



**HAL**  
open science

# **The Role of Content and Context in PISA Interest Scales - A study of the embedded Interest Items in the PISA 2006 Science Assessment**

Barbara Drechsel, Claus Carstensen, Manfred Prenzel

## **► To cite this version:**

Barbara Drechsel, Claus Carstensen, Manfred Prenzel. The Role of Content and Context in PISA Interest Scales - A study of the embedded Interest Items in the PISA 2006 Science Assessment. *International Journal of Science Education*, 2011, 33 (01), pp.73-95. <10.1080/09500693.2010.518646>. <hal-00658172>

**HAL Id: hal-00658172**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00658172v1>**

Submitted on 10 Jan 2012

**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.



HAL Authorization



**The Role of Content and Context in PISA Interest Scales - A study of the embedded Interest Items in the PISA 2006 Science Assessment**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2010-0328-A
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Research Paper
Keywords :	scientific literacy, science interest, large-scale studies
Keywords (user):	international comparisons, multidimensional scaling

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Only

1  
2  
3 **The Role of Content and Context in PISA Interest Scales: A Study of the Embedded**  
4  
5 **Interest Items in the PISA 2006 Science Assessment**  
6  
7

8 **Abstract**  
9

10 This paper focuses interest in science as one of the attitudinal aspects of scientific  
11 literacy. Large-scale data from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)  
12 2006 are analysed in order to describe student interest more precisely. So far the analyses  
13 have provided a general indicator of interest, aggregated over all contexts and contents in the  
14 science test (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2007a;  
15 Prenzel, Schütte, & Walter, 2007). With its innovative approach PISA embeds interest items  
16 within the cognitive test unit and its contents and contexts. The main difference from  
17 conventional interest measures is that in most questionnaires, a relatively small number of  
18 interest items cover broad fields of contents and contexts. The science units represent a  
19 number of systematically differentiated scientific contexts and contents. The units' stimulus  
20 texts allow for concrete descriptions of relevant content aspects, applications and contexts.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 In the analyses, multidimensional item response models are applied in order to  
37 disentangle student interest. The results indicate that multidimensional models fit the data. A  
38 two-dimensional model separating interest into two different knowledge of science  
39 dimensions described in the PISA science framework is further analysed with respect to  
40 gender, performance differences and country. The findings give a comprehensive description  
41 of students' interest in science. The paper deals with methodological problems and describes  
42 requirements of the test construction for further assessments. The results are discussed with  
43 regard to their significance for science education.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Recent conceptions of scientific literacy emphasise the multifold facets of this  
4  
5 construct. In this sense, scientific literacy includes cognitive as well as motivational and  
6  
7 value-related aspects of domain-specific competencies (e.g. Marshall, Scheppler, &  
8  
9 Palmisano, 2002; Millar, 2006). According to this, knowledge and attitudes are seen to be  
10  
11 relevant components of scientific literacy in the framework for the Programme for  
12  
13 International Student Assessment (PISA) 2006. Interest in science as one of the attitudinal  
14  
15 aspects of scientific literacy is the focus of this paper.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 The framework for PISA 2006 does not only present a cutting-edge theoretical model  
21  
22 of scientific literacy; it also suggests an innovative approach to measuring the science interest  
23  
24 of students in an international large-scale assessment. The so-called embedded interest  
25  
26 assessment uses the contextual and domain-related information of the cognitive science tasks  
27  
28 as concrete and illustrative stimuli. In such an approach the students have a clear idea of what  
29  
30 it means to be interested in science. Additionally, the approach allows the study of distinct  
31  
32 features of a more or less general interest in science. An approach to getting additional  
33  
34 information on students' interest in science by disentangling the PISA interest assessment will  
35  
36 be presented in the following. The analyses focus on the connection between the contents of  
37  
38 the cognitive test units and student interest.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 In a first section of the paper a discussion of the role of interest in learning processes  
45  
46 will substantiate the need for a closer look at science contents and contexts to which interests  
47  
48 are related. The second part describes the methodological approach and deals with the  
49  
50 different possibilities and problems the embedded interest assessment offers. Research  
51  
52 questions are derived in the following section and afterwards, the methods section explains  
53  
54 how interest is disaggregated and how subsequent group differences are calculated. Finally  
55  
56 we present our findings and discuss them in light of further research questions.  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **The Role of Interest**

1  
2  
3 From a literacy perspective, science education it is not confined to the development of  
4 scientific and science-related knowledge. The participation in a society that is highly  
5 influenced by science and technology also depends on motivational orientations, for example  
6 the willingness to further engage in scientific questions, topics and discussions. Science  
7 educators have always pointed out the importance of considering both cognitive and  
8 motivational aspects of scientific literacy (e.g. Millar, 2006). According to those ideas, the  
9 PISA science framework (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development  
10 [OECD], 2006) uses the concept of interest as one criterion to determine the extent to which  
11 young people have acquired the wider knowledge and skills in scientific literacy that they will  
12 need in adult life. Figure 1 illustrates that PISA aims to study scientific literacy  
13 comprehensively, taking a variety of aspects into account. Referring to the structure of the  
14 framework, several questions can be pursued, such as: What are appropriate contexts to test  
15 scientific literacy? What competencies, knowledge and attitudes can reasonably be expected  
16 from 15-year-old students?

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 please insert Figure 1 here: Framework for the PISA 2006 science assessment (derived from  
40 OECD, 2006, p. 26)

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 PISA informs participating countries of the extent to which their students are prepared  
47 for the knowledge society at age 15. From the scientific literacy perspective described above,  
48 it is instructive to look at the relation between science performance and science interest at a  
49 country level. Are the countries which are successful with regard to science performance as  
50 good with regard to fostering student interest? First results from PISA 2006 (OECD, 2007b,  
51 p.54) suggest that this is not necessarily the case. Students in Finland as the best performing  
52 country in science in PISA 2006, display remarkably low interest in science, as do students in  
53 other high performing countries like the Netherlands, New Zealand, the UK and Australia.

1  
2  
3 Only in a few countries, among them Germany, Japan and Austria, do we find an adequate  
4  
5 level of interest in terms of the comprehensive definition of scientific literacy. Findings like  
6  
7 this require a closer look at interest and its structure.  
8  
9

10 Interests play an important role in initiating, steering and retaining the engagement in  
11  
12 specific domains and learning processes (Renninger, Hidi, & Krapp, 1992; Schiefele, 2009).  
13

14 In educational research, interest has been conceptualised as a phenomenon that emerges from  
15  
16 a person's interaction with an object or a certain content (Krapp, 2002). The personal side of  
17  
18 this model has been well elaborated. Research has focused on a variety of the person aspects  
19  
20 of the theory, e.g. attention (Ainley, Hidi, & Berndorff, 2002; Hidi, Renninger, & Krapp,  
21  
22 2004), goals (Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, & Elliot, 2002; Pintrich & Zusho, 2002; Sansone  
23  
24 & Smith, 2000) or levels of learning (Alexander & Murphy, 1998; Hoffmann, 2002; Köller,  
25  
26 Baumert, & Schnabel, 2001). Interests, however, are not sufficiently described when looked  
27  
28 at only from the personal side. The objects and domains of interest are sometimes described  
29  
30 as opportunity structures for the development of interest. In most approaches, interest is  
31  
32 regarded as being domain specific (Häussler & Hoffmann, 1998; see also Krapp & Prenzel,  
33  
34 this volume). Nevertheless, a much smaller research body can be found on the object aspect  
35  
36 (e.g. Prenzel, 1992; Renninger, Ewen, & Lasher, 2002; Todt & Schreiber, 1998) of interest.  
37  
38 The topological perspective Häussler and colleagues adopted for the Leibniz-Institute for  
39  
40 Science Education (IPN) study on physics interest focuses on the structure of the domain  
41  
42 (Häussler, 1987; Hoffmann, Häussler, & Lehrke, 1998). In their topological model of physics  
43  
44 interest, they disentangle specific topics, contexts in which the topics are represented and  
45  
46 activities in which the individual can engage. Students are systematically confronted with  
47  
48 topics, application areas and activities related to physics.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 This strategy was stimulating for the development of the embedded interest measures  
58  
59 in PISA. While the IPN study used short texts to inform students about the actual topics, PISA  
60  
2006 refers to the situated assessment approach used in the cognitive tests.

### Why Embedded Interest Measures?

In science education, constructivist principles have been discussed for a long time (Duit & Treagust, 2003; Fraser & Tobin, 1998). Researchers emphasise the relevance of situations and contexts for understanding and for the construction of meaning, aspects that are also very relevant for valid assessments. PISA takes this into account, and subsequently designs its cognitive items in such a way that they provide a situation or context which puts students into the role of problem solvers in a specific situation. For its innovative interest measure, PISA takes advantage of this structure, even though it has some caveats that will be discussed below.

To construct the embedded interest measure, the structure of the cognitive test was used with its thematically differentiated units. A short description of the topic using a text, a picture and/or a graph, is followed by a number of test items that relate to the stimulus in the beginning. The stimulus introduces the topic and, at the same time, situates and contextualises the test items. In order to find out more about the role a certain context or content could play in the motivational processes, the interest measures are inserted at the end of a number of items of the cognitive test. Instead of giving rather unspecific indicators of being interested in domains like 'physics' or 'cell biology', students are asked to indicate their interest in specific topics. Interest is measured by asking whether or not a student would like to know more about what tooth decay bacteria look like under a microscope or to learn how the body recovers after stopping smoking. Students state their interest in a unipolar Likert-type rating scale.

With this methodological approach, used for the first time in 2006, PISA goes beyond the scope of traditional questionnaires. One major problem of conventional questionnaire-based interest measures (and also the PISA interest questionnaire) is that in most cases, a relatively small number of interest items covers broad fields of contents and contexts. The resulting interest measure is rather global and does not give a precise picture of the huge and multifaceted field of science. Students have to give abstracted judgments (Schwarz, 1999),

1  
2  
3 which are far more likely to be biased than concrete judgments. In order to give information  
4  
5 about science interest, students need to summarise their interests in cell biology, astronomy,  
6  
7 mechanics and many other scientific areas.  
8  
9

10 The PISA 2006 science test makes a first attempt to systematically differentiate a  
11  
12 number of contexts (i.e. life situations that involve science and technology: health, natural  
13  
14 resources, environment, hazards, but also the frontiers of science and technology) and a  
15  
16 variety of knowledge areas (living systems, physical systems, technology systems or earth and  
17  
18 space systems) which are relevant from a scientific literacy perspective (see Figure 1, OECD,  
19  
20 2006). Therefore, the item pool for the cognitive test offers a comprehensive constellation of  
21  
22 science contexts and contents for measuring interests differentiated. As opposed to a  
23  
24 traditional questionnaire, the embedded interest items offer a basis of rich information on  
25  
26 concrete, situated and contextualised science topics.  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 In principle the interest structure could be described along the dimensions of the  
32  
33 cognitive test. Several constraints, however, have to be taken into account. As a large scale  
34  
35 study, PISA is carried out using a rotated booklet design that allows for a high number of test  
36  
37 items in a limited span of time. Employing a rotated booklet design in an assessment means  
38  
39 that not every student receives all test items. The rotated booklet design provides students  
40  
41 with a balanced choice of items which represent only a small fraction of the entire number of  
42  
43 items. In PISA 2006, 17% of the science testing time was devoted to attitudinal items;  
44  
45 therefore, not all cognitive units were complemented by interest items. Interest items were  
46  
47 designed 'for suitable units' (OECD, 2009b); that is, interest items were constructed only for  
48  
49 a selection of units. In summary, this means that the data matrix for the embedded interest  
50  
51 measures is incomplete and much sparser than the data matrix for the cognitive science  
52  
53 assessment. With 52 items available from 13 units rotated over 13 booklets, our analysis  
54  
55 models cannot comprise all facets of interest. It is, however, an attempt towards a more  
56  
57 comprehensive picture.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 At first glance, the incomplete data structure is sufficient for analyses on an  
4 aggregated item level. A general indicator for interest in science can be successfully  
5 established on the data structure at hand. Using this aggregation, however, does not provide  
6 much extra information compared to the very global interest indicator based on the usual  
7 questionnaire approach in large-scale assessment. Thus, in order to disentangle dimensions of  
8 science interest in the PISA 2006 assessment, we refer to the interest item pool PISA  
9 produced.

10  
11 From a theoretical point of view, a first step towards a differentiation of the global  
12 interest in science could take into account the context and the knowledge aspects from the  
13 PISA framework, i.e. the knowledge of science dimension. Figure 1 displays the structure of  
14 scientific literacy as defined in PISA. The framed aspects were the focus of our attention: the  
15 life situations that involve science and technology (contexts) and the systems within which  
16 central knowledge aspects are systematised. For the theoretical reasons mentioned above,  
17 assuming that science interest is organised along domains and within the structure of a  
18 domain, focused on certain contents, contexts and activities (see Häussler & Hoffmann,  
19 1998), we expected those aspects to be relevant in identifying dimensions of science interest.

20  
21 In our study we adopted the argument that interest needs to be studied with regard to  
22 contents and contexts, in order to disentangle the object aspect of the person-object relation  
23 (Krapp, 2003). The PISA 2006 science assessment makes a first attempt to measure interests  
24 in the respective contexts.

25  
26 The core of the present study is the multidimensional scaling of the embedded interest  
27 items. Instead of a global indicator for science interest, we investigate a more differentiated  
28 description of different facets of science interest.

### 29 **Analysing Different Groups with Regard to Dimensions of Science Interest**

30  
31 Having found dimensions of science interest in the present data, we will pursue a  
32 number of questions that help to further clarify the picture by analysing group differences on

1  
2  
3 various levels. Research on science interest has always found remarkable gender differences  
4 (Gardner, 1998; Hoffmann, 2002), and consequently we take a look at the distribution of the  
5 interest dimensions among boys and girls.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Findings from PISA analyses on science interests show that the connection between  
11 science performance and science interest is complex and difficult to discern (OECD, 2007a,  
12 b). The relationship between interest in science and achievement (on an individual as well as  
13 on a country level) has been the subject of research for more than 40 years (e.g. Baumert &  
14 Köller, 1998; Osborne, Simon, & Collins, 2003), and thus we examine the connection  
15 between science performance and the dimensions of science interest. Earlier analyses show  
16 that high-performing students are overrepresented in the upper interest quartiles (Prenzel,  
17 Schütte, & Walter, 2007), even though not all high-performing students are highly interested  
18 in science. Interest is an important predictor of high-performing students' choice of a science-  
19 related career. In our analysis, we therefore focused on high-performing students (the upper  
20 performance quartile within a country), aiming at a more differentiated picture within this  
21 group.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 On a country level science performance and science interest do not necessarily  
39 correspond in an educationally desired way. In some countries, low performance is associated  
40 with extremely high interest and vice versa. In order to reduce the complexity of this  
41 relationship, we decided to work with a selection of OECD countries. We chose a group of  
42 countries that is rather homogeneous with regard to performance and can be compared to one  
43 another in terms of the significance of the natural sciences and technology in society. The  
44 criterion for the choice of these countries was ranging above the OECD average on the  
45 combined science performance scale. Fourteen countries were included in these analyses.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 Characteristics of the school systems and aspects of science teaching vary across the  
58 OECD countries (OECD, in prep.). Learning environments and their degree of stimulation  
59 with respect to the (natural) sciences are an important basis for the development of interests  
60

1  
2  
3 (Krapp & Prenzel, this volume). Fostering scientific literacy means supporting the  
4  
5 development of science competencies along with the development of science interest. On a  
6  
7 country level, it is helpful to know the general level of science interest and tendencies in the  
8  
9 distribution of dimensions of interest and learning preferences among 15 year olds. For  
10  
11 example, this information is crucial for purposes like reducing and essentialising curricula.  
12  
13

14  
15 Most of the countries selected for our analyses already suffer from or at least threaten  
16  
17 to suffer from a lack of specialised workforce in the natural sciences (OECD, 2009a). Science  
18  
19 interest is an important predictor of students' choice of a science-related career (OECD,  
20  
21 2006). Hence, from a motivational perspective, students with specialised interests are an  
22  
23 interesting group to study. This group of students is characterised by a one-sided high interest  
24  
25 in one dimension of interest with complementary low interest in the other dimension. Such an  
26  
27 orientation might even approach a well-developed interest, which is a very sophisticated stage  
28  
29 in the development of interest according to Hidi and Renninger (2006). It is interesting to pay  
30  
31 special attention to students belonging to this group. As the selection of countries chosen for  
32  
33 our analysis is strongly dependent on young scientists it is vital for those countries' schools to  
34  
35 foster interest and engagement in science in order to convince as many highly interested and  
36  
37 high-performing students as possible to make their vocational choice accordingly.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Research Questions**

44  
45 As mentioned above, the aim of this study is to explore the contribution of the  
46  
47 embedded items for a deeper understanding of facets of science interest. Therefore, the first  
48  
49 part of our analyses comprises the questions: Can interest in science be disaggregated with  
50  
51 regard to specific components of scientific literacy? Do we find specific dimensions of  
52  
53 science interest by which we can describe interest more precisely than in just one global  
54  
55 science interest score? We expect that either the contexts PISA provides with the test units or  
56  
57 the areas of scientific knowledge could be the basis of our disentangling analysis.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Once we have found dimensions of science interest, we analyse group differences on  
4 an individual and a country level: We examine the distribution of interest dimensions with  
5 regard to gender and to performance groups (high-performing students).  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Further, on a country level, we ask: Do we find specific preferences according to the  
11 dimensions of interest? Does the distribution of interests vary with respect to different high-  
12 performing OECD countries?  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Eventually, we ask for specific profiles of interests in the high-performing countries.  
18 Do we find countries where the group of students with a one-sided high interest in one  
19 dimension with complementary low interest in the other dimension is larger than in others  
20 (and vice versa)?  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 **Methods**

### 28 **Sampling Procedures**

29 The following data analyses and results are based on the international dataset from  
30 PISA 2006: a representative sample of 15-year-old students assessed in all 30 participating  
31 OECD countries with the instruments of PISA 2006. The total number of students analysed is  
32 251 278 and the population covered by these students is 12 933 228 fifteen year olds from the  
33 OECD countries. For the purpose of analysing the multidimensional structure, a random  
34 sample of 10% of the cases of the complete dataset was used, and a sample size of 25 476  
35 OECD students was reached. In order to report further findings for OECD countries later in  
36 this paper, for each analysis the full sample was used. These analyses also employed the PISA  
37 survey weights.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 **Item Pool**

53 Within the science assessment, interest items were constructed for 18 out of 37 science  
54 units. Seventeen percent of the testing time in science was devoted to the attitudinal  
55 component. The attitudinal assessment comprises items on 'interest in science', 'support for  
56 scientific enquiry' and the 'responsibility towards resources and environment' (OECD, 2006).  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our study focuses on the interest aspect of the attitudinal component of scientific literacy,  
4  
5 which was measured with 52 interest items embedded in 18 units.  
6  
7

### 8 **Test Format and Administration**

9

10 After having worked on the cognitive items, students were asked to rate their interest  
11  
12 in the topics, objects and activities with which they had just been confronted. Three-item  
13  
14 scales were constructed to measure interest within each of the units using four-point Likert-  
15  
16 type scales from 'high interest' to 'no interest'. The generic item construction principle  
17  
18 focuses the assessment of epistemic interest, e.g. knowing more, understanding better and  
19  
20 learning more how/about. The questions were highlighted in grey to ensure that students  
21  
22 regarded those questions as an extra part of the assessment which was not part of the  
23  
24 cognitive science test. Students were told that there was no right or wrong solution to the  
25  
26 questions. Figure 2 gives an example for the items.  
27  
28

29  
30 please insert Figure 2 here: Example Items for interest in science. (Source: OECD, 2009b,  
31  
32 p.36, for the cognitive unit, see p.104f.)  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 **Multidimensional Scaling of Interest in Science Items**

40

41 In order to disentangle science interest we considered the contexts and the knowledge  
42  
43 of science categories as potential criteria. Following our theoretical assumptions from  
44  
45 scientific literacy and, from an interest perspective, assuming that an object of interest is  
46  
47 determined by contents (in the PISA framework the knowledge of science dimension), as well  
48  
49 as by contexts, we analysed the interest items with regard to their science content. The  
50  
51 contexts are operationalised as areas of application in the PISA 2006 framework (Figure 1),  
52  
53 labelled as Frontiers of Science, Hazards, Environment, Health and Others. The contents  
54  
55 distinguished in the PISA 2006 framework are living systems, technology systems, physical  
56  
57 systems, earth and space systems (Figure 3).  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Data analyses were performed using multidimensional item response models  
4 specifying either context- or content-specific interests as dimensions measured by the  
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

Data analyses were performed using multidimensional item response models specifying either context- or content-specific interests as dimensions measured by the respective interest items from the assessment. Note that science items measuring science performance were not used in these models. A multidimensional generalisation of the partial credit model (Masters, 1982) assuming equal slopes for all items was used to scale the item responses.

To find an adequate multidimensional model, we compared several multidimensional models, starting with one for the contexts, one for the contents and a unidimensional model as a control. The best fitting model was chosen using several selection criteria: (a) The number of interest items available for each context or content dimension must be sufficient. Given the rotated booklet design and the fact that only some science units were complemented with interest items, it is important to achieve a reasonably large proportion of students with observed interest items for each dimension. From a psychometrical perspective, we compared different multidimensional models with regard to several criteria: (b) the likelihood based fit index Bayesian information criterion BIC (Bozdogan, 1987), (c) the estimated latent person variances, and (d) reliabilities of the interest dimensions based on Expected A Posteriori estimates (EAP) were employed in order to test to what degree the dimensions discriminate interest between students. Additionally, (e) we compared average variances of the measurement errors as indicators for the precision of the interest estimates. All model results are reported in the logit metric defined by a multidimensional Rasch model with slopes fixed to either zero or one. The interest parameters refer to the mean item difficulty being zero within each scale. In order to investigate item fit, generalised partial credit models with slope parameters were employed, fixing a slope either to zero or estimating it. All multidimensional models were specified as (restricted) general diagnostic models (von Davier, 2007) and estimated via maximising the marginal likelihood using the *egpcm* software by von Davier (2009).

## Results

### Disaggregated Science Interest

The first question asked for specific dimensions of science interest by which we can describe interest more precisely than through just one global science interest score. Pursuing this question required a reorganisation of the science units in order to identify meaningful dimensions of science interest. We considered the contexts and the knowledge of science categories as potential criteria (see Figure 1). In a first step, two 4-dimensional models were specified, one on contexts and the other on contents. Due to small item numbers, 'Health' and 'Environment' in the context model (M1, Table 1) were collapsed prior to the analysis. For the contexts model (M2, Table 1), three items that were not allocated to a context originally were considered close enough to be assigned to living systems. Thus, all model comparisons are based on all 52 interest items.

# please insert Table 1 here: Multi-dimensional interest models, scale definitions and results

The dimensions of these models and the respective numbers of items are reported in Table 1, as well as scale means, variances, reliabilities, average error variances of the EAP estimates and correlation matrices. Note that all results in this section were computed on a 10% random sample of the full dataset of N=25 476 students without employing survey weights. The table further displays results from two more models derived from the contents model (M2): To construct alternative models with more items in their dimensions, we reorganised the dimensions of knowledge of science with regard to their content. To eliminate the dimensions consisting of only five items, an alternative model with three content dimensions (M3) is proposed. The former living systems dimension now includes three items on earth and space (from the unit 'dinosaurs') and the former physical systems dimension now includes another two items (from the unit 'moon'). The earth and space units were

1  
2  
3 redistributed: the unit on dinosaurs was allocated to the living systems category, the unit on  
4  
5 the moon was assigned to the physical/technology systems category as this is more focused on  
6  
7 physical than on living system aspects.  
8  
9

10 Another model (M4) further collapses physical systems and technology systems into  
11  
12 one dimension. The new categories comprise living systems and physical/technology systems  
13  
14 in a broader sense and are illustrated in Figure 3. The physical and the technological systems  
15  
16 categories are taken together as one dimension. The results of the estimation of these two  
17  
18 further models are also reported in Table 1. As a control model, Table 1 also displays the  
19  
20 results of a unidimensional model (M5).  
21  
22  
23

24 Table 2 presents likelihood results which allow for comparing the goodness of fit from  
25  
26 these five models. With respect to the BIC, the model on four content dimensions (M2) fits  
27  
28 the data best, the model on four context dimensions fits the data second best, model M3 on  
29  
30 three contents fits the data third best, followed by model 4 on two content dimensions. As  
31  
32 expected, the unidimensional model has the worst fit among all five models. Since models  
33  
34 M1, M2 and M3 are rather close in their BIC index, each of these models could potentially be  
35  
36 used to describe the structure of interest in science.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 please insert table 2 here: Multi-dimensional interest models, goodness of fit  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 M2 shows the highest standard deviations and reliabilities among all five models (see  
49  
50 Table 1), indicating that these four dimensions best discriminate students' interests in science.  
51  
52 However, the standard deviations and reliabilities of model M1 are similar. The three content  
53  
54 dimensions of model M3 are virtually the same as the respective content dimensions in model  
55  
56 M2. The standard deviations and reliabilities from the two-dimensional content model are  
57  
58 close to the respective content dimensions of M3 and M2, quite close for living systems and  
59  
60 somewhat smaller for the collapsed dimension physical/technology systems. The

1  
2  
3 unidimensional model shows the smallest standard deviation and a rather high reliability.  
4  
5 Note that the reliabilities given are derived from EAP estimates, and thus are based on the  
6  
7 items of the respective dimensions and on the covariance among all dimensions of a model.  
8  
9  
10 The average error variance (of the EAPs) of each dimension provides a closer look into the  
11  
12 measurement precision of the estimates. This error variance obviously correlates with the  
13  
14 number of items: M5 shows the smallest error, while the dimension defined on five items for  
15  
16 earth and space systems in model M2 shows the greatest error. In terms of measurement error  
17  
18 the unidimensional model and model M4 are considered best; the other three models are less  
19  
20 precise in measuring their dimensions.  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Another indicator for the appropriateness of a model might be the fit of its items.  
26  
27 Table 3 presents the number of items from each model that do not fit well according to the  
28  
29 root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) between the expected and observed item  
30  
31 characteristic curves. A value greater than 0.05 is regarded as an indication of the misfit of a  
32  
33 particular item. The numbers of non-fitting items range from 9 items in M4 to 17 items from  
34  
35 the total of 52 items in M1.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 please insert table 3 here: Multi-dimensional interest models, number of non fitting items  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 In order to check whether these misfits might be explained by a bad fit of the items  
47  
48 into the assumed multidimensional structures expressed by the models, we reestimated the  
49  
50 five models, specifying different slopes for each item. Thus, the reestimated models are  
51  
52 multidimensional generalisations of a generalised partial credit model (GPCM), with two  
53  
54 parameters for each item (labelled 2PL). The numbers of non-fitting items are given in Table  
55  
56 3; Table 4 shows the likelihood results for the reestimated 'slopes'-models.  
57  
58  
59  
60

please insert table 4 here: Multi-dimensional interest models with slopes, goodness of fit

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 With respect to the BIC, the reestimated slopes models show a better fit than the  
7  
8 respective multidimensional Rasch models, as expected (Table 4). With estimated slopes, the  
9  
10 three contents model M3 seems to be the best fitting model. Allowing each item to fit into the  
11  
12 multidimensional structure to its own degree obviously reduces the number of dimensions  
13  
14 needed to explain the observed responses. The descriptive statistics, variances, correlations  
15  
16 and reliabilities of these models are quite similar to the values of the corresponding  
17  
18 multidimensional Rasch models (see Table 1) and are not reported here.  
19  
20  
21

22 The number of non-fitting items from the slopes models range from zero to nine items  
23  
24 (see Table 3). For the unidimensional model M5 and the two contents model M4, all item  
25  
26 misfits seem to be due to an unfitting (too restrictive) multidimensional structure, since these  
27  
28 items fit when estimating their slopes. For the other three models, the results are somewhat  
29  
30 more complex. Assuming higher dimensional models fitting the data (M1, M2 and M3), the  
31  
32 number of non-fitting items should become smaller. However, with higher dimensional  
33  
34 models, the discriminations of the dimensions increase as well and the item fit statistic shows  
35  
36 a higher sensibility to item misfit. By allowing slopes for these models, however, the number  
37  
38 of non-fitting items is reduced, even if some items with bad fit remain.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 An inspection of the slope parameters reveals which items do not fit well into the  
44  
45 dimensional structure. By definition, in our slopes models, the mean of the slopes is set to  
46  
47 one. If a generalised Rasch model holds as well, most slope parameters will be close to one.  
48  
49 With the unidimensional slopes model M5-2PL, most items show slopes around 1, ranging  
50  
51 from about 0.8 to 1.2; only some single items and the items from units S519 'airbags' and  
52  
53 S527 'extinction of the dinosaurs' show lower slopes, down to 0.6. The items of unit S519 fit  
54  
55 well within the three- and four-dimensional slope models M3-2PL and M2-2PL. The items in  
56  
57 unit S527 only show slopes sufficiently close to one in the four contents model M2-2PL.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Given the results presented above, choosing a multidimensional model according to  
4 different criteria will result in different choices. Discriminative power (i.e. standard deviation  
5 and reliabilities) would allow the use of both four-dimensional models, supported by the  
6 global model fit. With a high priority for measurement precision and for not having too few  
7 items in a dimension, one could decide to base further reporting on the three content model  
8 M3. If the numbers of items for each dimension should also be fairly well balanced, the two  
9 content models M4 would be optimal.

### 20 **Results for the Dimensions of Interest in the OECD Countries**

21  
22 In the remainder of this paper, we present interest results for OECD countries. Even  
23 though other models are more sophisticated and fine-grained, the distinction between living  
24 systems on the one hand and physical and technological systems on the other resembles the  
25 content structure of science as a domain very well, as seen from a student perspective. The  
26 distinction provides the strongest contrast, both psychologically and regarding the content  
27 aspect of interest. Vocational choices are made along these categories, too, as they reveal a  
28 typical area of tension. We therefore further analyse student interests with regard to the two  
29 content subscales of science interest of model M4, physical/technology systems, based on 22  
30 items and living systems, based on 30 items. This model's dimensions are illustrated in Figure  
31 3.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 please insert Figure 3 here: The Reorganisation of the Knowledge of Science-Categories  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 In a first step, the two dimensions of interest were analysed for the OECD countries'  
54 sample. The results are presented on a logit scale defined by the item response model; all  
55 results reported below were computed on the complete country samples using the PISA  
56 survey weights. The mean (M) for the living systems dimension is  $M=0.34$ , with Standard  
57 Deviation  $SD=1.45$  and Standard Error  $S.E.=0.013$ . For the physical/technology systems, we  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 find  $M=0.33$  with  $SD=1.47$  and  $S.E.=0.012$ . The latent correlation between the two  
4  
5 dimensions is  $r_{\text{living systems, physical/technology systems}} = 0.80$ . The latent correlation shows a  
6  
7 remarkable overlap between the two dimensions which, however, tends to be somewhat lower  
8  
9 than the correlation between the performance in the different PISA domains (OECD, 2009b,  
10  
11 p. 215). This finding once again supports the result that the two dimensions of science interest  
12  
13 can be seen as two distinct categories.  
14  
15

16  
17 We analysed gender differences at a country level, i.e. for the entire sample of students  
18  
19 in the OECD countries. Figure 4 displays the results: The means for the interest dimensions  
20  
21 with regard to gender range from 0.21 to 0.45. Girls show a more pronounced interest in  
22  
23 topics in the field of living systems compared with the topics of Physical/Technology  
24  
25 Systems, and for boys it is the opposite, even though the differences between the dimensions  
26  
27 are slightly smaller for boys than for girls. For the living systems dimension, we find a small  
28  
29 difference between girls and boys ( $M_{\text{girls}} = 0.33$ ,  $S.E.=0.017$  vs.  $M_{\text{boys}} = 0.35$ ,  $S.E.=0.014$ ),  
30  
31 while it is larger (and statistically significant) for the Physical/Technology Systems dimension  
32  
33 ( $M_{\text{girls}} = 0.21$ ,  $S.E.=0.016$  vs.  $M_{\text{boys}} = 0.45$ ,  $S.E.=0.014$ ).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 please insert Figure 4 here: Gender differences for two dimensions of interest in the OECD  
42  
43 sample  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Using a subsample of students consisting of the students in the highest performance  
49  
50 quartile, we explored the question: Do high-performing students differ in the dimensions of  
51  
52 interest from the complete sample of students in the OECD countries? Figure 5 presents the  
53  
54 results, analysed separately for males and females.  
55  
56  
57  
58

59 # please insert Figure 5 here: Differences for high performing students (upper quartile) for the  
60  
two dimensions of interest versus the other students in the OECD sample

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Compared to the other students in the OECD sample, the students in the subsample of high-  
7  
8 performing students are significantly more interested in both dimensions of interest. This  
9  
10 applies for boys (53.6%) as well as for girls (46.4%). The gender differences among the high  
11  
12 performers go in the same direction as for the whole sample. The picture of gender  
13  
14 differences for the high-performing students resembles the situation of the entire OECD  
15  
16 sample, only on a higher level of interest. Boys and girls in the highest-performing quartile of  
17  
18 the sample are equally interested in living systems ( $M_{\text{girls}}=0.56$ ,  $S.E.=0.022$  vs.  $M_{\text{boys}} = 0.55$ ,  
19  
20  $S.E.=0.022$ ). For Physical/Technology Systems there is a clear and statistically significant  
21  
22 difference in favour of the boys:  $M_{\text{girls}} = 0.30$ ,  $S.E.=0.022$  vs.  $M_{\text{boys}} = 0.56$ ,  $S.E.=0.024$ . In  
23  
24 fact, the level of boys' interest in Physical/Technology Systems for the whole sample  
25  
26 ( $M=0.41$ ,  $S.E.=0.016$ ) is considerably higher than the high-performing girls' interest in this  
27  
28 dimension. The already small interest difference for males for the two dimensions dissolves  
29  
30 completely in the high-performing subpopulation: Boys in the highest quartile are equally  
31  
32 interested in Living and Physical/Technology Systems.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 In the next step we analysed whether or not the distribution of interests varies for the  
40  
41 OECD countries ranging significantly above the OECD mean in science performance. For  
42  
43 this analysis we compared 14 high performing OECD countries with the OECD average. On  
44  
45 first glance, Figure 6 displays remarkable differences in the interest structure of high-  
46  
47 performing countries.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 please insert Figure 6 here: Interest in living vs. physical/technology systems: all students  
54  
55  
56

57  
58 The scores for both interest dimensions in countries like Japan ( $M_{\text{living}} = 0.41$ ,  
59  
60  $S.E.=0.041$ ,  $M_{\text{phys./tech.}} = 0.44$ ,  $S.E.=0.043$ ), Austria ( $M_{\text{living}} = 0.31$ ,  $S.E.=0.051$ ,  $M_{\text{phys./tech.}} =$   
 $0.37$ ,  $S.E.=0.046$ ) and Germany ( $M_{\text{living}} = 0.39$ ,  $S.E.=0.038$   $M_{\text{phys./tech.}} = 0.44$ ,  $S.E.=0.043$ ) are

1  
2  
3 rather high, which means that they are similar to the OECD average. The fact that on the  
4  
5 OECD level the average interest is approximately similar to the countries with highly  
6  
7 interested students is due to the selection of (high-performing) countries: It is a common  
8  
9 finding in PISA that low-performing countries show considerable interest compared to high  
10  
11 performers. In other, likewise high-performing countries like the Netherlands ( $M_{\text{living}} = -0.38$ ,  
12  
13  $S.E.=0.045$   $M_{\text{phys./tech.}} = -0.34$ ,  $S.E.=0.043$ ), Finland ( $M_{\text{living}} = -0.43$ ,  $S.E.=0.045$ ,  $M_{\text{phys./tech.}} =$   
14  
15  $-0.34$ ,  $S.E.=0.044$ ) or New Zealand ( $M_{\text{living}} = -0.18$ ,  $S.E.=0.042$ ,  $M_{\text{phys./tech.}} = -0.24$ ,  
16  
17  $S.E.=0.042$ ), the interest scores are quite low for both dimensions of interest, compared to the  
18  
19 OECD average ( $M_{\text{living}} = 0.34$ ,  $S.E.=0.013$ ,  $M_{\text{phys./tech.}} = 0.33$ ,  $S.E.=0.012$ ). Regarding the  
20  
21 dimensions of interest we also find considerable differences within the countries: As opposed  
22  
23 to the OECD means which indicates slightly higher interest for the living systems dimension  
24  
25 than for the physical/technology systems dimension, we find an interest preference for  
26  
27 physical/technology systems in a number of high-performing countries: Ireland, Austria,  
28  
29 Germany, the Netherlands, Japan and Finland. It needs to be mentioned that in some countries  
30  
31 this difference is on a rather high-interest level, in others on a low level, each compared to the  
32  
33 OECD average. In order to have a realistic impression of the differences we translated the  
34  
35 displayed scores back to the original values on the interest scale. The four-point Likert scale  
36  
37 comprises the categories 0 = no interest, 1 = low interest, 2 = medium interest and 3 = high  
38  
39 interest. On average for the entire OECD sample, the mean for the two interest dimensions is  
40  
41  $M_{\text{rawscore-living}} = 1.66$  and  $M_{\text{rawscore-phys/tech.}} = 1.63$ . For the Netherlands, for example, one of the  
42  
43 countries with the lowest interests, the means are  $M_{\text{living}} = 1.32$  and  $M_{\text{phys/tech.}} = 1.32$ .

52  
53 Finally we asked for specific profiles of interest dimensions in the high performing  
54  
55 countries. We asked whether, within a country, we could identify groups of students scoring  
56  
57 high on one dimension of interest while the other dimension is of minor interest for them. In  
58  
59 order to answer this question we calculated interest ratios for the high-performing countries.  
60  
The analysis was carried out by applying a median split of interest scores in both dimensions

1  
2  
3 within the data of the OECD countries differentiating higher versus lower interest in each of  
4 the interest dimensions. The OECD acts as the reference group for this analysis. We then  
5 analysed profiles of students indicating higher or lower interest in living systems and  
6 physical/technology systems. In the OECD, 9% of the students were found to indicate a  
7 profiled interest either way rather than indicating a higher or lower interest in both  
8 dimensions.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 please insert Table 5 here: Interest Profiles for the high performing OECD-countries  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Table 5 displays the percentages of students with (nonprofiled and) profiled interests.  
26 On the OECD level a total of 82% of the students are 'nonprofiled', i.e. they either score high  
27 or low in both dimensions of interest (Column 2 and 5). The interesting groups are 9% of the  
28 students who are either not interested in living systems while they are at the same time highly  
29 interested in physical/technology systems (Column 3), and another 9% of the students who  
30 are highly interested in living systems and score low in the physical/technology dimension  
31 (Column 4). If we look at Finland, the highest performing OECD country in science, we find  
32 that 63.7% of the students are not interested in either dimension of science interest. Column 3  
33 describes the percentages of students with profiled interests: In Finland, 9.9% of the students  
34 are strongly interested in physical/technology systems and not interested in living systems,  
35 slightly more than on the OECD level. The interests for the group of students in Column 4 are  
36 profiled vice versa. Those students are highly interested in living systems and hardly  
37 interested in physical/technology systems. For Finland as an example country, such students  
38 represent 6.7% of the sample, less than for the OECD sample. Column 5 displays the students  
39 who score high in both dimensions of science interest, which applies for 19.8% of the Finnish  
40 students. The last column gives a ratio that allows an estimation in comparison to the OECD  
41 mean: A ratio below 1 implies that the group of students who are not interested in living  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 systems while at the same time they are interested in physical/technology systems is larger  
4  
5 than the group where it is vice versa. Finland is an example country that shows that, compared  
6  
7 to the OECD average, there is a larger group with one-sided interest in Physical/Technology  
8  
9 Systems and a smaller group of students whose interest profile is the other way around. This  
10  
11 also applies for Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, the UK, Austria and Ireland. Canada, New  
12  
13 Zealand, Australia, Korea, the Czech Republic, Switzerland and Belgium are the high-  
14  
15 performing OECD countries where it is the other way around: In those countries the group of  
16  
17 students which is unidirectionally interested in living systems is larger than in the OECD  
18  
19 average.  
20  
21  
22  
23

### 24 **Discussion and Conclusion**

25  
26  
27 This study aimed at exploring new methodological approaches to optimise the  
28  
29 analyses of the insights from PISA data, i.e. the embedded science interest assessment. Our  
30  
31 paper provides an approach to generate additional information on student interest in science  
32  
33 by disentangling dimensions of the PISA interest assessment.  
34  
35

36  
37 The empirical results showed that all multidimensional models have the potential to  
38  
39 discriminate students along all dimensions of science interest analysed here. With regard to  
40  
41 global model fit, the four-dimensional models are well suited to describe the interest structure;  
42  
43 however, the three- and two-dimensional content models are applicable as well. The fit of  
44  
45 single items was analysed by an item fit statistic and by estimating slopes in alternative slope  
46  
47 models. An inspection of the estimated slopes revealed that with a few exceptions, all items  
48  
49 fit into the multidimensional structure of the four-dimensional content model. Two units were  
50  
51 found to fit within the four-dimensional content model M2 but not within any of the other  
52  
53 models.  
54  
55

56  
57 In summary, the multidimensional analyses seem to be best suited to reflecting the  
58  
59 dimensionality of the interest items model M2. Thus, the assessment of a multidimensional  
60  
structure of interest aimed at with the embedded items was successful. However, defining a

1  
2  
3 dimension on only five items does not warrant stable results from further analyses. Therefore,  
4  
5 we constructed alternative models on three and two dimensions. With further analyzing M3  
6  
7 instead of M2 or M4 instead of M3, reporting may lose a bit of the potential to obtain  
8  
9 differential insights into science interest structure but gains stability in the results. With regard  
10  
11 to the numbers of items in each dimension, it might be indicated to report interest along the  
12  
13 content dimensions based on the three- or two-dimensional models M3 or M4.  
14  
15

16  
17 From a methodological perspective, however, some remaining challenges should be  
18  
19 pointed out. The main disadvantage of implementing the innovative approach in PISA 2006  
20  
21 lies in the small number of interest items distributed over a complex rotated booklet design:  
22  
23 This does not necessarily support a fine-grained analysis of interest dimensions and their  
24  
25 interrelations. In order to examine interest dimension structures more comprehensively, a  
26  
27 higher number of embedded items in the respective dimensions would be helpful. Ideally, if  
28  
29 more testing time could have been allocated for the embedded attitudinal items, a minimum of  
30  
31 3 units comprising 9 interest items for each designated dimension within the 29 newly  
32  
33 constructed science units in PISA 2006 would have been appropriate. Our analyses contribute  
34  
35 to a better estimation of the required number of items. Even if the test construction is a very  
36  
37 complicated procedure and the required number of items is high, we find the results at hand  
38  
39 already quite instructive and we conclude that eventually, it would be very interesting to  
40  
41 pursue this approach. If it is too complicated to do so in a large scale format that employs a  
42  
43 rotated booklet design, it could instead be carried out in other studies, even in other-large  
44  
45 scale studies like in standard-based assessments where all students work on all test items.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 For further reporting in this paper we choose model M4 differentiating science interest  
54  
55 along the prominent distinction in life sciences, living systems in terms of PISA and rather  
56  
57 hard, physical and technological sciences, called physical systems and technology systems in  
58  
59 PISA. According to these two categories, we found gender differences that support findings  
60  
from a number of studies and indicate that males and females are about equally interested in

1  
2  
3 living systems, while males' interest in physical/technology systems is higher than that of  
4  
5 females. This also applies for students in the upper quartile of the performance scale. The  
6  
7 interest level in the group of high-performing students is higher than in the entire sample.  
8  
9 Boys and girls show considerable interest on a comparable level. High-performing girls are  
10  
11 less interested in Physical/Technology Systems than the boys of the same group.  
12  
13

14  
15 From a teaching perspective it is important to understand the students' motivational  
16  
17 situation and to know their learning preferences in order to adaptively foster interests and to  
18  
19 design instruction in a way that meets specific learning preferences (Darling-Hammond &  
20  
21 Bransford, 2005). This is supported by the results presented. Knowing the preferences and  
22  
23 special interests of students, boys as well as girls, can help to improve instruction in the  
24  
25 natural sciences.  
26  
27

28  
29 Studying the high-performing countries resulted in interesting findings: Firstly, for  
30  
31 high performing countries in the OECD sample we find considerable differences in the level  
32  
33 of interest. Figure 6 shows that high performance in a country is not necessarily  
34  
35 complemented with high interest levels. The ideal stated in the definition of scientific literacy  
36  
37 in PISA is not reached in a number of countries. Taking a closer look at the dimensions of  
38  
39 interest reveals further considerable differences. In some countries students prefer living  
40  
41 systems, while in other countries physical/technology systems are of higher interest to  
42  
43 students.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 So-called profiled interests were also studied: For the high-performing countries, the  
50  
51 group of students with high interest in one dimension complemented with a low level of  
52  
53 interest in the other dimension and vice versa was studied. We found countries with profiles  
54  
55 in favour of the living systems dimension with a higher percentage of students in this group  
56  
57 and countries where the profiled group with a preference for the Physical/Technology  
58  
59 Systems is larger, as shown in the ratio built in comparison to the reference ratio of 1 on the  
60  
OECD level.

1  
2  
3 From an educational systems perspective, these findings on the country level are very  
4  
5 instructive with regard to fostering interests. For high-performing countries it is interesting to  
6  
7 know how successful they are in fostering interest in science and at the same time enabling  
8  
9 the development of high performance in science.  
10  
11

12 Students with specialised interests are also very interesting from a teaching  
13  
14 perspective. They indicate high interest in one dimension while simultaneously disregarding  
15  
16 the other dimension. In societies which are in need of specialised scientists, these groups can  
17  
18 be very important, as interests play an important role in vocational choices. Another  
19  
20 perspective is the educational goal of supporting the development of competence along with  
21  
22 the development of interests. Fostering interests could be a differentiated and systematic  
23  
24 process, starting from an area of interest and transferring to aspects in the wider context of  
25  
26 one topic. Hence, the interest profiles can be helpful in finding out about learning preferences  
27  
28 in relation to the need to foster interests.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The present findings leave some questions unanswered; therefore, analyses will be  
35  
36 conducted in order to further describe students' interest in more detail, in terms of their  
37  
38 connection to students' views on a science-related career or background variables like  
39  
40 socioeconomic factors or other parental variables.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


## References

- Ainley, M., Hidi, S., & Berndorff, D. (2002). Interest, learning, and the psychological processes that mediate their relationship. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(3), 545-561.
- Alexander, P. A., & Murphy, P. K. (1998). Profiling the differences in students' knowledge, interest, and strategic processing. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 435-447.
- Baumert, J., & Köller, O. (1998). Interest research in secondary level I: An overview. In L. Hoffmann, A. Krapp, K. A. Renninger, & J. Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and Learning* (pp. 241-256). Kiel, Germany: IPN.
- Bozdogan, H. (1987): Model selection and Akaike's information criterion (AIC): The general theory and its analytical extensions. *Psychometrika, 52*(3), 345-370.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Duit, R., & Treagust, D. (2003). Conceptual change--A powerful framework for improving science teaching and learning. *International Journal of Science Education 25*, 671-688.
- Fraser, B., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (1998). *International handbook of science education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Gardner, P. L. (1998). The development of males' and females' interests in science and technology. In L. Hoffmann, A. Krapp, K. A. Renninger, & J. Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and Learning* (pp. 41-57). Kiel, Germany: IPN.
- Harackiewicz, J.M. Barron, K.E., Tauer, J.M., & Elliot, A.J. (2002). Predicting success in college: A longitudinal study of achievement--Goals and ability measures as predictors of interest and performance from freshman year through graduation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(3), 562-575.

- 1  
2  
3 Häussler, P. (1987). Measuring students' interest in physics--Design and results of a cross-  
4  
5 sectional study in the Federal Republic of Germany. *International Journal of*  
6  
7 *Science Education*, 9, 79-92.  
8  
9  
10 Häussler, P., & Hoffmann, L. (1998). Qualitative differences in students' interest in physics  
11  
12 and the dependence on gender and age. In L. Hoffmann, A. Krapp, K. A. Renninger,  
13  
14 & J. Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and Learning* (pp. 280-289). Kiel, Germany: IPN.  
15  
16  
17 Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2006). The four-phase model of interest development.  
18  
19 *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 111-127.  
20  
21  
22 Hidi, S., Renninger, K. A., & Krapp, A. (2004). Interest, a motivational variable that  
23  
24 combines affective and cognitive functioning. In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.),  
25  
26 *Motivation, emotion, and cognition* (pp. 98-118). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.  
27  
28  
29 Hoffmann, L. (2002). Promoting girls' interest and achievement in physics classes for  
30  
31 beginners. *Learning and Instruction*, 12(4), 447-466.  
32  
33  
34 Hoffmann, L., Häussler, P., & Lehrke, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Die IPN-Interessenstudie Physik*.  
35  
36 Kiel, Germany: IPN.  
37  
38  
39 Köller, O., Baumert, J., & Schnabel, K. (2001). Does interest matter? The relationship  
40  
41 between academic interest and achievement in mathematics. *Journal for Research in*  
42  
43 *Mathematics Education*, 32, 448-470.  
44  
45  
46 Krapp, A. (2002). Structural and dynamic aspects of interest development: Theoretical  
47  
48 considerations from an ontogenetic perspective. *Learning and Instruction*, 12(4),  
49  
50 383-409.  
51  
52  
53 Krapp, A. (2003). Interest and human development: An educational-psychological  
54  
55 perspective. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Monograph Series II (2),  
56  
57 57-84 (Development and Motivation: Joint Perspective).  
58  
59  
60 Marshall, S., Scheppler, J., & Palmisano, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Science literacy for the 21st*  
*century*. Amherst, MA: Prometheus.

- 1  
2  
3 Masters, G. N. (1982). A Rasch model for partial credit scoring. *Psychometrika*, 47(2), 149-  
4  
5 174.  
6  
7  
8 Millar, R. (2006). Twenty first century science: Insights from the design and implementation  
9  
10 of a scientific literacy approach in school science. *International Journal of Science*  
11  
12 *Education*, 28(13), 1499-1521.  
13  
14  
15 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2006). *PISA assessing scientific,*  
16  
17 *reading and mathematical literacy: A framework for PISA 2006*. Paris: OECD.  
18  
19  
20 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2007a). *PISA 2006: Science*  
21  
22 *competencies for tomorrow's world--Volume I: Analysis*. Paris: OECD.  
23  
24  
25 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2007b). *PISA 2006: Science*  
26  
27 *competencies for tomorrow's world--Volume II: Data*. Paris: OECD.  
28  
29  
30 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009a). *Education at a glance*  
31  
32 *2009: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD.  
33  
34  
35 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009b). *PISA 2006 technical*  
36  
37 *report*. Paris: OECD.  
38  
39  
40 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (in prep.). *PISA 2006. Thematic*  
41  
42 *report: Teaching and learning of science*. Paris: OECD.  
43  
44  
45 Osborne, J., Simon, S., & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes towards science: A review of the  
46  
47 literature and its implications. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(9),  
48  
49 1049-1079.  
50  
51  
52 Pintrich, P. R., & Zusho, A. (2002). The development of academic self-regulation: The role of  
53  
54 cognitive and motivational factors. In A. Wigfield & J. S: Eccles (Eds.),  
55  
56 *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 249-284). San Diego, CA: Academic  
57  
58 Press.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Prenzel, M. (1992). The selective persistence of interest. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi, & A.  
4 Krapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 71-98).  
5 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Prenzel, M., Schütte, K., & Walter, O. (2007) Interesse an den Naturwissenschaften. In M.  
11 Prenzel, C. Artelt, J. Baumert, W. Blum, M. Hammann, E. Klieme, & R. Pekrun  
12 (Eds.), *PISA 2006. Die Ergebnisse der dritten internationalen Vergleichsstudie* (pp.  
13 107-124). Münster, Germany: Waxmann.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Renninger, K. A., Ewen, L., & Lasher, A. K. (2002). Individual interest as context in  
21 expository text and mathematical word problems. *Learning and Instruction*, 12(4),  
22 467-491.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Renninger, K. A., Hidi, S., & Krapp, A. (1992). *The role of interest in learning and*  
28 *development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.  
29  
30  
31 Sansone, C., & Smith, J. L. (2000). The 'how' of goal pursuit: Interest and self-regulation.  
32 *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 306-309.  
33  
34  
35  
36 Schiefele, U. (2009) Situational and Individual Interest. In K. A. Wentzel & A. Wigfield  
37 (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 197-222). New York: Routledge.  
38  
39  
40  
41 Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American*  
42 *Psychologist*, 54, 93-105.  
43  
44  
45  
46 Todt, E., & Schreiber, S. (1998). Development of interests. In L. Hoffmann, A. Krapp, K. A.  
47 Renninger, & J. Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and Learning* (pp. 25-40). Kiel, Germany:  
48 IPN.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53 von Davier, M. (2007). *Hierarchical general diagnostic models* (ETS Research Rep. No. RR-  
54 07-19). Princeton, NJ: ETS.  
55  
56  
57  
58 von Davier, M. (2009). *GuiDM general diagnostic model software* (version 31.08.2009).  
59 Princeton, NJ: ETS.  
60



**ACID RAIN**

How much interest do you have in the following information?

*Tick only one box in each row.*

	<i>High Interest</i>	<i>Medium Interest</i>	<i>Low Interest</i>	<i>No Interest</i>
a) Knowing which human activities contribute most to acid rain	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub>
b) Learning about technologies that minimise the emission of gases that cause acid rain	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub>
c) Understanding the methods used to repair buildings damaged by acid rain	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub>


<b>Categories of <i>knowledge of science</i></b>	<b>N of Items</b>
Living Systems	24
Physical Systems	11
Technology Systems	9
Earth and Space Systems	5
Not assigned to a category	3




<b>Interest Contents</b>	<b>N of Items</b>
Living Systems	30
Physical/Technology Systems	22


For Peer Review Only

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



Peer Review Only





view Only

Model	Scale	Number of items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability	Error Variance	Correlation Matrix			
M1 "contexts 4D"							health_env	frontiers	hazards	resources
	health_env	12	0.50	1,70	0.72	0.52	1			
	frontiers	17	0.29	1,52	0.66	0.42	0.70	1		
	hazards	12	0.60	1,65	0.72	0.59	0.64	0.68	1	
	resources	11	0.29	1,71	0.73	0.60	0.74	0.73	0.65	1
M2 "contents 4D"							earth & space	living	physical	technology
	earth & space	5	0.85	1,73	0.70	0.72	1			
	living	27	0.36	1,56	0.78	0.34	0.61	1		
	physical	11	0.61	1,65	0.64	0.62	0.57	0.65	1	
	technology	9	0.13	1,79	0.78	0.64	0.55	0.72	0.65	1
M3 "contents 3D"							living	physical	technology	
	living	30	0.40	1,51	0.79	0.31	1			
	physical	13	0.61	1,61	0.62	0.63	0.67	1		
	technology	9	0.13	1,79	0.78	0.65	0.71	0.64	1	
M4 "contents 2D"							living	physical/technology		
	living	30	0.39	1,49	0.79	0.31	1			
	physical/technology	22	0.38	1,50	0.63	0.46	0.74	1		
M5 "all items 1D"										
	total	52	0.38	1,40	0.77	0.26	1			

Model	log Likelihood	# parameters	N	BIC
M1 "contexts 4D"	-434849	776	25476	877572
M2 "contents 4D"	-434263	776	25476	876400
M3 "contents 3D"	-437975	277	25476	878761
M4 "contents 2D"	-442709	178	25476	887225
M5 "all items 1D"	-450253	160	25476	902129

For Peer Review Only

Model	Slopes model:	
	Items with low fit	Items with low fit
M1 "contexts 4D"	17	9
M2 "contents 4D"	11	6
M3 "contents 3D"	11	3
M4 "contents 2D"	9	0
M5 "all items 1D"	10	0

For Peer Review Only

Model	log Likelihood	# parameters	N	BIC
M1 "contexts 4D", 2PL	-432178	824	25476	872716
M2 "contents 4D", 2PL	-431975	824	25476	872311
M3 "contents 3D", 2PL	-434798	326	25476	870249
M4 "contents 2D", 2PL	-438746	228	25476	879805
M5 "all items 1D", 2PL	-444458	210	25476	891046

For Peer Review Only

	Interest profiles in %				Ratio
	living ↓ phys./tech. ↓	living ↓ phys./tech. ↑	living ↑ phys./tech. ↓	living ↑ phys./tech. ↑	
Finland	63.7	9.9	6.7	19.8	0.67
Canada	53.8	8.8	9.1	28.3	1.03
Japan	36.1	10.4	8.4	45.1	0.81
New Zealand	57.8	7.2	9.6	25.4	1.33
Australia	56.3	8.3	8.9	26.5	1.07
The Netherlands	64.4	8.5	8.4	18.6	0.98
Korea	47.7	9.3	10.3	32.7	1.10
Germany	36.3	10.7	10.0	43.0	0.94
United Kingdom	56.8	8.6	8.3	26.3	0.96
Czech Republic	46.5	8.6	11.1	33.9	1.29
Switzerland	40.1	10.3	11.0	38.7	1.07
Austria	38.3	12.3	9.9	39.5	0.80
Belgium	41.8	8.6	11.5	38.1	1.33
Ireland	49.7	10.7	9.3	30.3	0.87
<b>OECD countries</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>1</b>