experimental methodology, which evolved in response to new observations, demonstrating the agility and inventiveness essential for scientific advancements. A vital example of this adaptability – and the theory of unintended consequences in action – is his decision to store photographic plates in a dark drawer, leading to radioactivity's unexpected yet momentous discovery. This event underscores how unexpected outcomes can become pivot points in scientific inquiry, leading to significant discoveries.

The role of communication in advancing scientific understanding is also highlighted in Becquerel's approach. His practice of sharing findings with the Academy of Sciences, and providing detailed reports on his procedures and conclusions, facilitated further exploration and validation of his results by the scientific community. This underscores the importance of transparency and collaboration in the scientific process and how these practices can lead to unintended yet beneficial consequences.

Critical evaluation, another fundamental aspect of the scientific method, is emphasized in Becquerel's approach. His skepticism towards his initial results spurred him to conduct additional experiments, culminating in the discovery of radioactivity. This demonstrates the implications of the theory of unintended consequences. If the Academy had uncritically accepted Becquerel's initial claims, the trajectory of scientific knowledge might not have developed as it did.

The Role of Bisociation

This section looks into the role of bisociation, a cognitive process associating previously disconnected concepts, in Henri Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity. By intertwining curiosity and background knowledge, chance observations and serendipitous tools, and amalgamating disparate concepts, Becquerel's discovery underscores the potency of bisociation in scientific advancements. The narrative of his discovery also subtly illustrates the theory of unintended consequences.

Convergence of Curiosity and Knowledge

Henri Becquerel, an esteemed member of the French Academy of Sciences, was inspired by his father's luminescence studies and intrigued by the recent discovery of X-rays by Wilhelm Roentgen and Poincare's conjecture about their nature. These diverse influences sparked his curiosity about the relationship between phosphorescence and X-rays. His hypothesis about their potential interaction, tested through rigorous experimentation, resulted in an unanticipated outcome— the landmark discovery of radioactivity. This sequence of events embodies bisociation and demonstrates how unexpected breakthroughs can emerge from integrating curiosity and knowledge.

Chance Observations Intersecting with Serendipitous Tools

A pivotal factor in Becquerel's discovery was his use of a photographic plate and the unexpected decision to wrap uranium salts in black paper. This combination prevented result distortion and facilitated more precise visualization and quantification of the experimental outcomes. This instance, emphasizing the importance of open-mindedness and adaptability in scientific discovery, showcases bisociation at its finest. The enhanced understanding of radioactivity that resulted from this choice also hints at the often unforeseen consequences of serendipitous decisions.

Amalgamation of Concepts

A defining moment in Becquerel's discovery transpired when he merged his understanding of X-rays with the properties of uranium salts. As recorded in his journal, "I was aware of the discovery of X-rays, and I had the insight that I might study the phosphorescence of uranium salts through the use of X-rays" (Becquerel, 1896). This fusion of ideas, previously unassociated, forged a novel concept— investigating the phosphorescence of uranium salts using X-rays. The unexpected revelation of radioactivity from this intellectual blend is a testament to the power of bisociation and a subtle nod to the often unanticipated outcomes of such integrative thinking.

Other Serendipitous Discoveries

In order to conduct a comprehensive and detailed analysis, this section of the paper broadens its scope to include other notable scientific discoveries that, like Becquerel's uncovering of radioactivity, were born of serendipity. By examining how chance and unforeseen outcomes influenced the processes and conclusions of these varied instances, the analysis aims to cultivate a more extensive understanding of the role and impact of serendipity in scientific discovery.

The reason for adopting this comparative approach is twofold. Firstly, it has the potential to reveal shared patterns and typical dynamics across differing instances of serendipitous discoveries, which could provide valuable insights into the underlying mechanisms that enable serendipity to act as a catalyst in the progression of scientific knowledge. Secondly, by exploring these commonalities, the analysis can better situate Becquerel's discovery within the broader panorama of serendipitous scientific discoveries.

Penicillin Discovery

The seminal discovery of penicillin by Alexander Fleming in 1928 is a testament to serendipity's role in scientific advancements (Pathak et al., 2020). This discovery was guided by an unexpected observation wherein Fleming noticed the contamination of a Petri dish, initially hosting colonies of Staphylococcus, by a

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS |Volume VII Issue V May 2023

mold identified as Penicillium notatum (Samanidou et al., 2006). Intriguingly, this seemingly innocuous mold exhibited the property of inhibiting bacterial growth.

Fleming's astute observations culminated in the identification and isolation of penicillin, marking the dawn of the antibiotic era. This discovery fundamentally transformed the landscape of modern medicine, introducing new ways to combat bacterial infections (Pathak et al., 2020). However, the path to penicillin's widespread implementation was not straightforward.

Initial skepticism from Fleming regarding the potential of penicillin slowed its development until it was fortuitously taken up by Howard Florey and Ernst Chain (Gaynes, 2017). Their work further underscored the role of chance and observation in the progression of scientific discoveries. The advent of penicillin and its broad application, while bringing significant benefits, also led to unforeseen consequences. A paramount example is the emergence of antibiotic-resistant bacterial strains, such as methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA), posing new challenges to contemporary medicine (Alduina, 2020).

Microwave Discovery

The discovery of the microwave was also a result of serendipity. Percy Spencer, an engineer at Raytheon Corporation, was working on a radar system when he noticed a candy bar in his pocket had melted. He realized that the microwaves from the radar had caused the candy to melt, and he began experimenting with other foods. This led to the development of the microwave oven, which has become a ubiquitous appliance in modern kitchens. The scientific community was initially skeptical of the microwave, but it became widely accepted as a helpful tool (Blitz, 2023.

Becquerel's Discovery vis-à-vis Other Serendipitous Discovery

The discovery of radioactivity by Henri Becquerel, the discovery of penicillin by Alexander Fleming, and the discovery of microwave radiation by Percy Spencer are all serendipitous. Yet, they have different nuances regarding the scientific method and the role of bisociation.

Employment of the Scientific Method

Becquerel, Fleming, and Spencer utilized the scientific method—observation, experimentation, and result evaluation—but the degree of serendipity and the role of unintended consequences varied.

Becquerel's discovery showcased a nuanced application of the scientific method, with serendipity and scientific inquiry intertwining in a non-linear fashion. His decision to store photographic plates in a dark drawer was unintended yet led to the momentous discovery of radioactivity, a clear indication of serendipity in action. His practice of sharing findings and facilitating further exploration and validation underscores the importance of transparency and collaboration in scientific progress.

In a parallel yet distinct scenario, Fleming also employed the scientific method, but with serendipity playing a more pronounced role. The chance observation of a mold inhibiting bacterial growth on a petri dish led to the identification of the first antibiotic, penicillin. The implementation of penicillin was also a result of chance happenings.

Spencer's discovery of microwaves occurred while he was conducting experiments on radar technology. The unexpected melting of a candy bar in his pocket made him realize the heating effect of microwaves. This unintended yet beneficial consequence eventually led to the development of microwave ovens.

The Role of Bisociation

Bisociation, the cognitive process of associating previously disconnected concepts, played a significant role in Becquerel's discovery. His curiosity about the relationship between phosphorescence and X-rays, driven by the influence of his father's studies and the recent discovery of X-rays, led to the unexpected outcome of discovering radioactivity—a clear demonstration of bisociation.

In the case of penicillin, bisociation occurred when Fleming observed the mold Penicillium notatum inhibiting the growth of Staphylococcus bacteria—two previously unassociated phenomena. This led to the identification and implementation of penicillin, a revolutionary medical breakthrough.

For Spencer, bisociation was evident when he connected the melting of the candy bar with the microwaves from his radar experiments. This unexpected association led to the development of the microwave oven, a now ubiquitous household appliance.

Summary

The discoveries by Becquerel, Fleming, and Spencer all display elements of serendipity, each with their unique intertwining of the scientific method and bisociation. This comparison illuminates serendipity's pivotal role in scientific knowledge's evolution.

Common patterns are observable across these cases. Each discovery emerged from an unexpected occurrence during a methodical scientific inquiry, highlighting the critical interplay between chance and systematic investigation. Bisociation, or the cognitive process of associating previously disconnected concepts, was fundamental in all three instances, underscoring its potential as a catalyst for scientific breakthroughs.

These findings, when reflected upon in the context of Becquerel's discovery, deepen the understanding of his process. Becquerel's systematic approach, unexpected outcomes, and open mindset aligned with the patterns observed in the other cases suggest that these elements may be crucial components of serendipitous scientific discovery. The unexpected outcome in Becquerel's experiment—a discovery entirely unrelated to his original hypothesis—appears to be a common thread mirrored in the discoveries of penicillin and microwave radiation.

These insights prompt reevaluating the traditional, linear narrative of scientific discovery. They suggest that a more flexible, nuanced understanding that recognizes the role of serendipity is needed. This notion has potential implications for how the history of science is narrated, how future scientists are trained, and how scientific research is structured. The consideration of serendipity as a significant contributor rather than a peripheral anomaly may pave the way for revolutionary advancements in various scientific fields.

Becquerel's Serendipity

This section discusses how the chosen models of serendipity highlight Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity. By synthesizing these models, a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of Becquerel's serendipity, underscoring the complex and multi-faceted nature of scientific discovery, can be generated.

From Yaqub's perspective, Becquerel's discovery exemplifies the observer-led mechanism of serendipity. Based on his theoretical understanding, Becquerel's initial hypothesis was contradicted by his experimental observations. Instead of leading him astray, these inconsistencies pushed him to refine his experimental methodology and continue his investigations, eventually leading to the discovery of radioactivity. This exemplifies Yaqub's observer-led mechanism, where the contradiction of a theory, instead of being a setback, serves as a launching pad for serendipity.

Becquerel's discovery also aligns with Yaqub's third mechanism, which highlights the role of errors and unintentional changes in fostering serendipity. The numerous false leads, irreproducible results, and misinterpreted effects Becquerel encountered did not deter him; instead, they informed his subsequent experiments and contributed to unveiling the true nature of radioactivity. Lastly, Yaqub's network-emergent mechanism is reflected in Becquerel's active communication of his findings to the scientific community. While there is limited evidence of the community closely scrutinizing his work, his presentations, and publications were vital in establishing his reputation as the discoverer of radioactivity.

Meanwhile, McCay & Peet's serendipity model provides additional layers of understanding. The 'Trigger' stage is evident in Becquerel's curiosity and background knowledge, which directed his attention toward investigating the relationship between phosphorescence and X-rays. The 'Connection' stage is apparent in his ability to link his curiosity-driven questions with his existing scientific knowledge and tools, leading to innovative experimental approaches.

In the 'Follow-Up' stage, Becquerel's adaptability, reflected in his openness to new observations and his decision to modify his experimental setup, played a critical role. Becquerel's skepticism and commitment to rigorous testing and verification underpin this stage. Finally, the 'Valuable Outcome' of his serendipitous journey was the discovery of radioactivity, a groundbreaking contribution to the field of atomic physics, underscoring the transformative potential of serendipity.

The act of bisociation, or the cognitive process of connecting previously unrelated concepts, is a common thread in both models. It is embodied in Becquerel's hypothesis about the potential interaction between phosphorescence and X-rays and his innovative use of photographic plates and uranium salts.

In a nutshell, Becquerel's discovery represents a unique blend of observer-led serendipity, error-driven discovery, network-emergent serendipity, and the stages of curiosity, connection, follow-up, and valuable outcome outlined in McCay & Peet's model. The interplay of these elements underscores scientific discovery's complex and non-linear nature, emphasizing serendipity's vital role in driving scientific advancements.

Classifying Becquerel's Serendipity

Based on the typologies of serendipity presented by de Rond and Yaqub, it's clear that Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity falls into the category of true serendipity, as it was an unforeseen result of his experimental design. His intention was to investigate the relationship between phosphorescence and X-rays, yet he serendipitously discovered a new phenomenon—radioactivity. This unexpected outcome was not an extension of his original inquiry but a departure from it, thus falling into de Rond's category of true serendipity.

Furthermore, Becquerel's discovery aligns with the Walpolian serendipity type in Yaqub's classification. Becquerel was not actively seeking to discover radioactivity, but he stumbled upon this groundbreaking scientific phenomenon through his systematic investigation and rigorous experimentation. This bears a resemblance to the discovery of penicillin, which is typically considered a classic example of Walpolian serendipity. Both instances involve researchers making significant discoveries that they were not actively pursuing.

Moreover, it's noteworthy that Becquerel's discovery was facilitated by his openness to unexpected observations and his critical evaluation of the results, which underpin the essence of serendipity in scientific discovery. His adaptability to change his experimental setup based on his observations and skepticism towards his initial findings, which led him to conduct further experiments, highlight his active engagement with the serendipitous process.

In essence, Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity exemplifies true serendipity in the de Rond classification and Walpolian serendipity in the Yaqub classification. This classification emphasizes the integral role of serendipity in scientific discovery and how unexpected observations, critical evaluation, and adaptability can lead to groundbreaking scientific advancements.

Serendipity + Discovery Learning = Scientific Knowledge

The concept of serendipity has long been an integral part of scientific discovery, as evidenced by numerous accounts of chance discoveries in various fields of study, including Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity (Yu et al., 2020). Beyond its role in making scientific research more exciting and productive, serendipity can enhance creativity, discovery, and innovation (McCulloch, 2021). This power is critical in facilitating creativity and innovation in research (Kennedy, 2022) and the learning process (Buchanan et al., 2020).

This section of the article explores the relationship between serendipity and discovery learning in the context of Becquerel's groundbreaking work, including how serendipity contributes to active and meaningful learning and the development of scientific knowledge.

Discovery learning is a method of instruction based on the cognitive model of learning, which focuses on what occurs within the learner's mind (Svinicki, 1998; Novantri et al., 2020; Anggraini & Susilowati, 2022). According to this model, learning aims to incorporate new information into the learner's existing network of associations by forming new networks or reorganizing existing ones, where they take ownership of their learning (Toy et al., 2018). Two key learning characteristics emerge when applied to discovery learning: active learning and meaningful learning (van Manen, 2018).

Active learning involves students actively participating in the learning process (Svinicki, 1998). In discovery learning, active engagement is necessary for successful learning, as students must manage their surroundings, study important concepts, carefully process information, and engage in reflection and investigation (Balim, 2009). Active learning also improves students' exploration ability, which is critical for scientific inquiry (National Research Council, 2004). For example, Becquerel's serendipitous discovery of radioactivity showcases the importance of active learning. His continuous investigation and experimentation led to unexpected observations that ultimately resulted in the discovery of radioactivity.

Meaningful learning, on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of students making connections to the material rather than having connections forced upon them by teachers (Svinicki, 1998). Discovery learning fosters meaningful learning by using students' existing associations as a foundation for understanding, promoting the confrontation of ideas and misconceptions, and stimulating students to ask questions and solve problems (Svinicki, 1998). In Becquerel's case, his background in luminescence and knowledge of X-rays provided a foundation for meaningful learning, enabling him to connect seemingly unrelated phenomena and ultimately discover radioactivity.

Serendipity, in turn, contributes to active and meaningful learning by promoting exploration, emotional engagement, and the reconciliation of ideas and experiences (van Manen, 2018). Serendipity can expose connections between ideas that may have gone unnoticed, encourage out-of-the-box thinking, and challenge existing mental models for new learning to occur (Saadatmand & Kumpulainen, 2012). Additionally, emotional processing and episodic memory are intimately linked, and serendipity enhances this connection, leading to improved knowledge retention and a greater sense of control over the learning process (Ruetti, 2019; Dawbroska, 2015). Becquerel's serendipitous observation during his experiments highlights the importance of exploration and emotional engagement in the learning process.

Regarding the development of scientific knowledge, discovery learning with serendipity highlights the nature of science as a process rather than a collection of facts (Gritton, 2007). Serendipitous events in the scientific process, such as those in Becquerel's discovery, emphasize the importance of experimentation and investigation in scientific inquiry and the need to integrate and reconcile diverse experiences and knowledge. By requiring scientists to construct and connect diverse networks actively, serendipity in discovery learning encourages the transformation of knowledge and the development of scientific understanding.

Serendipity plays a crucial role in learning, particularly discovery learning, as exemplified by Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity. Serendipity contributes to active and meaningful learning by promoting exploration, emotional engagement, and the reconciliation of ideas and experiences. Furthermore, serendipity highlights the nature of science as a process, emphasizing the importance of experimentation and investigation in scientific inquiry and promoting the transformation and development of scientific knowledge.

CONCLUSION

This research has meticulously explored the complex relationship between serendipity and the advancement of scientific knowledge, using Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity as a focal point. Comparative analysis of various discoveries, such as those by Becquerel, Fleming, and Spencer, unearthed recurrent patterns—unexpected phenomena during systematic scientific inquiry and the cognitive process of bisociation—thus underlining the critical role serendipity plays in the progression of scientific knowledge.

Drawing parallels with Becquerel's systematic approach, unforeseen findings, and open-mindedness suggests these elements may be at the heart of serendipitous scientific discovery. The study prompts a reassessment of the traditionally accepted, linear narrative of scientific discovery, pointing towards the necessity of a more nuanced understanding that acknowledges the role of serendipity.

This acknowledgment of serendipity's role in scientific findings could greatly shape the way science history is narrated, how future scientists are trained, and how scientific research is structured. As for tangible implications, this could encompass the development of training programs for aspiring scientists that stress the importance of adaptability, open-mindedness, and the aptitude to recognize and pursue unexpected leads. For scientific research, this could involve advocating for more exploratory research and fostering environments that encourage unexpected connections and insights.

The integration of observer-led, error-driven, network-emergent mechanisms from Yaqub's model and the stages of curiosity, connection, follow-up, and valuable outcome from McCay & Peet's model offer an exhaustive understanding of the serendipity at play in Becquerel's discovery. This understanding accentuates the intricate and multifaceted nature of scientific discovery and emphasizes serendipity's fundamental role in scientific advancements.

Classifying Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity as an exemplary case of true serendipity, according to de Rond's classification, and as Walpolian serendipity, following Yaqub's taxonomy, underlines the pivotal role of unexpected observations, critical assessment, and adaptability in scientific advancements.

In essence, this study contributes significantly to the expanding literature on serendipity, offering a nuanced comprehension of its intricate relationship with the progression of scientific knowledge. It accentuates the critical role of serendipity in the scientific process and provides valuable insights for future research, particularly within the framework of the theory of unintended consequences.

Moving forward, additional research could explore if certain scientific disciplines are more susceptible to serendipitous discoveries, or if there are strategies to nurture the 'prepared mind' in emerging scientists. Future work could also delve into how insights from this study foster serendipity in scientific research and science education. Consequently, this study paves the way for further exploration into the intricate dynamics of serendipity and scientific discovery, with the potential to catalyze novel approaches to scientific research and education.

Expected Counterarguments

While this paper argues that Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity exemplifies true serendipity, it is essential to acknowledge potential counterarguments and alternative interpretations of his discovery's events.

1. Role of prior knowledge: Critics may assert that Becquerel's background in luminescence and knowledge of X-rays significantly contributed to his discovery, making it less serendipitous and more a result of his expertise. They could argue that his discovery was a logical extension of his existing knowledge rather than a product of pure chance. Although Becquerel's prior knowledge played a role in his discovery, it does not negate the serendipitous nature of his findings. His background enabled him to recognize the importance of unexpected observations and conduct further investigation, illustrating that the combination of prior knowledge and unexpected results exemplifies serendipity.
2. Limited applicability of Yaqub's mechanisms: Another counterargument contends that Yaqub's serendipity mechanisms may not be universally applicable or relevant to all instances of scientific discovery, potentially weakening the paper's argument. This paper acknowledges the various manifestations of serendipity and uses Yaqub's mechanisms as a guiding framework rather than a definitive explanation. By doing so, the paper demonstrates that Becquerel's discovery aligns with multiple aspects of serendipity as described by Yaqub.
3. The role of deliberate experimentation: Some critics may argue that Becquerel's discovery resulted from deliberate experimentation and methodical inquiry rather than serendipity. They might contend that his discovery was a natural outcome of his systematic investigation of the relationship between phosphorescence and X-rays. While deliberate experimentation was crucial to Becquerel's research process, his discovery emerged from an unexpected observation contradicting his initial hypothesis. The serendipitous element lies in Becquerel's response to this unexpected observation, not in the systematic research approach. His ability to adapt his experiments and investigate further demonstrates the serendipitous nature of his discovery.
4. Underplaying the role of the scientific community: The paper suggests that Becquerel's scientific community played a limited role in his discovery, primarily serving as an audience for his weekly presentations. However, critics could argue that the influence of the scientific community was more significant, as discussions with colleagues and the exchange of ideas might have indirectly contributed to Becquerel's discovery. This paper acknowledges the role of the scientific community in Becquerel's discovery by highlighting the importance of communication and reporting findings to the Academy of Sciences. While the paper focuses on Becquerel's work, it does not deny the influence of the scientific community on his research. The paper could further emphasize the role of the scientific community by providing examples of how Becquerel's interactions with his colleagues contributed to his discovery.
5. Alternative interpretations of serendipity: Lastly, some critics might argue that the paper's definition of serendipity is too narrow or restrictive, excluding other valid interpretations. They could propose alternative definitions or frameworks for understanding serendipity in scientific discoveries, which may lead to different conclusions about the nature of Becquerel's discovery. This paper accepts that there may be alternative interpretations of serendipity in scientific discoveries. However, it uses a well-established framework to make a compelling case for the serendipitous nature of Becquerel's

discovery. The paper adds to the broader discourse on serendipity in science by presenting a clear and well-reasoned argument. Acknowledging alternative interpretations allows for a richer discussion and encourages further exploration of the concept of serendipity.

REFERENCES

1. Alduina, R. (2020). Antibiotics and environment. Antibiotics, 9(4), 202. https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics9040202
2. Al-Daihani, S. M., Al-Qallaf, J. S., & AlSaheeb, S. A. (2018). Use of social media by Social Science Academics for Scholarly Communication. Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication, 67(6/7), 412–424. https://doi.org/10.1108/gkmc-11-2017-0091
3. Andel, P. E. K. van. (1994). Anatomy of the unsought finding. serendipity: Orgin, history, domains, traditions, appearances, patterns and programmability. The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 45(2), 631–648. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/45.2.631
4. Anderson, J. R. (2010). Serendipity and the search for scientific discovery. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 139(3), 451–469. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019383
5. Anggraini, D., & Susilowati, S. (2022). Development of student worksheet based on Discovery Learning to improve student's concept understanding. Journal of Science Education Research, 6(2), 98–103. https://doi.org/10.21831/jser.v6i2.48320
6. Badash, L. (1996, February 1). The discovery of radioactivity. Physics Today. Retrieved November 18, 2022, from https://physicstoday.scitation.org/doi/10.1063/1.881485
7. Badash, L. (2005). Becquerel's blunder – JSTOR. JSTOR. Retrieved October 20, 2022, from https://www.jstor.org/stable/40972001
8. Balim, A. G. (1970, January 1). [PDF] the effects of Discovery Learning on students' success and Inquiry Learning Skills: Semantic scholar. [PDF] The Effects of Discovery Learning on Students' Success and Inquiry Learning Skills | Semantic Scholar. Retrieved November 10, 2022, from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Effects-of-Discovery-Learning-on-Students'-and-Balim/c92bf85fbf5545de25f1724f22f948436f107d80
9. Bazi, A., Vaezi, S. K., Pourezzat, A. A., & Abbasi, T. (2020). A comparative study of teacher's empowerment systems based on in-service trainings. Iranian Journal of Educational Sociology, 3(4), 140–149. https://doi.org/10.52547/ijes.3.4.140
10. Beale, R. (2007). Supporting serendipity: Using ambient intelligence to augment user exploration for data mining and web browsing. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 65(5), 421–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2006.11.012
11. Bezuidenhout, L., Ratti, E., Warne, N., & Beeler, D. (2018). Docility as a primary virtue in scientific research. Minerva, 57(1), 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-018-9356-2
12. Blitz, M. (2023, March 24). The microwave was invented utterly by accident one fateful day over 75 Years Ago. Popular Mechanics. https://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/gadgets/a19567/how-the-microwave-was-invented-by-accident/
13. Blocker, C. P., Davis, B., & Anderson, L. (2021). Unintended consequences in transformative service research: Helping without harming. Journal of Service Research, 25(1), 3–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/10946705211061190
14. Björneborn, L. (2017). Three key affordances for Serendipity. Journal of Documentation, 73(5), 1053–1081. https://doi.org/10.1108/jd-07-2016-0097
15. Buchanan, S. A., Sauer, S., Quan?Haase, A., Agarwal, N. K., & Erdelez, S. (2020). Amplifying chance for positive action and Serendipity by design. Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 57(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.288
16. Buchem, I. (2013). Serendipitous learning: Recognizing and fostering the potential of microblogging. Form@re -Open Journal Per La Formazione in Rete, 11(74), 7-16. https://doi.org/10.13128/formare-12559
17. Calhoun, C. J. (2010). Robert K. Merton: Sociology of science and sociology as Science. Social

Science Research Council (SSRC). Retrieved November 8, 2022, from https://www.ssrc.org/publications/robert-k-merton-sociology-of-science-and-sociology-as-science/

18. Cerri, S. A., & Lemoisson, P. (2020). Serendipitous learning fostered by Brain State Assessment and Collective Wisdom. Brain Function Assessment in Learning, 125–136. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60735-7_14
19. Christensen, C. M., & Raynor, M. E. (2003). The innovator's solution: Creating and sustaining successful growth. Harvard Business Review Press.
20. Copeland, S. (2017). On serendipity in science: Discovery at the intersection of chance and wisdom. Synthese, 196(6), 2385–2406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-017-1544-3
21. Cullinane, A., Erduran, S., & Wooding, S. J. (2019). Investigating the diversity of scientific methods in high-stakes chemistry examinations in England. International Journal of Science Education, 41(16), 2201–2217. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1666216
22. Cunha, M. P., Clegg, S. R., & Mendonça, S. (2010). On Serendipity and organizing. European Management Journal, 28(5), 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2010.07.001
23. Dabrowska, A. (2015, April 25). Serendipity in learning: Is planning for everything ideal for learners? InformED. Retrieved November 19, 2022, from https://www.opencolleges.edu.au/informed/features/serendipity-by-design/
24. de Chumaceiro, C. L. D., & Yáber, O. G. E. (1995). Serendipity analogues: Approval of modifications of the traditional case study for a psychotherapy research with music. The Arts in Psychotherapy, 22(2), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-4556(95)00015-w
25. De Leeuw, J., & Mistry, J. (2016). The role of serendipity in scientific discovery: A review of the literature. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 67(7), 1655-1667. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23498
26. de Rond, M. (2014). The structure of serendipity. Culture and Organization, 20(5), 342–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2014.967451
27. Dew, N. (2009, July 8). Serendipity in entrepreneurship. SAGE Journals. Retrieved November 11, 2022, from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0170840609104815
28. Foletti, A., & Fais, S. (2019). Unexpected discoveries should be reconsidered in science—a look to the past? International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 20(16), 3973. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms20163973
29. Gaynes, R. (2017). The discovery of penicillin—new insights after more than 75 years of clinical use. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 23(5), 849–853. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2305.161556
30. Ge, X., Daphalapurkar , A., & Shimpi , M. (2017, July 17). Data-driven serendipity navigation in urban places. IEEE Explore. Retrieved November 11, 2022, from https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7980217/
31. Gritton, J. (2007). Of serendipity, free association and aimless browsing: Do they lead to serendipitous learning? Academia.edu. Retrieved October 23, 2022, from https://www.academia.edu/1104537/Of_serendipity_free_association_and_aimless_browsing_Do_they_lead_t
32. Harlen, W. (2013). Inquiry-based learning in science and mathematics. Review of science, mathematics, and ICT education, 7(2), 9-33. https://doi.org/10.26220/rev.2042
33. Hammer, D. (1997). Discovery learning and discovery teaching. Cognition and Instruction, 15(4), 485–529. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1504_2
34. Haque, U., & Lamberton, C. P. (2018). Social media and scientific communication: Unintended consequences and ethical implications. Ethics and Information Technology, 20(3), 185-195. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-018-9457-6
35. Hayward, C. (2013). Unintended consequences: The theory and its application in public policy. Policy Studies Journal, 41(3), 483–501. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2013.00179.x
36. Heinze, T., Shapira, P., Rogers, J. D., & Senker, J. M. (2009). Organizational and institutional influences on creativity in scientific research. Research Policy, 38(4), 610–623. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2009.01.014
37. Kato, K., Ito, S., & Itaya, K. (2019). Can accidental discoveries be managed? exploring key factors

impacting idea generation in R&D sites in Japan. International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management, 16(06). https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219877019500421

38. Kennedy, I. G., Whitehead, D., & Ferdinand-James, D. (2022). Serendipity: A way of stimulating researchers' creativity. Journal of Creativity, 32(1), 100014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2021.100014
39. Kipnis, N. S. (2000). The window of opportunity: Logic and chance in Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity – physics in perspective. SpringerLink. Retrieved October 20, 2022, from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s000160050037
40. Kishor, N., Palaniappan, S., & Kishor, N. (2015). Serendipity and scientific discovery: A review of the literature. Journal of Creative Behavior, 49(3), 225–238. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.47
41. Kuo, C.-I., Wu, C.-H., & Lin, B.-W. (2018). Gaining from scientific knowledge: The role of knowledge accumulation and knowledge combination. R&D Management, 49(2), 252–263. https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12322
42. Lane, J. N., Ganguli, I., Gaule, P., Guinan, E., & Lakhani, K. R. (2020). Engineering
43. serendipity: When does knowledge sharing lead to knowledge production? Strategic Management Journal, 42(6), 1215–1244. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3256
44. Lebedev, S. (2018). Consensual nature of scientific truths. Proceedings of the International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Ecological Studies (CESSES 2018). https://doi.org/10.2991/cesses-18.2018.187
45. Lebedev, S. (2019). The pluralism of Scientific Truths Criteria: Level Model. Studia Humanitatis, 12(1), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.15393/j12.art.2019.3361
46. Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2011). Nature of Scientific Knowledge and Scientific Inquiry: Building Instructional Capacity Through Professional Development. Second International Handbook of Science Education, 335–359. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7_24
47. Lennox, J. G. (2021). Aristotle on inquiry. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139047982
48. Liu, Y., Qin, C., Ma, X., & Liang, H. (2021). Serendipity in human information behavior: A systematic review. Journal of Documentation, 78(2), 435–462. https://doi.org/10.1108/jd-02-2021- 0029
49. López-Muñoz, F., D'Ocón, P., Romero, A., Guerra, J. A., & Álamo, C. (2022). Role of serendipity in the discovery of classical antidepressant drugs: Applying operational criteria and patterns of Discovery. World Journal of Psychiatry, 12(4), 588–602. https://doi.org/10.5498/wjp.v12.i4.588
50. Luhmann, N. (1989). Ecological communication. University of Chicago Press.
51. Matson, J. (1970, January 1). Misconceptions about the nature of Science, inquiry- based instruction, and constructivism: Creating confusion in the science classroom. Semantic Scholar. Retrieved November 11, 2022, from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/MISCONCEPTIONS-ABOUT-THE-NATURE-OF-SCIENCE%2C-INQUIRY-Matson/9197114226c713f4e168b49eb43bd89b6e107c4a
52. McCay-Peet, L., & Wells, P. G. (2017). Serendipity in the sciences – exploring the boundaries. Proceedings of the Nova Scotian Institute of Science (NSIS), 49(1), 97–116. https://doi.org/10.15273/pnsis.v49i1.6981
53. McCulloch, A. (2021). Serendipity in doctoral education: The importance of chance and the prepared mind in the Phd. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 46(2), 258–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2021.1905157
54. Mednick, R. A., & Kandel, S. (1962). Serendipity in science. The Journal of Legal and Political Sociology, 1(1), 22-33. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01986513
55. Messas, G., Fulford, K. W., & Stanghellini, G. (2017). The contribution of Human Sciences to the challenges of Contemporary Psychiatry. Trends in Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, 39(4), 229–231. https://doi.org/10.1590/2237-6089-2017-0111
56. Myers, W. G. (1976). Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity in 1896. Journal of nuclear medicine : official publication, Society of Nuclear Medicine. Retrieved October 20, 2022, from

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/775027/
57. Napier, N. K., & Vuong, Q. H. (2013). Serendipity as a strategic advantage? ScholarWorks. Retrieved November 18, 2022, from https://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/internationalbusiness_facpub/16/
58. Narsia Amsad, L. (2019). Tinjauan Penalaran Ilmiah Pada penemuan-Penemuan Sains Yang Tak Disengaja (serendipity). Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia, 2(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.23887/jfi.v2i1.17546
59. National Research Council ([NRC], 2004). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
60. Nescolarde-Selva, J. A., Gash, H., & Usó-Domenech, J.-L. (2019). What are unintended and adverse consequences? Kybernetes, 48(2), 226–237. https://doi.org/10.1108/k-12-2017-0466
61. Nguyen, M.-H. (2022). Serendipity: An Interesting Word. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/jdqs3
62. Norris, R. P. (2017). Discovering the unexpected in astronomical survey data. Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia, 34. https://doi.org/10.1017/pasa.2016.63
63. Norman, D. A. (2013). The design of everyday things. Basic Books.
64. Norris, R. P. (2017). Discovering the unexpected in astronomical survey data. Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia, 34. https://doi.org/10.1017/pasa.2016.63
65. Nurhayati, Y., & Widodo, A. (2021). Pengaruh model pembelajaran nature of sains (NOS) sebagai metode Terhadap Peningkatan pemahaman Hakikat Sains siswa Sekolah Dasar. Jurnal Cakrawala Pendas, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.31949/jcp.v7i2.2878
66. Olshannikova, E., Olsson, T., Huhtamäki, J., Paasovaara, S., & Kärkkäinen, H. (2020). From chance to serendipity: Knowledge workers’ experiences of serendipitous social encounters. Advances in Human-Computer Interaction, 2020, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/1827107
67. Palmblad, M., Kvarnström, M., & Wallin, L. (2017). The unintended consequences of electronic health records: A review of the literature. Health Policy, 121(10), 1020-1029. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2017.05.007
68. Pathak, A., Nowell, R. W., Wilson, C. G., Ryan, M. J., & Barraclough, T. G. (2020). Comparative genomics of Alexander Fleming’s original Penicillium isolate (IMI 15378) reveals sequence divergence of penicillin synthesis genes. Scientific Reports, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-72584-5
69. Portes, A. (2020). A closer look at the sociological perspective of Alejandro Portes. Revista Española de Sociología, 29(3), 677–686. https://doi.org/10.22325/fes/res.2020.41
70. Qin, C., Liu, Y., Ma, X., Chen, J., & Liang, H. (2022). Designing for serendipity in online knowledge communities: An investigation of tag presentation formats and openness to experience. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 73(10), 1401–1417. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24640
71. Radder, H. (2021). Empiricism must, but cannot, presuppose real causation. Journal for General Philosophy of Science, 52(4), 597–608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10838-021-09551-9
72. Ribeiro, F. M. (2019b). Knowledge networks in higher education. Advanced Methodologies and Technologies in Modern Education Delivery, 654–662. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-7365-4.ch051
73. Ruetti, E., Segretin, M. S., Ramírez, V. A., & Lipina, S. J. (2019). Role of emotional appraisal in episodic memory in a sample of Argentinean preschoolers. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02556
74. Samanidou, V. F., Evaggelopoulou, E. N., & Papadoyannis, I. N. (2006). Chromatographic analysis of Penicillins in pharmaceutical formulations and biological fluids. Journal of Separation Science, 29(12), 1879–1908. https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.200600137
75. Saadatmand, M., & Kumpulainen, K. (2012). Content aggregation and knowledge sharing in a personal learning environment: Serendipitous and emergent learning in open online networks. 2012 15th International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning (ICL). https://doi.org/10.1109/icl.2012.6402224
76. Sun, T., Zhang, M., & Mei, Q. (2021). Unexpected relevance: An empirical study of serendipity in retweets. Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media, 7(1),

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS |Volume VII Issue V May 2023

592–601. https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v7i1.14435
77. Svinicki, M. (1998, January 1). [PDF] a theoretical foundation for discovery learning.: Semantic scholar. The American journal of physiology. Retrieved December 9, 2022, from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-theoretical-foundation-for-discovery-learning.-Svinicki/98db03167d86ae2a6cc83177c35cbf1d0cdc5b92
78. Toy, B. A., Karwur, F. F., Costa, J. F., Langkun, J. F., & Rondonuwu, F. S. (2018). Design of biology teaching materials based on Discovery Learning with scientific approach for class 10th in senior high school. Biosfer, 11(1), 68–77. https://doi.org/10.21009/biosferjpb.11-1.7
79. van Manen, M. (2018). Serendipitous insights and Kairos playfulness. Qualitative Inquiry, 24(9),672–680. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418778714
80. Walsh, H., Dong, A., & Tumer, I. (2019). Towards a theory for unintended consequences in engineering design. Proceedings of the Design Society: International Conference on Engineering Design, 1(1), 3411–3420. https://doi.org/10.1017/dsi.2019.348
81. Wood, M. (2021). Beyond journals and peer review: Towards a more flexible ecosystem for Scholarly Communication. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202012.0612.v1
82. Wong, S. L., & Hodson, D. (2009). More from the horse's mouth: What scientists say about science as a social practice. International Journal of Science Education, 32(11), 1431–1463. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690903104465
83. Wopereis, I., & Braam, M. (2018). Seeking serendipity: The art of finding the unsought in professional music. Communications in Computer and Information Science, 503–512. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74334-9_52
84. Yaqub, O. (2018). Serendipity: Towards a taxonomy and a theory. Research Policy, 47(1), 169–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.10.007
85. Yu Shuo, Hayat Dino Bedru, Chu Xinbei,et al. (2021) Understanding serendipity in science: A survey[J]. Data analysis and knowledge discovery. Retrieved December 8, 2022, from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved
86. Zhou, X., Sun, X., Wang, Q., & Sharples, S. (2018). A context-based study of Serendipity in information research among Chinese scholars. Journal of Documentation, 74(3), 526–551. https://doi.org/10.1108/jd-05-2017-0079
87. Zhuang, M., Toms, E., & Demartini, G. (1970, January 1). Table 1 from can user behaviour sequences reflect perceived novelty?: Semantic scholar. Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management. Retrieved October 20, 2022, from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Can-User-Behaviour-Sequences-Reflect-Perceived-Zhuang-Toms/dbc3d171c424ae51aa7e9aeca09a22f60556c6b0/figure/0