



HAL
open science

Scientific Processes in PISA Tests Observed for Science Teachers

Roser Pinto, Samira El Boudamoussi

► **To cite this version:**

Roser Pinto, Samira El Boudamoussi. Scientific Processes in PISA Tests Observed for Science Teachers. *International Journal of Science Education*, 2009, 31 (16), pp.2137-2159. 10.1080/09500690802559074 . hal-00529574

HAL Id: hal-00529574

<https://hal.science/hal-00529574>

Submitted on 26 Oct 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.



Scientific Processes in PISA Tests Observed for Science Teachers

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2008-0341
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	teacher beliefs
Keywords (user):	PISA, scientific processes, scientific competences



Scientific Processes in PISA Tests Observed for Science Teachers

Abstract

A research study, mainly based on the notion of 'scientific literacy' from PISA 2003 assessment framework, was carried out obtaining data from the administration of an open written questionnaire with items covering three central scientific processes: *describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena, understanding scientific investigation and interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions*, to 30 experienced in-service secondary school science teachers. The purpose was to analyse their views regarding the competences on the mentioned scientific processes assessed by Science PISA tests: which of the competences assessed were the most frequently identified by teachers, which of the competences they considered presenting difficulties for their students and, finally, which activities they used in their classes to promote similar competences. Our results indicated that teachers had different perceptions of one or other scientific processes considered relevant for scientific literacy in PISA framework. Their awareness of the expected students' difficulties did not necessarily match the competences intended to be assessed by neither PISA nor what they thought to be assessed. Moreover, their views differed depending not only on the type of scientific process but also on the underlying subject. Concern about the students' need of reading fluently with understanding and of paying special attention during the test time was also observed.

Keywords: *PISA, Teachers' perceptions, scientific processes, scientific competences.*

Introduction

Since the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) was launched in 2000, its media and social impact have been gradually increasing. From the first warnings about the relevance of such studies (Fenshan & Harlen, 1999) to the claims for informing practice and educational policy everywhere (Baker & Jones, 2005), great strides have been made. As a consequence of the publication of the first PISA results, in many countries important measures were approved at national levels to improve the countries' rankings in PISA (Moens, 2006). These measures have had significant implications and contributions to the questioning of recent reforms or the acceleration and implementation of the new and the ongoing ones (Ertl, 2006; Moens, 2006).

The impact and controversial characteristics of the PISA results, combined with the particularity of making the data available for researchers, have encouraged many of them to carry out research studies based on these data. At present, thousands of studies have elaborated evidence of the social relevance attached to such data and results. Most of these studies have used PISA data sets for further analyses of the reasons/factors behind the differences in results between countries (e.g., Lietz, 2006; Marks, 2006; Suchaut, Duru-Bellat, & Mons, 2005; Turmo, 2004), for secondary analyses (e.g., Lie & Linnakyla, 2004; Marks, 2006) or for re-interpretations of results (Ginsburg, Cooke, Leinwand, & Pollock, 2005). Cross-national comparisons (e.g., Ginsburg, Cooke, Leinwand, & Pollock, 2005; Kjaernsli & Lie, 2004; van Langen, Bosker, & Dekkers, 2006) as well as national comparisons between different provinces or regions within the same country have also been carried out (e.g. Willms, 2005; 2006). Other studies are more critical and question the real potential of international

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 comparative surveys based on school performance indicators (e.g., Simola, 2005) or discuss
4
5 the problems related to the use of large-scale surveys (e.g., Goldstein, 2004; Wu, 2005).
6
7

8 From a pedagogical point of view, some studies are interested in the difficulty of items,
9
10 measured by the percentage of students who correctly answered a given item and relate this to
11
12 the content of the item (Ginsburg, Cooke, Leinwand, & Pollock, 2005), to the difficulties of
13
14 the translation of the item to different languages, to the familiarity of students with the content
15
16 or context, to the test format (multiple choice items or constructed response items), or to the
17
18 dependency of different items on the same context (Grisay & Monseur, 2007). Only a few
19
20 studies seem to be interested in the content of PISA items (e.g., Neubrand, 2004) or in the
21
22 textual materials employed (Hatzinikita, Dimopoulos, & Christidou, 2008) to assess students'
23
24 scientific literacy rather than in the data sets. There are also studies interested in teachers'
25
26 perceptions of external evaluations, such as PISA, as judgmental and controlling, which is
27
28 contrasting with the view of internal school-based evaluation as a developmental process
29
30 contributing to improve teachers' and students' learning (Livingston & McCall, 2005).
31
32 However, we did not find research studies about teachers' perceptions of the students'
33
34 requirements that PISA tests suppose (El Boudamoussi, Tortosa, & Pintó, 2008). It has been
35
36 already well established that external evaluations have an important impact on the school,
37
38 particularly in the selection of the content to be taught and the emphasis conferred to them.
39
40 Therefore, if teachers understand the aims of the PISA items and if they are able to identify
41
42 the competences assessed by those items, we assume, they will more likely promote such
43
44 competences in their classes. Moreover, they will easily be aware of the difficulties of their
45
46 students in relation to such competences. On the contrary, if they do not identify what the
47
48 PISA tests are assessing, probably they will scarcely promote the competences assessed by
49
50 PISA. We realise that teachers are grateful when they learn about the rationale of the PISA
51
52 tests and when they understand the reasons for the low results of their students and what they
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 could do to improve student learning. In our schools, the emphasis on learning the conceptual
4
5 content is very high whereas the content about procedures, even though being part of the
6
7 Spanish curriculum since the 1980s, has rarely been assessed; and therefore, these aspects of
8
9 the official curriculum have scarcely had any repercussion in the real classes. It is expected
10
11 that from such wide dissemination of the PISA results, no matter how many people disagree
12
13 with them, more attention will be paid in our schools to make predictions, draw conclusions,
14
15 infer from observations and so forth in a definitive direction to enhance students' scientific
16
17 competences. To sum up, it is expected that schools will reap the benefits of the relevance
18
19 given to such external evaluations in order to persuade teachers to promote the learning of a
20
21 wide range of content in the curriculum.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **The PISA assessment framework**

31
32 The OECD Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) adopts a framework
33
34 focused on the outcomes that are considered as required for all citizens (OECD, 2003). In this
35
36 framework, 'literacy' is a key concept which is used for the three domains assessed by PISA:
37
38 reading, mathematics, and science.
39
40

41 In our article and for our research purpose, we focus on the definition of 'scientific
42
43 literacy' adopted by PISA 2003 (OECD, 2003)¹. In this framework, scientific literacy is
44
45 understood as:
46
47

48 'the capacity to use scientific knowledge, to identify questions and to draw evidence-based
49
50 conclusions in order to understand and help make decisions about the natural world and the
51
52 changes made to it through human activity' (p. 133).
53
54
55

56 PISA items are designed taking into account that the necessary capacities or competences for
57
58 scientific literacy have always a base in scientific knowledge that students should be able to
59
60

¹ The PISA 2000, 2003 and 2006 frameworks present some nuances as to the definition of "scientific literacy" as well as to the organisation of the assessed domain of science. They are not relevant for our purpose in this paper.

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 apply in particular contexts or situations. Students are required to apply concepts of physics,
4
5 chemistry, biology and earth and space sciences, not just recall them. The use of scientific
6
7 knowledge is a fundamental characteristic of each of the three scientific processes selected for
8
9 PISA².

10
11
12 Scientific processes are defined by PISA as ‘mental (and sometimes physical) actions used in
13
14 conceiving, obtaining, interpreting and using evidence or data to gain knowledge or
15
16 understanding’ (p. 136). PISA 2003 focuses on three scientific processes:
17
18

- 19 1. Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena
 - 20 2. Understanding scientific investigation
 - 21 3. Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions
- 22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Table 1 presents the descriptors of each scientific process assessed in agreement with Dossey,
30
31 McCrone, and O’Sullivan (2006) and OECD (2003; 2004).

32 [Insert Table 1 about here]

33
34
35
36
37
38

Our research study

39
40
41 Within the described framework, we are interested in knowing how well teachers are
42
43 aware of the abilities or competences that students are required for doing a PISA test and to
44
45 what extent teachers consider the test to be fostering these abilities and competences in their
46
47 classes. Thus, the research questions to address these two aspects in our research study are:

- 48 1. Which are the competences assessed by PISA science items teachers most likely to
49
50 identify?
 - 51 2. Which are the difficulties teachers consider their students will experience when faced with
52
53 the items?
- 54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ² The framework for PISA 2006 differs in some extent to the presented above. Particularly, it refers to scientific competences as the scientific processes considered in PISA 2003, it takes into consideration the attitudes in science and regard the relevance in knowledge of science as well in knowledge about science

- 1
2
3 3. Which activities are teachers proposing in their classes that they consider would promote
4 any of the competences required to answer the PISA items?
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Methodology and Samples**

11 *The selected PISA items*

12
13
14
15 In order to analyse teachers' views regarding the competences assessed, a selection of
16 eight science items from four units of the PISA 2003 and PISA 2000 (OECD, 2002)
17 assessments was done. In Annex 1, there is the text of the items selected from the unit Stop
18 that Germ and the text of the other three units are available online at
19 http://antalya.uab.es/crecim/PISA_study :
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 2 items from the unit ;Stop that Germ! (the first two items in the PISA unit)

28
29 3 items from the unit Peter Cairney (1st, 2nd and 3rd items of the unit)

30
31 1 item from the unit Corn (3rd item of the unit)

32
33 2 items from the unit Ozone (1st and 4th items of the unit)

34
35
36 Each item in a unit is designed to assess at least one of the three scientific processes defined
37 above. They cover all three processes defined by PISA, even though not all the aspects
38 described in the definition of each process are considered.
39
40
41
42

43
44 We prioritized those items in which the context is more familiar to students and which
45 entail concepts tackled in their science curriculum. We also intended not to include items or
46 units which require long text reading. Table 2 shows the process for which each item is
47 designed by PISA to assess and the particular aspect of that process from those defined in the
48 list of descriptors of Table 1.
49
50
51
52

53 [Insert Table 2 about here]
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

*Scientific processes in PISA tests**The sample*

The sample of teachers who took part in this study included 30 experienced in-service secondary school science teachers with different scientific backgrounds. Nineteen natural sciences teachers (biologists or earth scientists) and 11 physical sciences teachers (chemists or physicists) voluntarily accepted to participate in the study.

Data collection

In order to address the research questions we used a written questionnaire with open-ended questions, without pre-established lists of processes, difficulties or activities to select, in order not to influence teachers' responses. It was made up of three questions corresponding directly to the three research questions:

- 1) Which are the competences that you consider to be assessed by each of the items of this hypothetical test (elaborated with PISA items)?
- 2) Which are the difficulties that you think your students may have to respond to an evaluation test of this type?
- 3) Name briefly examples of activities that you usually use in your classes to promote some of the competences you have previously identified in the sample test.

For each item, each teacher's responses were categorised and, in case of more than one response from the same participant we assigned a single category in order to obtain a clearer picture of their view. In doing so, we chose the response or part of it, which corresponded most to the main scientific process assessed by PISA, and disregarded the other aspects. The descriptors in Table 1 guided the categorisation, even though in some cases they are not enough clear and made it difficult to codify teachers' responses.

The two authors carried out the categorisation independently, then compared their results and reached a consensus in the problematic cases.

Results and discussion

The results of this study are organised into three main parts. The first part presents the results obtained from the analysis and categorisation of teachers' responses related to the first research question. In the second part, we focus on the teachers' perceptions of the expected difficulties that these items would have for their students (second question). The third part focuses on the activities described by the participants as examples of what they are carrying out in their classes in order to enhance similar competences as those assessed by PISA in each item (third question).

First question: Teachers' perceptions of the processes assessed by PISAs science items

Teachers' responses about the scientific processes they perceived are assessed by each item were categorised according to the three scientific processes considered by PISA 2003: *describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena* (Process 1); *understanding scientific investigation* (Process 2); and *interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions* (Process 3). In addition to these three categories, two more categories were needed: 'Using cognitive skills', which includes the responses that refer to students' competences such as the ability to think accurately, reason, be concentrated on the issue and so forth, and 'Other', for vague or non-specific responses.

Results referring to the unit ;Stop that Germ!

- **Item 1** presents a doctor, Zabdiel Boylston, who scratched the skin of his six-year-old son and that of 285 other people and rubbed pus from smallpox scabs into the wounds in order to carry out an experiment to test an idea related to the immune system and the smallpox disease. It is intended to assess the competence of students for analysing scientific investigations (Process 2) and we found only five out of 30 (about 20%) participants recognizing it with responses such as: 'Identify a scientific issue in a text (scientific methodology)'; 'Identify the hypothesis'. Most of the responses (about 60%)

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 were assigned to as relating to Process 1: *describing, explaining and predicting*
4
5 *scientific phenomena* and almost 20% to Process 3: *interpreting scientific evidence*
6
7 *and conclusions*.
8
9

10 In the case of Item 2, in the same context of the above item, students were asked for
11
12 additional information that would be needed to decide how successful it was to test
13
14 Boyleston's idea with the approach given to his experiment. Almost 40% of the participants
15
16 considered that the item was assessing Process 2: *understanding scientific investigation*.
17
18 Teachers' responses coded as belonging to this Process 2 were, for example:
19
20
21

22 'Knowledge of "scientific methodology" and design of experiments to prove
23
24 hypothesis, design other experimental procedures in order to generalise results'; 'Find the
25
26 variables in an experiment and control them'. About 25% of the participants attributed it to
27
28 Process 1 and about 10% gave responses regarding the question as assessing Process 3:
29
30 interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions.
31
32
33

34 Results referring to the unit Peter Cairney
35

36 Item 3 requires scientific knowledge about kinematics and asks students to select, from a list
37
38 of four actions, the one that would help a supposed researcher, Peter Cairney, to be sure that
39
40 his advice concerning the effect of painting lines on narrow roads was appropriate. Fifty
41
42 percent of the participants provided responses which could be considered as closer to Process
43
44 2. Typical teachers' responses assigned to this category were: 'Ability to identify the issue or
45
46 the key question in a scientific investigation'; 'Competence to select which evidence need to
47
48 be obtained in a scientific investigation, in order to draw adequate conclusions and be able to
49
50 make founded decisions'. About 25% of the participants referred to each of the other two
51
52 processes (See Table 3).
53
54
55

56
57 [Insert Table 3 about here]
58
59
60

1
2
3 Item 4 provides students with some results, obtained by Peter Cairney, about how the traffic
4 has changed on one stretch of a narrow road after the lane lines were painted. On the basis of
5
6 has changed on one stretch of a narrow road after the lane lines were painted. On the basis of
7
8 these results, it is supposed that the decision made was that lane lines should be painted on all
9
10 narrow roads. Students are asked whether they think this was the best decision and to give
11
12 reasons for agreeing or disagreeing. Therefore, this item focuses on the students' capacity to
13
14 give reasons for or against a given conclusion in terms of the data provided and, thus it is
15
16 designed to assess Process 3: *interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions*. Almost 60%
17
18 of the participants provided responses which could be categorised under this Process 3. In
19
20 teachers' responses identifying such PISA intentions, we found sentences such as 'to draw
21
22 conclusions from data'; 'Explain an opinion on the basis of data, analyse and interpret data'
23
24 and so on. The way in which the question was asked as well as the involved curricular subject
25
26 (kinematics), which is usually very familiar to science teachers in secondary school, might
27
28 have influenced teachers' responses. This is contrary to the situation in Item 1.
29
30
31
32

33
34 About 10% of the participants referred to Process 1 as being assessed by this item and 10%
35
36 referred to Process 2. A percentage of nearly 20% referred to competences that could be
37
38 categorised as 'Reading comprehension' and 'Using cognitive skills'. Their responses
39
40 included, for example, the ability to 'use arguments'.
41
42

43
44 Item 5 asks students to explain why a faster car takes more distance to stop than a slower one.
45
46 The participants' responses referred to ideas that correspond to Process 1 in 90% of the cases
47
48 (see Table 3). We find explanations such as: 'Applying studied concepts'.
49
50
51
52

53 Results referring to the unit Corn

54
55 Item 6 provides information about the relative greenhouse effect per molecule of gas of the
56
57 four most important gases causing it: carbon dioxide (1), methane (30), nitrous oxide (160),
58
59 and chlorofluorocarbons (17000). From this data, a researcher concludes that carbon dioxide
60

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 is not the main cause of the greenhouse effect. Students are told that this conclusion is
4 premature and that further information is needed and, this Item 6 asks them to choose among
5 four types of data which are the most appropriate to be collected in order to conclude whether
6 or not carbon dioxide is the main cause of the greenhouse effect. This item focuses on the
7 students' competence to identify the assumptions made in reaching a conclusion (Process 3)
8
9 Only about 10% of the participants seemed to be able to identify this Process 3 of *interpreting*
10 *scientific evidence and conclusions* (see Table 3). Typical teachers' responses were: 'To be
11 aware of the descriptions that are not supported by enough data' and 'Validity of opinions,
12 how to infer correctly'. The largest number of participants, slightly more than 40%, actually
13 referred to aspects more related to Process 1, followed by a 40% whose responses referred to
14 Process 2 as being assessed by this item (See Table 3).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Results referring to the unit Ozone

32
33
34 Item 7 asks students to write, using the words atoms and molecules, an explanation of a comic
35 strip where oxygen molecules are represented, and split and recombined into ozone
36 molecules. We found the same 90% of teachers' responses identifying Process 1, for which
37 Item 7 is in fact designed. They talked about applying or transferring concepts to real-life
38 situations, using and recognizing models, giving explanations and so forth. For example, one
39 of them said, 'Ability to explain phenomena from real life with concepts studied at high
40 school'. The rest of participants gave responses that should be distributed among the other
41 four categories as indicated in Table 3.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Finally, Item 8 asks students two questions about whether these questions can be answered by
54 scientific research or not. Around 50% or 16 participants could identify Process 2 as being
55 assessed by Item 8. We found responses such as: 'Differentiate between a scientific
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 investigation and any other kind of study or investigation’; ‘distinguish between the questions
4 that can be scientifically investigated and those that cannot’.

5
6
7
8 About 30% or nine participants provided responses that should be categorised under Process 1
9 and about 7% or two participants considered that the question asks students’ possibility to use
10 Process 3. Other responses referred to more general aspects, such as the ability to ‘associate a
11 scientific question with a problem to be investigated [...]’.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 *Comparing the results to Question 1 for different items assessing the same scientific process*

21
22 As indicated by Table 3, the process of *describing, explaining and predicting scientific*
23 *phenomena* was identified by most of the participants (90%) when the items (5 and 7)
24 required it.

25
26
27
28 In four of the items (1, 2, 3 and 8), teachers had to identify the process of *understanding*
29 *scientific investigation* (Process 2); however, only 50% or less of them did this (see Table 3).

30
31
32
33
34 The participants seemed less likely (less than 40%) to identify students’ ability to recognise
35 the additional information needed in a scientific investigation (Item 2). The percentage was
36 higher (more than 50%) when the competences assessed refer to recognising scientifically
37 investigable questions (Item 8). The intermediate result of 50% was obtained when
38 participants had to recognise the students’ ability to identify the action to carry out in order to
39 collect relevant data needed in a scientific investigation (Item 3).

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 The special case is Item 1 where Process 2 was identified as a matter of assessment for less
49 than 20% of the participants. In fact, it can be a matter of discussion if Item 1 assesses the
50 competence of *understanding scientific investigation*, as it is claimed by PISA specifications,
51 instead of the competence in Process 1. This is because since students are asked: ‘What idea
52 might Zabdiel Boylston have been testing?’ and, the expected right answers for the PISA
53 team are: The idea that infecting someone with smallpox provides some immunity and the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 idea that by breaking the skin, smallpox is introduced into the blood stream. The argument of
4
5 the PISA team is that in this item the main challenge is not the knowledge required; they
6
7 consider that students 'should not demonstrate their understanding' even though they are
8
9 required to use it to apply to a novel situation.
10
11

12
13 As we may notice from Table 3, there is a substantial difference between the number of
14
15 teachers who correctly identified the process in the two items designed by PISA to assess the
16
17 process of *interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions*. The percentage of participants
18
19 was much higher when they had to identify student's ability to give reasons for or against a
20
21 given conclusion in terms of the data provided (Item 4), than when this ability was to identify
22
23 the assumptions made in reaching a conclusion (Item 6).
24
25

26
27 Table 3 also shows that *interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions* is a process scarcely
28
29 identified by teachers.
30

31
32 We could conjecture that in the cases where participants were not skilled to identify the
33
34 competences intended to be assessed (Items 1 and 6) and the required scientific knowledge is
35
36 not trivial, they tended to assign what is being assessed to the process of *describing,*
37
38 *explaining and predicting scientific phenomena*. Everything happens as if teachers consider
39
40 that students should recall and use the scientific knowledge necessary to answer the question
41
42 and not so much that other competences are required. This assertion could be clearer for Item
43
44 6 than Item 1, previously analysed. In Item 6, students should deal with chemical concepts
45
46 and also should make an intellectual exercise of ruling out different options of data to be used
47
48 to conclude whether or not carbon dioxide is the main cause of the greenhouse effect. So,
49
50 Process 3 was not frequently identified and it was almost not recognised by any participant in
51
52 this case where chemical ideas have to be brought into play. New analyses with other items
53
54 and samples should be necessary to confirm this preliminary supposition.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Second question: Teachers' perceptions of the expected difficulties of the PISA science items*
4
5
6 *for students*
7

8 The responses to the second question, aimed at analysing the teachers' perceptions, about
9 which difficulties more likely students will find in answering the PISA tests, were also
10 analysed and coded according to the three scientific processes considered by PISA within its
11 assessment framework. During the analysis, we had to add two new categories in order to
12 include difficulties considered relevant by the teachers and not directly related to any of the
13 three scientific processes. In total, five categories were used; the additional ones were
14 'Reading comprehension' (in order to understand the contextualisation of a text or the
15 paragraph), and 'Using cognitive skills'. Table 4 shows the results for the different eight
16 items.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 [Insert Table 4 here]
30
31

32 Results referring to the unit ;Stop that Germ!. Table 4 indicates that the expected
33 difficulties mentioned by most teachers in the case of Item 1 ('What idea might Zabdiel
34 Boylston have been testing?'), are related to Process 1 (about 70%) even though this
35 particular item was designed by PISA to assess Process 2 (see Table 2). The teachers seem to
36 have in mind in the first place that students had a lack of scientific knowledge to answer the
37 question especially because it deals with concepts not covered in the school curriculum ('At
38 15 years old, students have not seen [studied] the topic of immunology'). As well, five
39 participants, nearly 20%, mentioned 'Reading comprehension' as a main difficulty for their
40 students to answer Item 1: 'Long text, they cannot follow the sequence of events'.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 In the case of Item 2, ('Give two other pieces of information that you would need to decide
54 how successful Boylston's approach was') also designed by PISA to assess Process 2, we
55 found that nearly 40% of the participants referred to the competence in Process 1 as a
56 difficulty for their students (see Table 4). One of them said, 'They [students] would not
57
58
59
60

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 answer because they do not know the immune system'. Process 2 comes in the second place,
4
5 with around 30% (26.7%) of the participants mentioning it as a difficulty for their students
6
7 ('Not knowing the scientific methodology and how to design experiments') and another
8
9 percentage of nearly 30% considering that students would have difficulties of 'Reading
10
11 comprehension' ('not understanding what the question asks for') (See Table 4).
12
13

14
15 We can consider the whole unit 'Stop the Germ!' with its Items 1 and 2, and compare the
16
17 competences identified by the teachers as a matter of assessment with the difficulties they
18
19 would expect for their students, that is, teachers' responses to Questions 1 and 2 (see the
20
21 figures in Tables 3 and 4).
22
23

24
25 Considering the whole unit, we realise that the difficulties that teachers would predict for the
26
27 students were very much focused on the competence to describe, explain and predict scientific
28
29 phenomena or on 'Reading comprehension'. However, as we have noted previously, the PISA
30
31 team considered the two items are assessing the competences of students for Process 2:
32
33 *understanding scientific investigation*.
34
35

36
37 As commented above, most of the teachers did not believe that their students would be able to
38
39 deal comfortably with the scientific phenomenon of immunity and this seems to be a barrier
40
41 for considering the experimental facet of the items, especially Item 2. The required scientific
42
43 knowledge for correctly answering the question would operate as an obstacle, according to the
44
45 teachers' views, for thinking how to design the scientific research of Mr Boylston. Moreover,
46
47 many of them believed that students would not be able to read to understand the text. The
48
49 difficulties mentioned by teachers go in diverse directions but rarely indicate that students
50
51 will not be able to understand how to do a good piece of research, as it is supposed that the
52
53 item measures.
54
55

56
57 Results referring to the Unit Peter Cairney: The largest number of participants, even
58
59 though less than 40% (36.7%) of them referred to the process of *understanding scientific*
60

1
2
3 *investigation* as an expected difficulty for answering Item 3 (see Table 4), which is in
4 agreement with the purpose of the PISA item designers. Difficulty to ‘Identify correctly the
5 control variables that affect the results’, ‘They are not used to design experiments’ and ‘Not
6 understanding that there are variables that affect the investigation (...)’ were teachers’
7 common responses. We realise that teachers also believed, in relatively large percentages, that
8 students would have problems in ‘Reading comprehension’, as well as difficulties in
9 reasoning or, in paying attention and so on (‘Using cognitive skills’).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 In the case of Item 4, designed to assess the competence in interpreting evidence and
21 draw conclusions, the teachers’ perceptions were very heterogeneous. There was not an
22 accumulation of responses assignable to Process 3, as could be expected but all the categories
23 received similar number of responses. Responses such as ‘They [students] are not able to
24 extract conclusions from an experimental observation and they are not used to justifying their
25 decisions (...)’ were almost as frequent as others such as ‘... difficulties in identifying the
26 problem and the variables that define it’; ‘Relate the results with the experimental design’
27 ‘Lack of common sense’, ‘difficulties with reasoning’ and so forth.

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 The difficulties that teachers assigned to Item 5, are mainly related to Process 1
40 followed by ‘Reading comprehension’ difficulties, about 13% (see Table 4). The responses
41 that we considered within the first category referred to students’ failure due to the lack of the
42 scientific knowledge required and the difficult concepts involved (‘Not knowing the fact that
43 should be explained’; ‘Not knowing the laws of kinematics and dynamics’), as well as to the
44 lack of the scientific terminology required to give an explanation (‘They [students] would not
45 use the appropriate scientific terminology’). Many references to the use of appropriate
46 vocabulary or to the fluency of reading were also found. To be able to explain why a car takes
47 more time to stop when its velocity is higher, should not be difficult for students since
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 Kinematics has been a school subject for all the 15-year-old students. Then, the slightly less
4
5 than 75% of the responses in the first category does not seem exceptional (see Table 4).
6

7
8 According to the PISA team, the three items of Peter Cairney Unit are assessing different
9
10 competences of students (Process 2 for Item 3, Process 3 for Item 4 and Process 1 for Item 5)
11
12 and for the three items, the source of the difficulties assigned to a particular item matches in a
13
14 higher percentage with the kind of process that the item is intended to assess. Even so, the
15
16 percentages vary greatly from about 27% to 73% (see Table 4).
17
18

19
20 We can consider the whole unit Peter Cairney, with its Items 3, 4 and 5, and compare the
21
22 competences identified by the teachers as a matter of assessment with the difficulties they
23
24 would expect for their students, that is, teachers' responses to Questions 1 and 2 of the
25
26 questionnaire (see the figures in Tables 3 and 4).
27
28

29
30 We are not in the same situation here than Items 1 and 2 of ;Stop that Germ! Unit since the
31
32 Peter Cairney Unit refers to Kinematics, a common school subject for all the 15-year-old
33
34 students. We realise that, when an item, such as Item 5, is designed to assess Process 1, it is
35
36 more likely that teachers identified this process in the question formulated to students and also
37
38 they considered that mastering such competence in describing, explaining and predicting
39
40 scientifically was the main difficulty that students would have to overcome when answering
41
42 the item. If the item, such as Item 3, is designed to assess the competence of students on
43
44 Process 2, less than half of the teachers in the sample were able to identify it but the kind of
45
46 difficulties expected by the teachers were mainly for Process 2. Also difficulties related to the
47
48 right use of cognitive skills and to the fluency in reading for comprehension were predicted in
49
50 many cases. When students have to draw conclusions from evidence, as it appears in Item 4,
51
52 17 or more than half of the participants were aware of this intention of the item but there was
53
54 little homogeneity in their expected possible causes of students' difficulties; they gave
55
56 different kind of reasons: cognitive capabilities of students, fluency in understanding the text,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mastery of scientific knowledge to be applied or, understanding scientific investigations. The
4
5 largest gap between what teachers identified as a matter of assessment and what teachers
6
7 perceived as difficult for their students to answer well was found for Process 3 in this Unit.
8
9

10 Results referring to the unit Corn (and particularly Item 6 where students should
11
12 decide what data are necessary to collect in order to get a logical conclusion about the gases
13
14 causing the greenhouse effect): Most of the difficulties mentioned by the participants
15
16 correspond to Process 1; even though the item is designed for assessing the students'
17
18 competence on Process 3. Common opinions were: 'lack of updated information about the
19
20 causes of the greenhouse effect in order to compare data'; 'Difficulties with some concepts:
21
22 greenhouse effect, molecule, photosynthesis...'. The context of Item 6 is long and it makes
23
24 use of many scientific concepts before it arrives at formulating any question. It seems as if
25
26 instead of concentrating on 'which other data Karin need(s) to collect in order to conclude
27
28 whether or not carbon dioxide is the main cause of greenhouse effect', the participants
29
30 perceived that a large number of prior concepts were needed for selecting the appropriate
31
32 source of data.
33
34
35
36
37

38 Many other teachers believed that students would have problems in understanding the text
39
40 that, in fact, we find very long and rather confusing (see Table 4). For example, one teacher
41
42 said, 'Besides the reading comprehension I do not see many difficulties'.
43
44
45

46 The rest of the participants either referred to Process 2 (about 7%): ('Understand the
47
48 different variables that intervene and their relative importance in the greenhouse effect') or to
49
50 'Using cognitive skills' (about 7%): ('I think that they [the students] will answer intuitively
51
52 but few of them will read the whole text again') (see Table 4).
53
54

55 Comparing the results from the first and second question (see Tables 3 and 4), we observe a
56
57 special problem in Item 6. As shown previously, teachers rarely identified this item as
58
59 assessing the students' competence of *interpreting evidence and drawing conclusions*. This is
60

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 probably the cause that no one mentioned any difficulty related to the competence in Process
4
5 3 and attributed most of the difficulties mainly to the lack of knowledge in chemistry and their
6
7 poor competence in reading comprehension.
8
9

10 Results referring to the unit Ozone: Most of the participants (about 67%) referred to
11
12 the ability on *describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena* as the expected
13
14 difficulty for answering Item 7, in accordance with the purpose of the designers (see Table 4).
15
16 Teachers considered that students would have problems in explaining the strip about the
17
18 Ozone formation, due to the lack of the scientific knowledge required and the concepts
19
20 involved, as well as the lack of the scientific terminology required to give an explanation ('To
21
22 confuse the different levels of matter structure and composition'; 'the concepts of atom and
23
24 molecule may not be clear for them'; '[...] ability to use the correct vocabulary'). Again, a
25
26 relatively high percentage (30%) referred to 'Reading comprehension' ('too much reading for
27
28 their age') as a main difficulty that students would have for correctly answering the question.
29
30
31
32
33

34 Finally, in the case of Item 8, the largest number of participants (about 40%)
35
36 mentioned the process of *understanding scientific investigation* as the expected difficulty that
37
38 students could have (see Table 4). 'They [students] do not know what 'scientific
39
40 investigation' means', 'Difficulty to distinguish between questions that can be solved by
41
42 investigation and others that have a political character (...)' or 'Not understanding the
43
44 question since they do not know how the CFC acts and how long it takes to act once it is
45
46 released' were typical responses from the teachers.
47
48
49

50 Considering the results of the whole unit Ozone (see Tables 3 and 4), we realise that the
51
52 process identified as a matter of assessment was also contemplated by teachers as the main
53
54 source of difficulties for students in both Items 7 and 8. We observe, thus, the coherence
55
56 between the focus of the items and the centre of expected difficulties. Again, we also observe
57
58 the high sensitivity of teachers in being aware of other difficulties students could have due to
59
60

1
2
3 the required ability in reading with understanding and the demand of good thinking,
4
5 reasoning, being concentrated and so forth.
6

7
8 *Comparing the results to Question 2 for different items assessing the same scientific process*
9

10 The results seem to indicate that the participants were more aware of the competences
11 related to Process 1 as representing difficulties for their students, not only when it is the main
12 process that is assessed (Items 5 and 7), but also when other processes are assessed (Items 1, 2
13 and 6). This makes the difficulties related to Process 1: *describing, explaining and predicting*
14 *scientific phenomena* as the most frequently mentioned process by participants in the case of
15 five items out of eight (see Table 4).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The maximum proportion of participants who referred to Process 2 as an expected
25 difficulty was 13/30 (about 43%) compared to 22/30 (about 73%) who referred to Process 1.
26 In addition, when the participants considered Process 2 (assessed by the Items 2, 3 and 8) as
27 the main difficulty, the highest percentage was always less than half (43.3%) of the total (see
28 Table 4). That is, the most probable items to be considered difficult for students are those
29 designed to assess Process 1
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The process of *interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions* was the least frequent
42 difficulty mentioned by the participants (see Table 4). The percentage of the teachers that
43 considered this Process 3 as the main difficulty for their students was lower than 30% in the
44 case of Item 4 and nil in the case of Item 6, both designed to assess this process.
45
46
47
48
49

50 It is important to note that the teachers also referred to 'Reading comprehension' as a
51 difficulty for their students in answering almost all the selected PISA items. The proportions
52 of these teachers ranged from 13% to 30% of the participants. The same can be said for the
53 difficulties of 'Using some cognitive skills' required for answering the test.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 The fact that the participants were more likely to perceive Process 1 as a difficulty for
4 their students than Processes 2 and 3 may lead us to think that teachers considered that these
5 two last processes did not represent properly students' difficulties. But, it may also be
6 interpreted differently. As these two processes were not mainly on the teachers' minds, it is
7 not probable that they were sensitive to them when considering students' difficulties in
8 learning.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Cross-analysis

17
18 In order to examine whether the difficulties identified by the participants correspond to the
19 process that they believed to be assessed by each item, we cross-analysed their responses to
20 the first and second questions of our questionnaire, that is about the competences identified
21 and about the difficulties foreseen.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Table 5 represents the total numbers of the teachers' responses assigned to any of the
30 four categories considered (corresponding to the three scientific processes assessed by PISA
31 and the other combined category: reading comprehension and using cognitive skills) as
32 assessed competences and as expected students' difficulties.
33
34
35
36
37

38 [Insert Table 5 here]
39
40

41 Table 5 indicates that when a participant considered Process 1 as being assessed by a
42 PISA item, probably he/she also referred to it as a possible difficulty for their students. This
43 happened in 73 responses out of 113. However, when the participants identified Processes 2
44 or 3 as assessed competences, they tended to mention other competences as difficulties for
45 their students in a total of 40 responses out of 65 and in 32 responses out of 39, respectively.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 Among the 39 out of 240 responses (16%), in which the participants identified Process 3:
54 *interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions* as being assessed by an item (from Items 1 to
55 8), only seven responses referred to this process as a difficulty for the students. Similar
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 situation can be said for Process 2, in which only 25 responses, out 65, referred to this process
4
5 (see Table 5).
6

7
8 In other words, in the cases of Processes 2 and 3, the difficulties teachers expected for their
9
10 students are generally not related to the competences they considered to be assessed by the
11
12 item or required for them to answer it correctly. This could be attributed to their lack of the
13
14 knowledge of the shortcomings of their students but, taking into consideration the wide
15
16 professional experience of the participants, such interpretation would not be plausible.
17
18 Teachers with long experience are usually knowledgeable of the students' limitations. Instead,
19
20 perhaps a confused identification of the competences required by each item would be a more
21
22 plausible interpretation of these results. Thus, we can confirm much consistency when
23
24 discussing the results about Process 1 but not about those in Processes 2 and 3. Moreover, we
25
26 can also notice that, in 83 out of 240 responses, teachers considered that the difficulties they
27
28 expected for their students would not come from the processes assessed but from other
29
30 obstacles, such as the demand of high cognitive skills or high competence in reading
31
32 comprehension. We can conjecture again if this difference may be due to teachers not being
33
34 aware of the processes assessed or the relevance assigned to the skills in these processes.
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 *Third question: Teachers' perceptions of the activities they usually carry out to enhance*
42
43 *similar competences to those required by the PISA items*
44

45
46 Finally, the questionnaire administered to the participants included a third question,
47
48 about which competences, among those assessed by the selected PISA items, teachers
49
50 consider that they usually promote in their classes. The participants' responses were thus
51
52 analysed and categorised according to the three scientific processes and the categories
53
54 'Scientific communication' and 'Others'. A large number of activities (106) were described
55
56 by the participants.
57
58

59
60 [Insert Table 6 here]

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 The results summarised in Table 6 indicate that 37% of the activities described by
4 participants are related to the process of *describing, explaining and predicting scientific*
5 *phenomena*. These activities generally referred to transferring school knowledge to everyday
6 life or explaining phenomena using ideas previously taught ('I ask them to search for (books,
7 films, press...) news, texts so that they can talk about it'; 'Occasionally I ask them to explain
8 what they have supposedly learnt, in other words').
9

10
11 The second category cited by the participants corresponds to Process 2. About 25% of
12 the total activities described by the participants could be considered in this category. Most of
13 these activities referred to carrying out or designing experiments ('small experiments in the
14 classroom with various variables to be controlled'; 'design of simple experiments in which
15 students have to identify measurable variables').
16

17
18 A low proportion (13%) of the activities described by the participants corresponded to
19 the category of *interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions*. They include activities
20 leading to the interpretation of results, the extraction or formulation of conclusions ('We put
21 an emphasis on the steps to be followed when doing a good experiment to extract valid
22 conclusions').
23

24
25 Sixteen participants described activities that could be considered in the category of
26 'Scientific communication', representing 15% of the total number of activities described.
27 Their responses referred to 'reading texts extracted from newspapers and supplements (...)'.
28 In 'Scientific communication', we included teachers' responses that referred to the activities
29 devoted to reading scientific texts, understanding the scientific terminology, the vocabulary
30 and so on. The fact that teachers had frequently mentioned the use of scientific texts and
31 extracts from the newspapers—as activities intended to promote competences similar to those
32 assessed by PISA—may be attributed to considering reading skills as a very important ability
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

1
2
3 required to answer the PISA items or to considering it important to relate everyday news with
4
5 school knowledge.
6
7

8 The category of 'Others' activities included 10% of the participants' responses that
9
10 were not very specific (see Table 6) such as: 'We use activities that emphasize the
11
12 relationships between all the experimental science subjects' or were addressed to a different
13
14 kind of competences: 'exercises or role play to raise student' and 'awareness of environmental
15
16 problems'.
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Conclusions and implications**

23
24 Considering the overall results from the questionnaire, we notice different perceptions of
25
26 teachers when faced with the three scientific processes that are considered crucial for
27
28 scientific literacy in PISA 2003.
29

30
31 *Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena* (Process 1) was very commonly
32
33 identified by teachers as the scientific process that is required by students for answering the
34
35 items designed for such purposes. The relevance that teachers conceded to the competence of
36
37 being able to apply scientific knowledge in different contexts or to describe or explain
38
39 scientifically a situation was very high in most of the cases. Such relevance was as high when
40
41 they were faced with the need to identify the demand in students' tests as when they had to
42
43 predict the difficulties of their students when faced with the PISA tests. Moreover, the
44
45 teachers in our sample said that they focused their class activities on promoting this
46
47 competence in their students. It was the 'world' of scientific knowledge, on which teachers
48
49 concentrated their efforts.
50
51
52
53

54
55 Less importance was attached to the mastery of scientific inquiry (Process 2), according to the
56
57 responses of the teachers in our sample. On the average, only less than half of the participants
58
59 (5/30, 11/30, 15/30 and 16/30; see Table 3) noticed the demand of such competences in the
60

Scientific processes in PISA tests

1
2
3 items (1, 2, 3 and 8) designed to examine the abilities of students for analysing scientific
4
5 research, for analysing the necessary actions to collect relevant data, or for testing some ideas.

6
7
8 In addition, in the cases where teachers were aware of this scientific process (Process 2) being
9
10 assessed, such recognition was so weak or the process was so far away from their minds that,
11
12 when these teachers were asked for their students' possible difficulties for answering the
13
14 items assessing his process only a minority (39% or 25 of 65 of their responses) took Process
15
16 2 into consideration (see Table 5). Moreover, the sources of difficulties assigned to the items
17
18 intended to assess the process of *understanding scientific investigation*, were not all about the
19
20 learning of such process (a similar percentage 42% or 27 of 65 responses referred to other
21
22 skills such as the possibility to use high cognitive skills or to read for understanding).
23
24 Something parallel can be said for Process 3 that only 7 out of 39 responses or 18% of the
25
26 participants that could identify this process being assessed could also find it a difficulty for
27
28 their students. Thus, the consistency observed for Process 1 (73 out of 113 responses or 65%)
29
30 was not found for Processes 2 and 3 (see Table 5).
31
32
33

34
35
36 In any case, the scientific process least easily identified by the teachers was interpreting
37
38 scientific evidence and drawing conclusions from data (Table 3). Furthermore, the need for
39
40 students to be competent in such a process did not receive very much attention in the class
41
42 activities mentioned (Table 6). This process seemed to be out of the teachers' minds and so,
43
44 hardly (13 responses out of 240) any teachers mentioned it as a difficulty for students (Table
45
46 5).
47
48
49

50
51 On the other hand, we have to acknowledge the high sensitivity of our teachers to problems
52
53 that students can have when faced with PISA tests in different directions not considered by
54
55 the PISA tests. The categories of 'non-PISA processes' had scores higher than two PISA
56
57 scientific processes (Processes 2 and 3) (see Table 5). Teachers were very sensitive to the
58
59 demand of the PISA tests on the students due to the necessity to be fluent in reading for
60

1
2
3 understanding and in being attentive and wakeful during the test time. We could also interpret
4 that teachers weakly recognised that science education should include other competences
5
6 different from mastering scientific facts or laws.
7
8

9
10 It has also to be remarked that such sensitivity seemed to be higher depending on the
11
12 underlying scientific knowledge. When the topic worked out to be familiar to the teachers,
13
14 they were more willing to take into consideration the diversity of processes. On the contrary,
15
16 when faced with an unfamiliar context or a topic not usually taught, teachers were more
17
18 inclined towards thinking within the requirements of scientific knowledge than looking at
19
20 other processes (i.e., Processes 2 and 3) of the question.
21
22

23
24 Our study is limited by the kind of instruments to collect more data and by the small size of
25
26 the sample. In fact, further studies and larger samples will be necessary to confirm and extend
27
28 our conclusions. However, the need for enlarging the range of competences to be promoted in
29
30 students seems to be evidenced by our results. The PISA tests are not only a challenge for 15-
31
32 year-old students but also for teachers themselves and for teacher educators as well.
33
34

35
36 In terms of teachers' training activities, the results of this study have various implications.
37
38 First, general training activities can be suggested to help teachers learn more about 'scientific
39
40 processes' required in science education and how such processes can be assessed. Second,
41
42 more specific training activities can be proposed in order to help teachers identify the kind of
43
44 situations that their students would be confronted with in real life as well as during their
45
46 school education, and to promote a reflection about the most appropriate classroom activities
47
48 to enhance different types of competences. Third, another implication of this study is the need
49
50 for developing activities or identifying existing ones that would help teachers to put more
51
52 emphasis on the different scientific processes in their classes.
53
54
55
56

57 58 59 60 **Acknowledgements**

1
2
3 We would like to thank Montse Tortosa for her help and support making it possible to
4
5 interest many Catalanian teachers and involve their association in this study. We also thank
6
7 all the teachers who took part and all those who expressed their interest in the study.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **References**

- 21
22 Baker, R., Jones, A. (2005) How can international studies such as the international
23
24 mathematics and science study and the programme for international student
25
26 assessment be used to inform practice, policy and future research in science education
27
28 in New Zealand? *International Journal of Science Education*, 27, 2, 145 - 157
29
30
31 Dossey, J. A., McCrone, S.A., and O'Sullivan, C. (2006, December). Problem Solving in the
32
33 PISA and TIMSS 2003 Assessments (NCES 2007-049). U.S. Department of
34
35 Education. Retrieved 18/04/2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>
36
37
38 El Boudamoussi, S. Tortosa, M., and Pintó, R. (2008) La visión de los profesores de las
39
40 competencias evaluadas en las pruebas PISA [The teachers' view of the competences
41
42 evaluated in PISA tests]. *Alambique* 57.
43
44
45
46 Ertl, H. (2006). Educational Standards and the Changing Discourse on Education: The
47
48 Reception and Consequences of the PISA Study in Germany. *Oxford Review of*
49
50 *Education*, 32(5), 619-634.
51
52
53 Fensham, P. J., Harlen, W. (1999) School science and public understanding of science.
54
55 *International Journal of Science Education*, 21, 7, 755 - 763
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ginsburg, A., Cooke, G., Leinwand, S. N., Jay, & Pollock, E. (2005). *Reassessing U.S.*
4
5 *International Mathematics Performance: New Findings from the 2003 TIMSS and*
6
7 *PISA*: American Institutes for Research.
8
9
- 10 Goldstein, H. (2004). International Comparisons of Student Attainment: Some Issues Arising
11
12 from the PISA Study. *Assessment in Education Principles Policy and Practice*, 11(3),
13
14 319-330.
15
16
- 17 Grisay, A., & Monseur, C. (2007). Measuring the equivalence of item difficulty in the various
18
19 versions of an international test. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 33 (1), 69-86.
20
21
- 22 Hatzinikita , V, Dimopoulos, K., Christidou, V. (2008) PISA test items and school textbooks
23
24 related to science: A textual comparison. *Science Education*, 92, 4, 664 – 687
25
26
- 27 Kjaernsli, M., & Lie, S. (2004). PISA and Scientific Literacy: Similarities and Differences
28
29 between the Nordic Countries. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48 (3),
30
31 271-286.
32
33
- 34 Lie, S., & Linnakyla, P. (2004). Nordic PISA 2000 in a Sociocultural Perspective.
35
36 *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(3), 227-230
37
38
- 39 Lietz, P. (2006). A Meta-Analysis of Gender Differences in Reading Achievement at the
40
41 Secondary School Level *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 32 (4), 317-344.
42
43
- 44 Livingston, K., & McCall, J. (2005). Evaluation: Judgemental or Developmental? *European*
45
46 *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28 (2), 165-178.
47
48
- 49 Marks, G. N. (2006). Are between- and within-School Differences in Student Performance
50
51 Largely Due to Socio-Economic Background? Evidence from 30 Countries
52
53 *Educational Research*, 48(1), 21-40.
54
55
- 56 Moens, F. (2006). *PISA : Controverses et débats en Belgique francophone. Des indicateurs à*
57
58 *la qualité ? [PISA: Controversies and debates in French-speaking Belgium. Quality*
59
60 *indicators?]*. Paper presented at the Colloque sur L'évaluation des politiques

Scientific processes in PISA tests

d'éducation et de formation [Symposia on the Evaluation of educational and training policies], INRP: 12-13 September. France.

Neubrand, M. (2004). The PISA-Study: Differentiated assessment of "mathematical literacy".

In J. Emanuelsson & D. Clarke (Eds.), *Contrasting comparative research on teaching and learning in mathematics*. Cape Town: International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education.

OECD. (2002). *Sample Tasks from the PISA 2000 Assessment: Reading, Mathematical and Scientific Literacy*. Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2003). *The PISA 2003 Assessment Framework: Mathematics, Reading, Science and Problem Solving Knowledge and Skills*. Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2004). *Learning for Tomorrow's World First Results from PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD.

Simola, H. (2005). The Finnish Miracle of PISA: Historical and Sociological Remarks on Teaching and Teacher Education. *Comparative Education*, 41(4), 455-470.

Suchaut, B., Duru-Bellat, M., & Mons, N. (2005). Organisation scolaire et inégalités sociales de performance : les enseignements de l'enquête PISA [School organisation and social inequalities of performance: the teachings of the PISA survey]. *Education et formation*, 70, 123-131.

Turmo, A. (2004). Scientific Literacy and Socio-Economic Background among 15-Year-Olds--A Nordic Perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(3), 287-305.

van Langen, A., Bosker, R., & Dekkers, H. (2006). Exploring Cross-National Differences in Gender Gaps in Education *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12(2), 155-177

Willms, J. D. (2005). Why the Difference? Variation in Reading Scores among Canadian Provinces. *Education Canada*, 45(1), 54-55.

1
2
3 Willms, J. D. (2006). Variation in Socioeconomic Gradients among Cantons in French and
4
5 Italian-Speaking Switzerland: Findings from the OECD PISA. *Educational Research*
6
7 *and Evaluation*, 12 (2), 129-154.
8
9

10 Wu, M. (2005). The Role of Plausible Values in Large-Scale Surveys. *Studies in Educational*
11
12 *Evaluation*, 31(2), 114-128
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

Table Captions

Table 1. Descriptors of the scientific processes assessed by PISA

Table 2. Characteristics of the selected PISA items included in the study

Table 3. Number of participants who identified the competence for which the item has been designed ($n = 30$)

Table 4. Number of participants by category of expected difficulties ($n = 30$)

Table 5. Number of responses of participants that considered as “a difficulty” a competence they identified as being assessed by a test item.

Table 6. The scientific processes promoted by teachers in their classes

Table 1. Descriptors of the scientific processes assessed by PISA

Scientific process	Descriptors of the scientific processes
<i>Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena</i>	Apply appropriate knowledge in a given situation
	Describe or explain scientific phenomena/events
	Predict changes or outcomes to science-related situations
	Recognise phenomena, make considered judgements as to the impact of these phenomena
	Give explanations
<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>	Create or use conceptual models to make predictions or give explanations
	Recall of simple scientific knowledge or common scientific knowledge or data
	Recognise and communicate questions that can be investigated scientifically
	Recognise questions and problems that could be solved using scientific methods
	Analyze scientific investigations in order to grasp, for example, the design of an experiment or to identify an idea being tested
<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>	Identify or recognise evidence needed in a scientific investigation: for example, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what variables should be changed, controlled or measured • what additional information is needed • what action should be taken so that relevant data can be collected
	Use of scientific findings as evidence for a diverse range of claims and conclusions
	Produce and communicate conclusions based on scientific evidence
<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>	Give reasons for or against a given conclusion in terms of the data provided
	Identify the assumptions made in reaching a conclusion
	Use common scientific knowledge in drawing or evaluating conclusions

Table 2. Characteristics of the selected PISA items included in the study

Unit (and number			
Item	of item in PISA	Scientific process	Aspects of the scientific process focused on the item
test)			
1	;Stop that Germ! (1 st item)	<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>	- Analyze scientific investigations in order to grasp, for example, the design of an experiment or to identify an idea being tested
2	;Stop that Germ! (2 nd item)		- Identify and recognise evidence needed in a scientific investigation, particularly the additional information needed
3	Peter Cairney (1 st item)	<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>	- Identify and recognise evidence needed in a scientific investigation, particularly, the action to carry out to collect relevant data
4	Peter Cairney (2 nd item)	<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>	- Give reasons for or against a given conclusion in terms of the data provided.
5	Peter Cairney (3 rd item)	<i>Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena</i>	- Give an explanation - Apply appropriate knowledge in a given situation - Describe or explain a scientific phenomenon
6	Corn (3 rd item)	<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>	- Identify the assumptions made in reaching a conclusion.
7	Ozone (1 st item)	<i>Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena</i>	- Give an explanation
			- Apply appropriate knowledge in a given situation - Describe or explain a scientific phenomenon - Recognise phenomena, make considered judgements as to the impact of these phenomena - Create or use conceptual models to make predictions or give explanations
8	Ozone (4 th item)	<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>	- Recognise or identify scientifically investigable questions

Table 3. Number (percentage) of participants who identified the competence for which an item has been designed ($n = 30$)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena</i>		<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>		<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>		<i>Reading comprehension</i>	<i>Using cognitive skills</i>
Item 1	19	(63.3)	5	(16.7)	6	(20.0)	0	0
Item 2	7	(23.3)	11	(36.7)	3	(10.0)	4	5
Item 3	7	(23.3)	15	(50.0)	7	(23.3)	0	1
Item 4	4	(13.3)	3	(10.0)	17	(56.7)	5	1
Item 5	27	(90.0)	1	(3.3)	0	(0.0)	1	1
Item 6	13	(43.3)	12	(40.0)	4	(13.3)	1	0
Item 7	27	(90.0)	2	(6.7)	0	(0.0)	-	-
Item 8	9	(30.0)	16	(53.3)	2	(6.7)	1	2
Total	113	(47.1)	65	(27.1)	39	(16.3)	12	10

Table 4. Number (percentage) of participants by type of expected difficulties ($n = 30$)

Item	<i>Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena</i>	<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>	<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>	<i>Reading comprehension</i>	<i>Using cognitive skills</i>
Item 1	22 (73.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (16.7)	3 (10.0)
Item 2	11 (36.7)	8 (26.7)	1 (3.3)	8 (26.7)	2 (6.7)
Item 3	2 (6.7)	11 (36.7)	1 (3.3)	9 (30.0)	7 (23.3)
Item 4	5 (16.7)	6 (20.0)	8 (26.7)	5 (16.7)	6 (20.0)
Item 5	22 (73.3)	1 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	4 (13.3)	3 (10.0)
Item 6	17 (56.7)	2 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	9 (30.0)	2 (6.7)
Item 7	20 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (30.0)	1 (3.3)
Item 8	4 (13.3)	13 (43.3)	3 (10.0)	8 (26.7)	2 (6.7)
Total	103(42.9)	41(17.1)	13(5.4)	57(23.8)	26(10.8)

Table 5. Number of responses of participants ($n = 30$) that considered as “a difficulty” a competence they had identified as being assessed by a test item

Difficulties related to PISA processes, which students would have when faced with items 1-8 (according to the participants)					
Competences identified by the participants as being assessed by items 1-8	<i>Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena</i>	<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>	<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>	<i>Difficulties with skills not assessed in PISA items</i>	Total
	<i>Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena</i>	73	5	3	32
<i>Understanding scientific investigation</i>	11	25	2	27	65
<i>Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions</i>	10	6	7	16	39
<i>Competences or skills not assessed in PISA items</i>	9	5	1	8	23
Total	103	41	13	83	240

Table 6. The scientific processes promoted by teachers in their classes

Scientific process assessed by PISA items	Activities described by teachers	
Describing, explaining and predicting scientific phenomena	39	37%
Understanding scientific investigation	26	25%
Interpreting scientific evidence and conclusions	14	13%
Scientific communication	16	15%
Others or vague answers	11	10%
	Total	106
		100%

Appendix 1: The Questionnaire

- 1) Which are the competences that you consider being assessed by each of the items of this hypothetical test?
- 2) Which are the difficulties that you think your students may have to respond to an evaluation test of this type?
- 3) Name briefly examples of activities that you use in your classes to promote some of the competences you had previously identified in the hypothetical test.

An example of the chosen PISA items for the study **Questions 1 and 2 of the questionnaire**

Other items used in the research study can be found in:

http://antalya.uab.es/crecim/PISA_study

STOP THAT GERM!¹

Competences assessed by Item 1:

As early as the 11th century, Chinese doctors were manipulating the immune system.

By blowing pulverised scabs from a smallpox victim into their patients' nostrils, they

could often induce a mild case of the disease that prevented a more severe onslaught

later on. In the 1700s, people rubbed their skins with dried scabs to protect themselves **Expected difficulties of Item 1 for students:**

from the disease. These primitive practices were introduced into England and the

American colonies. In 1771 and 1772, during a smallpox epidemic, a Boston doctor

named Zabdiel Boylston tested an idea that he had. He scratched the skin on his six-

year-old son and 285 other people and rubbed pus from smallpox scabs into the **Competences assessed by Item 2:**

wounds. All but six of his patients survived.

ITEM 1:

What idea might Zabdiel Boylston have been testing?

ITEM 2: **Expected difficulties of Item 2 for students:**

Give two other pieces of information that you would need to decide how successful

Boylston's approach was.

¹ Science Unit 1: Stop that Germ! The PISA 2003 Assessment Framework: Mathematics, Reading, Science and Problem Solving Knowledge and Skills, © OECD 2004