



HAL
open science

Chemie im Kontext – a symbiotic implementation of a context-based teaching and learning approach

Ilka Parchmann

► **To cite this version:**

Ilka Parchmann. Chemie im Kontext – a symbiotic implementation of a context-based teaching and learning approach. *International Journal of Science Education*, 2007, 28 (09), pp.1041-1062. 10.1080/09500690600702512 . hal-00513320

HAL Id: hal-00513320

<https://hal.science/hal-00513320>

Submitted on 1 Sep 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Chemie im Kontext – a symbiotic implementation of a context-based teaching and learning approach

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2006-0058
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Research Paper
Keywords:	chemistry education, curriculum
Keywords (user):	context-based



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

***Chemie im Kontext* – a symbiotic implementation of a context-based teaching and learning approach**

9 Ilka Parchmann, University of Oldenburg, Cornelia Gräsel, University of Wuppertal,

10
11 Anja Baer, Reinhard Demuth, IPN Kiel, Bernd Ralle, University of Dortmund

12
13
14
15 and the project group ChiK

16
17
18 Correspondence to:

19 Ilka Parchmann University of Oldenburg, Germany

20 ilka.parchmann@uni-oldenburg.de

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Chemie im Kontext (ChiK) is a project which aims at the improvement of chemistry teaching at secondary school in Germany. Based on a framework, which was derived from theories and empirical data on the teaching and learning of science, science education researchers and teachers work together on learning communities to transform this framework into teaching and learning practice. Funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and the participating federal states, such learning communities have developed and tried units for almost all topics for the upper and lower secondary education. The accompanying research studies show different effects on students' motivation: The ChiK units point out the relevance of chemistry, but the student-oriented learning approach can also lead to a feeling of getting lost in the context. One reason might be seen in the result that teachers have put more emphasis on the realisation of a good context than on the second important principle of ChiK: the development of basic concepts. However, data also showed that the learning communities have indeed inspired and supported the teachers to change their teaching towards a more context-based and student-oriented teaching. The

1
2
3 continuing work will now especially focus on the improvement of facilitating the
4
5 students with a better guideline, and on the development and assessment of different
6
7 science competencies.
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Introduction**

14
15
16 After the publication of the results of the international TIMMS and PISA tests, the
17
18 German school system has been criticised by a lot by experts, politicians and media.
19
20 Topics of criticism have not just covered learning outcomes, but also organisational
21
22 and structural aspects of the whole school system, like the modes of assessment, the
23
24 early separation of students into different types of secondary schools, and the
25
26 organisation of teacher education.
27
28

29
30 Any innovation, aiming at the improvement of learning outcomes, has to consider the
31
32 complex structures of the school system. The German school system shows some
33
34 important characteristics, which might be more hindering than fostering for the
35
36 development and implementation of an innovation: (1) The school system is a federal
37
38 system. This means, that every state has got its own syllabi and structure of school
39
40 types (e.g. Gesamtschulen, where students are not separated according to their
41
42 abilities, or Haupt-, Realschulen and Gymnasien, where students are separated after
43
44 primary school). Additionally, the structure of science subjects is different: for
45
46 example, in some states sciences are taught as an integrated subject up to year
47
48 seven or nine, while they are taught as different subjects right from the beginning in
49
50 other states. Therefore, every innovative curriculum has to produce syllabi for 16
51
52 states, the three main school types for secondary education, not to mention different
53
54 demands and conditions in schools, e.g. equipment for students' laboratory
55
56 experiments. (2) Teacher education is also organised by state rules. In some states,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in-service training is compulsory, while it is voluntary in others. Therefore, the
4
5 implementation of an innovative approach might be left to some very ambitious
6
7 teachers only in some states, while it could become compulsory for all teachers in
8
9 other states. In many states co-operation between teachers is also left to personal
10
11 activities and not really established in institutes.
12
13

14
15 Regarding these circumstances, the success of an innovation project will not only
16
17 depend on the curriculum and material of the new course, but also on the
18
19 effectiveness and flexibility of the accompanying implementation strategy.
20
21
22

23 Chemie im Kontext (ChiK) is a project aiming at the improvement of secondary
24
25 chemistry teaching and learning on the one hand, and at the support of co-operation
26
27 among teachers, as well as between teachers and science educators on the other
28
29 hand.
30
31

32
33 The demand for a different science education, which regards the development of
34
35 'scientific literacy' for all future citizens as important as the development of a solid
36
37 fundament of concepts and competences for future scientists, has been pointed out
38
39 by many different studies and reports (e.g. Baumert et al., 2001; High Level Group,
40
41 2004). Context-based approaches such as ChiK claim to offer frameworks and
42
43 exemplary units to realise such a different way of science education. However, these
44
45 approaches and materials cannot simply be given to teachers to change their habits
46
47 and traditional ways of teaching science. To bring about an innovation into the
48
49 practical situation of the school, it has been shown that the involvement of teachers'
50
51 existing situation (their beliefs, needs, working conditions etc.) in the process of
52
53 developing an innovation seems to be relevant to making it successful (Pilling,
54
55 Holman & Waddington, 2001; Eilks, Parchmann, Gräsel & Ralle, 2004; Gräsel &
56
57 Parchmann, 2004). The implementation strategy of ChiK (which we call a 'symbiotic
58
59
60

1
2
3 implementation', see below) builds up on a strong and continuous co-operation
4
5 between teachers and science educators in 'learning communities' (Putnam & Borko,
6
7 2000). In this developmental process, both groups bring in their expertise and
8
9 experience, and, as a result, both groups benefit for their own professional
10
11 development.
12
13

14
15 This paper describes how the ChiK project developed - and still develops -, beginning
16
17 with an idea of a different approach to teaching and learning chemistry and some
18
19 theories about how this should be done, followed by the establishment of a 'symbiotic
20
21 implementation strategy', up to the first review of where the project stands now. As a
22
23 guideline for this paper, a model of curriculum representations described by Van den
24
25 Akker will be used (see Van den Akker, 1998; Pilot & Bulte, this issue). First results
26
27 of accompanying, mainly ongoing formative research studies are included in this
28
29 model.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **The organisational structure and development process of Chemie im Kontext**

38
39 ChiK took its first steps in 1997, following the ideas of and experiences of the Salters
40
41 courses in the UK (Pilling et al., 2001). Since 2002, an innovative implementation
42
43 project based on ChiK has been funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education
44
45 (BMBF) and the participating states. The central goal of this project is to implement
46
47 the ideas of context-based learning into the school systems of the federal states and
48
49 to gain further insight into fostering and hindering conditions for the implementation of
50
51 school innovation. ChiK is a co-operative project between the IPN (Leibniz-Institute
52
53 for Science Education) in Kiel and the universities of Dortmund, Oldenburg and
54
55 Wuppertal. The project group consists of researchers (working in the areas of
56
57 science education as well as in general educational research), research students,
58
59
60

1
2
3 and teachers. Currently, 14 of the 16 federal states participate in this project.

4
5 Additionally, ChiK co-operates with other German innovation projects (e.g. 'SINUS',
6
7 'piko' and 'BiK', see <http://www.ipn.uni-kiel.de>) and projects in other countries (e.g.
8
9 the Salters projects in England and the context approaches in the Netherlands).

10
11
12 On the one hand, ChiK is still a developmental project, aiming at the development
13
14 and dissemination of structures, exemplary units and teaching and learning material
15
16 for upper and lower secondary education. On the other hand, several research topics
17
18 are being investigated within this project, to enlarge knowledge about the design,
19
20 effects and implementation of context-based teaching and learning in school. As
21
22 shown above, the specific situation in Germany calls for innovations which can be
23
24 adapted to the different demands, structures and conditions of schools in the 16
25
26 states, e.g. concerning syllabi, the number of chemistry lessons for secondary
27
28 education, the financial support, and the structures of in-service training for teachers.
29
30 However, a flexible course structure will lead to different realisations in states,
31
32 schools and classrooms. Therefore, the research programme of ChiK cannot simply
33
34 ask whether teaching and learning will be better or not, following the routes of ChiK.
35
36 Instead, the main questions of interest accompanying the project look at different
37
38 aspects of the developmental and implementation process and can be subsumed
39
40 under the model of curriculum representations (described by Van den Akker, 1998):
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 (1) From goals and theories to an ideal framework. In a first phase, goals and
50
51 theories about teaching and learning were analysed and transformed into a
52
53 conceptual framework by researchers of the project group (Parchmann et al.,
54
55 2000, 2001). This framework was then used as a guideline for the development of
56
57 exemplary units. One important aspect, especially taking the German school
58
59 system into consideration, is the demand for a flexible structure for the design and
60

1
2
3 teaching of units. Consequently, the framework can also be adapted to new
4
5 guidelines for the school system (e.g. the introduction of national science
6
7 education standards) or the experiences gained from trials and the learning
8
9 communities.
10
11

12
13 Hence, the main question of interest in this first phase was:
14

15
16 Which goals and theories of teaching and learning chemistry (science) at
17
18 school should be used as a background for the ideal framework of ChiK?
19

20
21 (2) From an ideal framework to a formal unit guide and the design of first
22
23 operational units. The conceptual framework was used to design exemplary units
24
25 by members of the project group and some interested teachers (e.g. Huntemann,
26
27 Honkomp, Parchmann & Jansen, 2001; Schmidt, Rebentisch & Parchmann,
28
29 2003). These units were tested in normal classroom situations. Case studies
30
31 analysed some outcomes and effects, e.g. regarding students' motivation and
32
33 attitudes (Huntemann, Haarmann & Parchmann, 2000; Gräsel, Nentwig &
34
35 Parchmann, 2005). Based on the results and feedback from classroom
36
37 experience, descriptions for exemplary units were written and given to other
38
39 teachers joining in the project.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 The question leading this part of the project was:
47

48
49 Can the ideal framework be transformed into exemplary units and teaching
50
51 and learning material, which realise the theories and ideas of ChiK?
52

53
54 (3) From first trials to a perceived and operational framework. The next huge step
55
56 was enabled through the implementation project, funded by the Federal Ministry
57
58 of Education and the participating states. In 12 states initially, learning
59
60 communities were established, consisting of teachers and science educators

1
2
3 (Fey, Gräsel, Puhl & Parchmann, 2004, see below). The means of support for
4
5 these learning communities were the ideal framework as well as the tested
6
7 exemplary units and a large portfolio of extra material, such as context-based
8
9 experiments (e.g. Paschmann, Höffmann & Parchmann, 2001), a handout about
10
11 teaching and learning methods in science and a handout about assessment tools
12
13 (The ChiK project group, 2003).
14
15

16
17
18 The implementation project was and still is accompanied by several research
19
20 studies, which regard several questions of interest, for example:
21
22

23 Which elements of the ideal framework and which means, given to the groups,
24
25 are being used successfully by teachers to design and to teach ChiK-units?
26
27 Which are fostering or hindering conditions for the implementation of ChiK,
28
29 regarding different conditions of systems, schools and participants?
30
31

32
33 (4) From operational units to the experiential and attained curriculum. The
34
35 organisation of learning environments within the ChiK framework involves
36
37 students much more than usual in the phases of planning and investigating a
38
39 topic. Probably, the attained curriculum will be very different to what students (and
40
41 teachers?) have experienced before: goals no longer refer to learning chemical
42
43 knowledge dominantly. Different areas of competence are touched on and should
44
45 be experienced by students, such as the application of knowledge on STS
46
47 questions and the presentation of results.
48
49
50

51
52 To observe the attained curricula, research studies haven been set up, leading by
53
54 the following questions:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 What changes are reported by teachers and students as compared with prior
4 teaching and learning experiences? Which effects can be measured regarding
5 learning outcomes of students?
6
7
8
9

10 The processes described above have been carried out in the pilot phase and the
11 implementation project of ChiK (2002-2005). In summer 2005, a follow-up project has
12 begun, which is aiming at the transfer of context-based teaching and learning
13 experiences to more schools and teachers, e.g. by the design of in-service training
14 courses. Another focus will be set on the reflection and review of ChiK units and
15 material regarding the new standards for science education in Germany.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Consequently, two more processes can be described for the future:
26
27

28 (5) From experiences back to the formal curriculum. The framework of ChiK
29 started with the design of exemplary units, to make sure that the general
30 approach was teachable in the German school systems. Based on this
31 developmental work and experiences, the learning communities are now a)
32 revising their exemplary units and b) planning to design a whole curriculum,
33 aiming at the continuous development of different competencies, as described in
34 the new standards for chemistry education (KMK, 2004). Using an accompanying
35 portfolio of context-based units, many groups have decided to have a closer look
36 at tasks used for the initiation and diagnosis of learning processes.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 (6) From an implementation project towards a dissemination project. To convert
50 an innovation into the practical situation of the school, it has to lose its character
51 as a project and instead become part of the normal school system. To support
52 this last step, effective tools and structures have to be characterised and
53 disseminated. Building on experiences of the learning communities, the use of
54 different tools will be analysed and also tested in in-service training workshops as
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 part of the follow-up project. Additionally, accompanying research projects
4
5 investigate co-operation structures at schools, for example, also trying to support
6
7 processes by in-service training (Gräsel, Parchmann, Puhl, Baer, Fey & Demuth,
8
9 2004).
10
11

12
13 The following sections will offer a more detailed insight into the processes of
14
15 curriculum innovation of the ChiK project and the first results of the accompanying
16
17 research studies.
18
19
20
21
22

23 **From goals and theories to an ideal framework**

24
25
26 To address the first question of the previous section, the project group analysed and
27
28 summarised several theories and empirical data about the goals of education, about
29
30 teaching and learning and about implementation strategies (Gräsel & Parchmann,
31
32 2004; Nentwig, Parchmann, Demuth, Gräsel & Ralle, 2005). Based on findings and
33
34 interpretations, we formed a conceptual framework for the design of an approach of
35
36 chemistry teaching, in which the context for learning and the application of chemical
37
38 knowledge play important roles. A 'context' should enable students to see the
39
40 relevance and possible application of their learning results on the one hand, and to
41
42 tie the new topic into their pre-knowledge, interests and ideas to enable successful
43
44 learning processes (in the light of constructivistic learning theories). In traditional
45
46 science frameworks, the systematic structure of concepts and principles are often
47
48 separated from applications in relevant learning contexts for students. Therefore, one
49
50 of the big challenges for ChiK was to combine context-based learning with a
51
52 systematic development of basic chemistry concepts, such as matter and particles or
53
54 structures and properties. To implement effective learning processes with the result
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of achieving applicable and transferable knowledge, the framework should also
4
5 connect principles of student-oriented, situated learning with structures that enable
6
7 the development of a systematic understanding.
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 *The understanding of 'context'*

15
16 Following the analysis of the meaning of context given by Gilbert, (this issue), three
17
18 meanings of 'context' should be considered and connected, designing a context-
19
20 based approach like ChiK:
21
22

23
24 Context as content: The design of teaching units must connect relevant contexts,
25
26 from which questions are derived, and the basic concepts that can be applied to
27
28 answer such questions. Other competencies, such as the research and presentation
29
30 of necessary results or experimental investigations to develop such results are
31
32 included by the design of the teacher's and the students' activities.
33
34

35
36 Context as learning stimulation: Learning environments must stimulate students'
37
38 personal mental activities to enable successful learning processes.
39
40

41
42 Context as frame for situated development and application of knowledge and
43
44 competencies: Learning processes in class must enhance and support the social
45
46 development of competencies, especially the transfer of learning outcomes from one
47
48 unit to another.
49
50

51
52 To realise these aims, theories and findings about teaching and learning haven been
53
54 used, as described in the following sections.
55
56

57 58 59 60 **The empirical and theoretical background of Chemie im Kontext**

1
2
3 Many articles have been written about empirical findings, attesting to the
4
5 unsatisfactory outcomes and structures of science education in Germany (e.g.
6
7 Baumert et al., 2001; Seidel et al., 2002). A demand was made for more 'authentic
8
9 science' in class, for more application of science knowledge already as part of the
10
11 learning process and for a greater variety of activities for students (Fischer, Klemm,
12
13 Leutner, Sumfelth, Tiemann & Wirth, 2003; High Level Group, 2004). Of course, the
14
15 demand for a more authentic, interesting and understandable science education is
16
17 not easy to achieve: authentic phenomena and investigations are often complex,
18
19 difficult to explain or cannot be carried out with school equipment. Additionally, they
20
21 can raise a large number of questions, which will not all lead to scientific
22
23 investigations and explanations. The latter reflects real life situations, of course, but
24
25 might lead to problems with the level of available learning time for science education
26
27 in school. The challenge, therefore, is to develop a curriculum, which offers examples
28
29 of relevant authentic science (questions, knowledge and activities) that can be
30
31 carried out in school, and that connects knowledge about students' motivation and
32
33 pre-conceptions to the development of basic and applicable knowledge and
34
35 competences in science or especially chemistry.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 *Relevant science: a different question for scientists and members of a 'scientific*
48
49 *literate society'*
50

51
52 The question of relevance and authenticity is often raised and cannot be answered in
53
54 the same way for all students. It surely depends on individual interests and activities
55
56 within a 'community of practice'. For researchers, relevant questions arise from
57
58 investigations and research studies, connecting theories to experiments and aiming
59
60 at a better understanding and technical realisation of for example chemical

1
2
3 processes. For non-scientists, questions might arise from daily-life activities, such as
4
5 cleaning or eating and drinking. Natural or technical phenomena can also lead to
6
7 relevant questions and to the motivation for dealing with science. Cultural and
8
9 societal issues lead to more authentic questions and tasks for scientific
10
11 investigations, but they are not always perceived as being important for the students'
12
13 daily-life experiences. Last but not least, career perspectives influence interests in
14
15 scientific processes and understanding, but of course not for all students in the same
16
17 way.
18
19
20
21

22 Therefore, learning environments aiming at offering an insight into authentic science
23
24 questions and processes must consider different situations and levels of application
25
26 and explanations. This is one criterion for the choice and combination of contexts and
27
28 situations for the design of ChiK units.
29
30
31

32 Different domains for carrying out science involve similar activities and demand the
33
34 development of similar competencies. These are the recognition of questions that are
35
36 important and can be answered by scientific investigations, the understanding and
37
38 application of scientific knowledge, the use of scientific methods, the interpretation of
39
40 data or the exchange and discussion with other people (see the definition for
41
42 scientific literacy given by the OECD-PISA-consortium in 1999). Hence, curricula,
43
44 which place more emphasis on these competencies, especially on the understanding
45
46 and application of scientific knowledge, should be able to achieve 'authentic science'
47
48 in a more effective way. The four phases of a ChiK unit point out these different
49
50 activities and steps of investigating a topic in a scientific way (see Figure 1).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theories about interest and motivation

1
2
3 The importance of the context in which science is carried out was also pointed out by
4
5 the IPN research study on interest in physics and chemistry (Gräber, 1995). The
6
7 results describe students' interest as a product of a context, a topic and an activity.
8
9 Regarding many textbooks and teaching materials, the context seems to be
10
11 neglected: often only tasks and topics are important for the teaching process, they
12
13 cannot be related to any authentic question. This design of many traditional curricula
14
15 delivers science in 'a world of its own' (High Level Group, 2004, p. x).
16
17

18
19 Following the different areas of authenticity, ChiK develops context-based units that
20
21 pick up questions from the students' daily life as well as from societal issues and
22
23 science professions. Well-established activities, such as carrying out experiments,
24
25 are integrated into such context-based units as necessary means to investigate the
26
27 topic in the given situation.
28
29

30
31 The motivation to deal with chemistry in class is influenced by several situational
32
33 aspects, too. Building up on the theory of motivation by Deci & Ryan (see Prenzel,
34
35 1997), six aspects are used in the ChiK framework to design and to analyse learning
36
37 situations:
38
39

- 40
41
42 - The relevance of chemistry should be shown by a variety of authentic science
43
44 questions, used to develop context-based units.
45
46
47 - The perception of autonomy should be considered by enabling students to
48
49 integrate their own ideas and activities in different phases of a unit, e.g. during
50
51 the planning and conduct of inquiries.
52
53
54 - The perception of competence should be fostered by using different tasks with
55
56 a variety of activities, so that all students should be able to participate in a
57
58 problem-solving process.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
- The quality of instruction should be supported by a unit design, which follows a systematic sequence of scientific activities in each unit (Nentwig, Christiansen & Steinhoff, 2004, see also Figures 1 and 2) and which connects single units and learning outcomes with overall basic concepts revisited in every unit.
 - The aspect of social embedding is covered through group learning activities within classes and by the application of learning outcomes outside school, e.g. by being able to participate in discussions and decision-making processes.
 - Last but not least, the interest of the teacher is perhaps the most important aspect for students' motivation. Comparable to students, teachers also have different interests and skills to initiate and to support students' learning. Therefore, the ChiK framework offers different choices for the teachers too, to foster their motivation of context-based teaching.

Knowledge and competences

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

The definition of competence given by Weinert, 2001, points out an important aspect: competence is not just based on cognitive understanding and abilities, but also on motivation and willingness to apply these to different problems, interacting with other people. Following this definition, students' motivation and the application of knowledge are not something that can be offered after the development of competence - they are parts of competence and must be considered already in the learning process also from the cognitive point of argumentation.

55
56
57
58
59
60

Leading back to the discussion of relevant science, we agree with others that the aim of science education must not be a replacement of daily-life concepts, but to use the adequate concept in each situation (Duit, Gropengießer & Kattmann, 2005).

1
2
3 Therefore, one goal of ChiK is to let students develop this ability to use different
4 concepts and activities depending on the context and situation (Parchmann &
5 Schmidt, 2003). They should be able to participate in different 'communities of
6 practice', communicating with experts of chemistry as well as with non-experts,
7 discussing a scientific matter. The importance of communication about science as
8 well as the application in different contexts and situations have lately also been
9 defined as standards for learning outcomes at the end of lower and upper secondary
10 level (KMK, 2004). ChiK addresses all four claimed areas of competence of the new
11 standards: understanding and applying basic concepts, methods of investigation,
12 methods of communication and decision making processes.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **The structure of Chemie im Kontext: design principles**

31
32
33 Chemie im Kontext combines well-developed theories and goals of teaching and
34 learning chemistry at school by describing a framework, which is based on three
35 guiding principles (Parchmann, Demuth, Ralle, Paschmann & Huntemann, 2001;
36 Gräsel et al., 2005):
37
38
39
40
41
42

- 43 1. All context-based units are based on relevant authentic topics and questions,
44 which are the backbone and guideline for teaching and learning processes.
45 For the design of learning environments, three areas of authentic relevant
46 topics have been chosen: a) daily-life-situations (personal relationships), b)
47 issues important for a society (relevance for a cultural community) and c)
48 scientific and technical issues (insight into special communities and their role
49 within a society).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
2. A variety of teaching and learning methods enable students to integrate their ideas, competencies and interests, and to construct their own knowledge. They must also offer instruction to support individual learning processes and to carry out scientific investigations. The framework of ChiK describes four phases (see Figure 1), in which the roles of students and teachers change as well as the amount of instruction and self-directed learning activities carried out by the students.

23
24
25
26
27
28

insert figure 1 about here

- 29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
3. Basic concepts and students' competencies are developed through the investigation of relevant topics. ChiK describes six basic concepts as guidelines, which are now also mentioned in the German standards for lower and higher secondary education: the concept of matter and particles, the concept of structures and properties, the concept of energy, the concept of donor and acceptor processes, the concept of chemical equilibrium and the concept of reaction kinetics (the last three are sometimes combined to a frame of concepts of the chemical reaction). The idea of ChiK is not to develop a certain concept through one context-based unit only, but rather to pick up the same basic concepts again and again in each unit (see Figure 2). The use and development is guided by the questions and tasks of a relevant topic, but the aim is not to complete a concept in one unit. Only the combination of different units will lead to the development of such concepts, which must be connected and abstracted from the former learning context (see the fourth phase as a

1
2
3 summary). These abstract concepts can be used to explain and to investigate
4
5 other phenomena and questions from a chemical perspective (see Figure 2).
6
7
8
9

10
11 ***insert figure about 2 here***
12
13
14
15
16

17 Summarised, the framework of ChiK asks for the realisation of all three principles
18 (context-based learning, the development of basic concepts and the design of
19 student-oriented learning activities). The four phases illustrated in Figure 1 offer a
20 structure to design the units and Figure 2 points out the necessity of combining
21 different context-based units to define basic concepts and to develop science
22 competencies.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Starting from this ideal framework of a curriculum, the next step was to design and to
32 test exemplary units following these design principles.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *From an ideal framework to a formal unit guide and to operational units: the design*
41 *and test of exemplary units*
42
43
44

45 The first units were designed by members of the project group and co-operating
46 teachers. The contexts chosen dealt with societal issues (e.g. fuel problems), societal
47 and technical questions (e.g. the development and evaluation of the hydrogen car) or
48 daily-life topics (e.g. food or cleaning detergents). These units were tested in school,
49 some of them accompanied by research studies about students' perception of ChiK
50 or the development of conceptual understanding (e.g. Huntemann et al., 2000;
51 Schmidt et al., 2003). The results of these first studies showed a positive perception
52 by teachers and students. Especially weaker students liked the different way of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 teaching (which is now reported controversial, see below). The perception of
4
5 relevance and the quality of instruction were significantly more positive, compared to
6
7 the teaching they were used to before (Gräsel et al., 2005). Reinforced by these
8
9 results and experiences, the project of the 'symbiotic implementation' was initiated,
10
11 which will now be described.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 *From first trials to a perceived and operational framework*

19
20 While the first exemplary units were taught as designed for the trials, the ideal and
21
22 formal framework of the implementation project leaves the final design, the choice
23
24 and the combination of units to the teachers to adapt it to their conditions and
25
26 expectations. Hence, the implementation process integrates the ideal framework,
27
28 designed by science educators and teachers, and the different individual conditions
29
30 and experiences of teachers and classes participating in the project. We call this
31
32 approach a 'symbiotic approach' to point out the reciprocal dependency and profit of
33
34 curriculum designers, researchers and practitioners (Gräsel & Parchmann, 2004).
35
36
37
38
39

40 This implementation approach of ChiK can be characterised by two important
41
42 aspects: A) it is a co-operative and symbiotic process, in which teachers and
43
44 researchers work together in learning communities, implementing and revising the
45
46 ideal framework of ChiK. B) The process is a developing approach: changes and
47
48 revisions of the ideal framework are not only allowed, they are regarded as important
49
50 to adapt ChiK to different situations and conditions (Gräsel & Parchmann, 2004).
51
52
53

54 Consequently, as in all innovation processes, the implemented curriculum will only
55
56 reflect parts of the ideal framework, and again, the attained curriculum will lead to
57
58 some expected and other unexpected learning outcomes for students (Fullan &
59
60

1
2
3 Pomfret, 1977; Van den Akker, 1998). The implemented curriculum will be different
4
5 for individual teachers, the attained curriculum different for individual students.
6
7 Believing in theories about constructivism and situated learning, these processes of
8
9 (individual) adaptation are necessary for effective learning environments. Of course,
10
11 it will be important to make sure that the main characteristics of the ideal approach
12
13 will survive (see Figures 1 and 2) and that the necessary adaptations to a specific
14
15 situation and group will be carried out. The first should be taken care of by the project
16
17 members in the learning communities, the latter by the participating teachers. Hence,
18
19 the learning communities are the central instrument to enable the realisation of the
20
21 ChiK design principles on the one hand and the necessary flexibility on the other.
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 In each of the participating states one or two learning communities of 8-12 teachers
29
30 each were set up to elaborate the teaching material, to try it in their own classrooms
31
32 and to reflect their experiences with it (see Figure 3).
33
34
35
36
37

38 ***insert figure 3 about here ***
39
40
41
42
43

44 Each group is chaired by one person from their own ranks and one science educator
45
46 of the project-group. A national communication network, occasional supra-regional
47
48 meetings and in-service training inputs complete the support.
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Initial research results**

55
56

57 As mentioned before, the combination of both perspectives, those of the teachers
58
59 and those of the researchers, lead to the design and testing of context-based
60
teaching units and learning processes of students. Another important outcome

1
2
3 should be a benefit for both sides and professions (Gräsel & Parchmann, 2004; Eilks
4 et al., 2004). To follow up these goals and ideas, group meetings were documented
5
6 by meeting protocols, and the designed units and materials were collected and
7
8 distributed to other groups. Also the chairing science educators and teachers as well
9
10 as a group of 37 teachers were interviewed at the end of the third year. Additionally,
11
12 questionnaires were given to all participants to investigate effects of the attained
13
14 curriculum (e.g. regarding the perception of chemistry teaching and learning or the
15
16 co-operation in the learning communities, see Table 1).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 ***insert table 1 about here***
26
27
28
29
30

31 Even though the analysis of the material has not been completed yet, some
32
33 conclusions can be drawn regarding the research questions mentioned earlier: Which
34
35 elements of the ideal framework and which means given to the groups are used
36
37 successfully by teachers to design and to teach ChiK-units? Which are fostering or
38
39 hindering conditions for the implementation of ChiK, regarding different conditions of
40
41 systems, schools and participants?
42
43
44

45
46 It was left to the groups to choose which units they wanted to teach or to develop and
47
48 on which aspect of ChiK they wanted to put the main focus on. Many groups chose
49
50 one of the given exemplary units to start with, but they adapted them as a group or
51
52 even individually to their expectations and teaching conditions. These adaptations
53
54 concerned the variety of topics and activities as well as the amount of self-directed
55
56 learning, for example. After their first trials, most groups decided to develop their own
57
58 units, which were given to other learning communities after they were tested and
59
60

1
2
3 commented. In the second year, these units were often picked up and again adapted
4
5 by the other learning communities, and they were regarded as a very effective tool to
6
7 support the implementation of ChiK by teachers and the participating science
8
9 educators. On the whole, the interviews as well as personal feedback show that the
10
11 exemplary units, the units developed by other groups and the exchange and co-
12
13 operative development and adaptation processes in learning communities were
14
15 regarded as the most effective means to support the realisation of the ChiK approach
16
17 (see Figure 4). The importance of ownership was also pointed out in other studies
18
19 (Eilks et al., 2004).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ***insert figure 4 about here***
29
30
31
32

33
34 The results of the interview analysis and of the designed units and material have
35
36 shown another important aspect. The emphasis in the first two years has clearly
37
38 been laid on two aspects of the framework only: all groups have put a focus on
39
40 finding a good context, estimated as being relevant for students and also suitable to
41
42 teach the chemical content asked for in the state syllabus. The second aspect
43
44 achieved by the groups has been the integration of different and more student-
45
46 oriented teaching and learning methods, enabling the students a greater participation
47
48 in the phases of planning and investigation (see Figures 5 and 6). However, the third
49
50 design principle, the abstraction of general basic concepts, has not been achieved in
51
52 the same way yet. We suppose that the teachers at first picked up those aspects that
53
54 were rather innovative and unusual for them and which they connected most with the
55
56 ChiK approach. Still, after three years, more groups report problems, especially with
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 their weaker students, and they have asked for more guidelines and structures.
4
5 Some of them have started to use basic concepts explicitly and report about positive
6
7 effects for their students.
8
9

10
11
12
13 ***insert figures 5 and 6 about here***
14
15

16
17
18
19 Almost all groups reported difficulties with the length of the units. Therefore, many
20
21 units were shortened by reducing open-ended student activities and placing greater
22
23 emphasis on central points.
24
25

26
27 To find hindering and fostering conditions, the data collected by interviews and by
28
29 questionnaires given to teachers and students were analysed too. In the perception
30
31 of the teachers, their syllabi and freedom of choice for topics and activities are the
32
33 most important factor for a successful implementation of an innovation. The next
34
35 important aspect was the equipment of their schools, which is understandable
36
37 regarding the demands of different activities in the ChiK framework. The analysis of
38
39 the questionnaires about the teachers perception of their teaching and the
40
41 questionnaires about the work in their learning communities showed significant
42
43 effects: the more positive the perception of the support offered by the learning
44
45 communities was, the higher were the reported changes towards a 'ChiK-like
46
47 teaching' (Fey et al., 2004; Eilks et al., 2004).
48
49
50
51
52

53
54
55
56 *From the operational curriculum to the experiential and attained curriculum*
57

58
59 The perceived and attained curriculum should be different according to the teachers'
60
and students' beliefs, expectations, abilities, etc. To gather this information, the

1
2
3 questionnaire was given to students and teachers at the beginning of the project and
4
5 after each year. Currently, the first two points of data collection have been analysed.
6
7

8 We focus on the following question:
9

10
11 What changes are reported by teachers and students as compared with prior
12
13 teaching and learning experiences?
14

15
16 The results of the pre-ChiK questionnaire were coherent with those of other studies
17
18 but also showed some interesting results for researchers and teachers. For example,
19
20 students perceived the learning of subject matter as the main goal of chemistry
21
22 classes, while teachers had a much broader view (of what they thought they had
23
24 done?). The teachers' main expectations for participating in ChiK were the rise of
25
26 students' motivation and student-oriented learning (Fey et al., 2004). Many teachers
27
28 worried about the quality of subject matter learning, which has also been described
29
30 for other context-based curricula (Bennett, Gräsel, Parchmann & Waddington, 2005).
31
32 However, these expectations varied enormously between the groups, probably
33
34 referring to different teaching traditions in different states (see Figure 7).
35
36
37
38

39
40 Findings after the first year show that these worries – probably based on critical
41
42 attitudes towards context-based learning on the one hand and on traditional beliefs of
43
44 'good chemistry teaching' on the other – influenced the implementation of the
45
46 curriculum: In one state, where these beliefs have a particularly strong tradition,
47
48 protocols and materials show that the teachers used the context as a mere
49
50 introduction of a unit, not as a guideline. Only after evaluating the learning outcomes
51
52 of ChiK as positive - which was another result of our questionnaires - they opened up
53
54 and tried to use the context as a real guideline for a teaching unit. Other groups
55
56 showed a larger variety of design principles realised in their units right from the
57
58 beginning.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 ***insert figure 7 about here***
7
8
9

10
11 One important goal of ChiK was to enhance the students' motivation for chemistry.
12 Therefore this question was investigated in the trials as well as in the main
13 study. Exemplary items are given in Table 2.
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21
22 ***insert table 2 about here***
23
24
25
26
27

28 Regarding the development of the students' motivation, first results show positive
29 effects: A comparison between the motivation to learn chemistry of ChiK-students
30 and students learning within a conventional curriculum ($n_1 = 216$; $n_2 = 183$) shows
31 that at the beginning of the school year the two groups were comparable in their
32 motivation towards learning chemistry as well as in their overall evaluation of the
33 chemical education they had experienced until then. At the end of the school year the
34 motivation of students following a conventional curriculum decreased significantly
35 more compared to the ChiK-group. After two years, the interest of all students
36 participating in ChiK was significantly higher than at the beginning of the project.
37 Further, after two years of the project more than 60% of the ChiK students at the end
38 of 10th and 11th grade stated that they liked to choose chemistry in upper secondary
39 level. Especially the application of knowledge and the perceived personal relevance
40 of chemistry were important for the positive development of students' interest. Also,
41 the influence of the teacher was found to be crucial for the development of interest.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The questionnaires were followed up by an interview study with a limited number of
4 students, using a reduced form of the questionnaire as interview-guide. The
5
6 outcomes of the survey were confirmed in detail, including the influence of the person
7
8 of the teacher, which cannot be overlooked. The motivation of the students was
9
10 definitely raised both by the fact that the issues dealt with in their chemistry class
11
12 were not just academic but had to do with their real life and that, within feasible limits,
13
14 they were allowed to follow their own interests in pursuing the theme. They were,
15
16 however, not uncritical towards their new learning experience. The feelings of getting
17
18 lost in the complexity of a context and of losing the clear learning goal were
19
20 evaluated by students as not encouraging.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 *Which effects can be measured regarding learning outcomes of students?*

31
32
33 As the implementation of the framework was different in different classes, problems
34 occur when the success of a new curriculum is analysed and documented: the same
35
36 ideal framework might be and will be highly successful in some classes and not
37
38 successful at all in others (Lange & Parchmann, 2003). Nevertheless, it will be very
39
40 important to be able to give information about positive effects and also about
41
42 difficulties in teaching the ChiK framework. Hence, in the first phase of the project,
43
44 we have developed and tested several instruments to diagnose students' interests
45
46 and learning outcomes in different areas of knowledge and competences. We will
47
48 use these instruments in the follow-up project to carry out design experiments. If
49
50 possible, exemplary video-studies might offer a closer look into lesson design and
51
52 resulting teaching and learning processes.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The first study carried out was looking at the learning outcomes concerning the
4 understanding of a context as well as the basic concept. Additionally, an analysis
5 was done of cognitive skills and the transfer of knowledge to another context (Lange
6 & Parchmann, 2003). The first important result was that a great diversity between
7 classes could be observed, so it was impossible to say whether the unit was effective
8 or not effective in general. No effects were found between the understanding of the
9 context (polymers in cars) and the underlying concept (polymers). As expected, the
10 average results were lower for the transfer context (clothes). The perhaps most
11 interesting finding was that the length of the unit showed positive effects for the
12 advanced courses and negative effects for basic courses. One assumption is a loss
13 of motivation for the less interested or less able students.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Another study was investigating the development of students' explanations,
31 beginning with pre-conceptions and analysing the use of scientific or very often
32 mixed conceptions (Parchmann & Schmidt, 2003). The diversity between classes
33 was also found in this study, though for the phenomena also taught during a context-
34 based unit, the changes towards the application of particle models were rather high
35 (up to 70%).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Three other studies developed and analysed test instruments, which were designed
46 to investigate different areas of competence, e.g. the design of experiments, the use
47 of mental models or the use of chemical knowledge for decision making processes
48 (Menthe, 2005). For a test on acids and bases (n=359 students), the only
49 comparative study, the results showed slightly better results (significant, but low
50 effect) for ChiK classes.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusions and implications

First observations and results of research studies show that teachers have started teaching units, following the characteristics of the ideal ChiK framework, and that they have implemented the units according to their specific needs and circumstances. The results of the investigation of the experienced and attained curriculum show positive effects as well as challenges to be responded to. One explanation for observed problems might be the neglect of one important design principle of ChiK: while all groups designed context-based teaching units and integrated a greater variety of teaching and learning methods, almost no group has yet found a good way to integrate the basic concepts as a necessary abstraction for the transfer of knowledge. This will be one important point to improve in the next phase of the project.

To make the framework of ChiK more robust against problems, more guidelines might be necessary. Two have been developed already, again in a symbiotic way by teachers and researchers, and will be given to the groups shortly: one describes steps towards the design of a successful context-based unit, the other connects the ideas and design principles of ChiK with the new standards for chemistry education in Germany. The later guideline also contains a matrix to plan and to analyse the units, e.g. check the 'need-to-know' basis for basic concepts and competencies from the experts' point of view and from the point of view of the students in class. The assessment of the students' ideas and learning outcomes will be supported by the systematic design of competence-based tasks.

More important answers will be given after a longer period of time, when the new approach will have to become 'normal', when occurring problems will have to be

1
2
3 solved and when the groups of teachers will become more and more self-directed in
4
5 their work with ChiK.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **References**

12
13 Baumert, J., et al. (Eds.) (2001). *PISA 2000. Basiskompetenzen von Schülerinnen*
14
15 *und Schülern im internationalen Vergleich [Basic Competencies of students*
16
17 *internationally compared]*. Opladen, Leske + Budrich.

18
19
20
21 Bennett, J., Gräsel, C., Parchmann, I., & Waddington, D. (2005). Context-based and
22
23 Conventional Approaches to Teaching Chemistry: Comparing teachers' views.
24
25 *International Journal of Science Education*, 27, 1521-1547.

26
27
28 Duit, R., Gropengießer, H., & Kattmann, U. (2005). Towards science education
29
30 research that is relevant for improving practice: The model of educational
31
32 reconstruction. In H.E. Fischer (Eds.) *Developing Standards in Research on Science*
33
34 *Education* (pp. 1-10). London, Taylor & Francis.

35
36
37 Eilks, I., Parchmann, I., Gräsel, C., & Ralle, B. (2004). Changing teachers' attitudes
38
39 and professional skills by involving them into projects of curriculum innovation in
40
41 Germany. In I. Eilks & B. Ralle (Eds.) *Quality in Practice-oriented Research in*
42
43 *Science Education* (pp. 29-40). Aachen, Shaker.

44
45
46 Fey, A., Gräsel, C. Puhl, T., & Parchmann, I. (2004). Implementation einer
47
48 kontextorientierten Unterrichtskonzeption für den Chemieunterricht [Implementation
49
50 of a context-based instructional concept for Chemical Education].
51
52
53 *Unterrichtswissenschaft*, 32, 238-256.

54
55
56 Fischer, H., Klemm, K., Leutner, D., Sumfelth, E., Tiemann, R., & Wirth, J. (2003).
57
58 Naturwissenschaftsdidaktische Lehr-Lernforschung: Defizite und Desiderata
59
60

1
2
3 [Learning-teaching research in science pedagogy]. *Zeitschrift für Didaktik der*
4
5 *Naturwissenschaften*, 9, 179-209.

6
7
8 Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction
9
10 implementation. *Review of Educational Research*, 47, 335-397.

11
12 Gilbert, J. K. (this issue). On the nature of 'context' in chemical education.
13
14
15 *International Journal of Science Education*.

16
17 Gräber, W. (1995). Schülerinteressen und deren Berücksichtigung im STS-
18
19 Unterricht: Ergebnisse einer empirischen Studie zum Chemieunterricht [Interests of
20
21 students and accounting for that in STS education: Results of an empirical study in
22
23 chemical education]. *Empirische Pädagogik*, 9, 221-238.

24
25
26 Gräsel, C., & Parchmann, I. (2004). Implementationsforschung [Research on
27
28 implementation]. *Unterrichtswissenschaft* 32, 196-214.

29
30
31 Gräsel, C., Parchmann, I., Puhl, T., Baer, A., Fey, A., & Demuth, R. (2004).
32
33 Lehrerfortbildungen und ihre Wirkungen auf die Zusammenarbeit von Lehrkräften
34
35 und die Unterrichtsqualität [Development of students and the effects on the co-
36
37 operation of teachers and the quality of instruction]. In J. Doll, M. Prenzel (Eds.)
38
39 Bildungsqualität von Schule (pp. 133-151). Münster, Waxmann.

40
41
42 Gräsel, C., Nentwig, P., & Parchmann, I. (2005). Chemie im Kontext: Curriculum
43
44 development and evaluation strategies. In J. Bennett, J. Holman, R. Millar, & D.
45
46 Waddington (Eds.) Evaluation as a tool for improving science education (pp. 53-66).
47
48
49 Münster, Waxmann.

50
51
52 High Level Group on Human Resources for Science and Technology in Europe
53
54 (2004). *Report on Increasing Human Resources for Science and Technology in*
55
56
57 *Europe*. Brussels, European Communities.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Huntemann, H., Haarmann, E., & Parchmann, I. (2000). Schüleraussagen zur Unterrichtsreihe „Treibstoffe in der Diskussion“: Eine erste Untersuchung zur Wirksamkeit von Chemie im Kontext [What students say about the lesson series „Fuels in discussion“: A first study into the effectivity of Chemie im Kontext]. *CHEMKON*, 7, 131-136.

Huntemann, H., Honkomp, H., Parchmann, I., & Jansen, W. (2001). Die Wasserstoff/Luft-Brennstoffzelle mit Methanolsplaltung zur Gewinnung des Wasserstoffs – Der Fahrzeugantrieb der Zukunft? [The Hydrogen/Air cell with separation of methanol for the production of hydrogen – The propulsion for cars in the future?] *CHEMKON*, 8, 15-21.

KMK (Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland) (2004). *Bildungsstandards im Fach Chemie für den Mittleren Schulabschluss [Educational standards in Chemistry for secondary school exams]*. München, Wolters Kluwer.

Lange, B., & Parchmann, I. (2003). Untersuchung zur Entwicklung fachspezifischen Wissens bei Schülerinnen und Schülern in einem Unterricht nach Chemie im Kontext [Research to develop subject specific knowledge at students in instruction based on Chemie im Kontext]. In A. Pitton (Ed.) *Außerschulisches Lernen in Physik und Chemie, Proceedings of the GDCP meeting 2002* (pp. 269-271). Münster, LIT Verlag.

Menthe, J. (2005). Acquisition and encouragement of decision making processes in science classes. In H.E. Fischer (Ed.) *Developing Standards in Research on Science Education* (pp. 155-164). London, Taylor & Francis.

Nentwig, P., Christiansen, D., & Steinhoff, B. (2004). Aufgaben zur Kompetenzentwicklung – Kriterien und Beispiele der Aufgabengestaltung nach

1
2
3 Chemie im Kontext [Tasks for development of competence – Criteria and examples
4 for the construction of tasks based on Chemie im Kontext]. *Praxis der*
5
6
7
8 *Naturwissenschaften-Chemie – Chemie in der Schule*, 53, 21-24.

9
10 Nentwig, P., Parchmann, I., Demuth, R., Gräsel, C., & Ralle, B. (2005). *Chemie im*
11
12 *Kontext - From situated learning in relevant contexts to a systematic development of*
13 *basic chemical concepts*. Paper presented at the International Symposium on
14
15 Context-based learning, Kiel 2002. Münster: Waxmann, 2005.

16
17
18
19
20 Parchmann, I., Ralle, B., & Demuth, R. (2000). Chemie im Kontext - eine Konzeption
21 zum Aufbau und zur Aktivierung fachsystematischer Strukturen in lebensweltlichen
22 Kontexten [Chemie im Kontext – a concept for the construction and elaboration of
23 subject specific structures in contexts related to the world students live in]. *MNU* 53,
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 132-136.

31
32 Parchmann, I., Demuth, R., Ralle, B., Paschmann, A., & Huntemann, H. (2001).
33 Chemie im Kontext - Begründung und Realisierung eines Lernens in sinnstiftenden
34 Kontexten [Chemie im Kontext – Arguments and realisation of learning in meaningful
35 contexts]. *Praxis der Naturwissenschaften-Chemie*, 50, 2-7.

36
37
38
39
40
41 Parchmann, I., & Schmidt, S. (2003). Students' pre-conceptions as a tool to reflect
42 and to design teaching and learning processes - a study from the project Chemie im
43
44
45
46
47 Kontext. Paper presented at the ESERA conference 2003.

48
49
50
51
52
53
54 Paschmann, A., Höffmann, B., & Parchmann, I. (2001). Die Gewinnung von
55
56
57
58
59
60 Magnesium aus dem Salz des Toten Meeres The production of magnesium from the
salt of the Dead Sea]. *CHEMKON* 8, 30-31.

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70 Pilling, G., Holman, J., & Waddington, D. (2001). The Salters' experience. *Education*
in Chemistry, 38, 131-137.

1
2
3 Pilot, A., & Bulte, A.M.W. (this issue). The use of 'contexts' as a challenge for the
4
5 chemistry curriculum: its successes & the need for further development and
6
7 understanding. *International Journal of Science Education*.

8
9
10 Prenzel, M. (1997). Sechs Möglichkeiten Lernende zu demotivieren. Wege zum
11
12 Können. Derterminanten des Kompetenzerwerbs [Six possibilities to motivate
13
14 students. Ways to knowledge]. In H. Gruber & A. Renkl (pp. 2-10). Bern, Huber.

15
16
17 Putnam, R. T., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking
18
19 have to say about research on teacher learning? *Educational Researcher*, 29, 4-15.

20
21
22 Schmidt, S., Rebentisch, D., & Parchmann, I. (2003). Chemie im Kontext auch für die
23
24 Sekundarstufe I – Cola und Ketchup im Anfangsunterricht [Chemie im Kontext also
25
26 for the phase I in secondary education – Cola and ketchup in introductory science
27
28 education]. *CHEMKON* 10, 6-17.

29
30
31 Seidel, T. et al. (2002). „Jetzt bitte alle nach vorne schauen!“ – Lehr-Lernskripts im
32
33 Physikunterricht und damit verbundene Bedingungen für individuelle Lernprozesse
34
35 [„Now all should look to the front side“ – Learning-teaching scripts in physics
36
37 education and related conditions for individual learning processes].
38
39 *Unterrichtswissenschaft*, 30, 52-77.

40
41
42
43 The ChiK-project group (2003). *Materialien-CD: Unterrichtsmaterial – Konzeption –*
44
45 *Hilfsmittel [Materials on CD: Teaching materials – Concept of the units – Additional*
46
47 *materials]*. Project material on CD ROM.

48
49
50
51 Van den Akker, J. (1998). The science curriculum: between ideals and outcomes. In:
52
53 B. Fraser and K. Tobin (Eds.) *International Handbook of Science Education* (pp 421 –
54
55 447). Dordrecht, Kluwer.

56
57
58 Weinert, F. E. (2001). *Leistungsmessungen in Schulen [Assessments in schools]*.
59
60 Weinheim & Basel, Beltz.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Tables and figures for the paper

***Chemie im Kontext* – a symbiotic implementation of a context-based teaching and learning approach**

Ilka Parchmann, University of Oldenburg, Cornelia Gräsel, University of Wuppertal,

Anja Baer, Reinhard Demuth, IPN Kiel, Bernd Ralle, University of Dortmund

and the project group ChiK

Table 1: Names of variables, number of items, Cronbach's alpha and examples of items used to evaluate the teachers' views of their teaching used in Figures 6 and 7.

<i>Names of variables</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>	<i>Cronbach's alpha</i>	<i>Examples of items</i>
Variety of teaching methods	5	.67	I used a broad variety of teaching methods.
Students' participation	5	.74	The contents and learning activities were chosen together with the students.
Teacher control	5	.62	In the process of teaching and learning I realised exactly my planning.
Feasability	6	.73	It is difficult to integrate 'Chemie im Kontext' in our syllabus.
Content knowledge of students	3	.78	Students were able to apply their knowledge on the solution of everyday problems.
Classroom management	3	.67	Students often talked together about private things.

Table 2: Names of variables, number of items, Cronbach's alpha and examples of items used to evaluate the students' motivation and interest.

<i>Names of variables</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>	<i>Cronbach's alpha</i>	<i>Examples of items</i>
Motivation	4	.81	Learning chemistry is fun.
Relevance	5	.70	In chemistry, I learn contents which are personally meaningful.
Interest	6	.83	If I see something written about chemistry in magazines or books, I start reading.




Figure 1: Four phases of an exemplary ChiK-unit.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2: Basic concepts are developed through the combination of different context-based units and used for the explanation of new topics.




Figure 3: Activities in a learning community.




Figure 4: Evaluation of useful means given to the groups to support the implementation of ChiK. Results from the interview study with the chairing science educators (n=18) and teachers (n=37) (Baer et al., in press). The graph shows how often a certain tool was mentioned as being useful.




Figure 5: Enhancement of the variety of student-oriented teaching methods, results of the teachers' questionnaire (light: before beginning with the project, dark: after the first year; **: significant differences; Fey et al., 2004).




Figure 6: Realisation of the different principles of the ideal framework of ChiK as perceived by the chairing science educators and teachers: Results of the interview study (Baer et al., in press). The graph shows how often a certain tool was mentioned as being useful.




Figure 7: Case studies of perceptions by two groups of teachers (called a set of teachers) in two different states, regarding their expectations before doing ChiK and their experiences after the first year of ChiK. Results from the teachers' questionnaire (n=13/16 for expectations and n=5/7 for experiences).

1
2
3 Table 1: Names of variables, number of items, Cronbach's alpha and examples of items used
4
5 to evaluate the teachers' views of their teaching used in Figures 6 and 7.
6
7

8 Table 2: Names of variables, number of items, Cronbach's alpha and examples of items used
9
10 to evaluate the students' motivation and interest.
11
12
13
14

15 Figure 1: Four phases of an exemplary ChiK-unit.
16

17 Figure 2: Basic concepts are developed through the combination of different context-based units and
18 used for the explanation of new topics.
19
20

21 Figure 3: Activities in a learning community.
22

23 Figure 4: Evaluation of useful means given to the groups to support the implementation of ChiK.
24 Results from the interview study with the chairing science educators (n=18) and teachers (n=37) (Baer
25 et al., in press). The graph shows how often a certain tool was mentioned as being useful.
26
27
28

29 Figure 5: Enhancement of the variety of student-oriented teaching methods, results of the teachers'
30 questionnaire (light: before beginning with the project, dark: after the first year; **: significant
31 differences; Fey et al., 2004).
32
33
34

35 Figure 6: Realisation of the different principles of the ideal framework of ChiK as perceived by the
36 chairing science educators and teachers: Results of the interview study (Baer et al., in press). The
37 graph shows how often a certain tool was mentioned as being useful.
38
39
40

41 Figure 7: Case studies of perceptions by two groups of teachers (called a set of teachers) in two
42 different states, regarding their expectations before doing ChiK and their experiences after the first
43 year of ChiK. Results from the teachers' questionnaire (n=13/16 for expectations and n=5/7 for
44 experiences).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60