
Shelley Ann Lipowich
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2622

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1988 Shelley Ann Lipowich
A COMPUTER-ASSISTED, BASE-LINE DESCRIPTION OF
THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS IN AN
EXEMPLARY, ELEMENTARY SCIENCE PROGRAM:
SCHAUMBURG ELEMENTARY DISTRICT 54

by
Shelley Ann Lipowich

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
October
1988
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my Dissertation Chair, Diane P. Schiller, and my Dissertation Committee: Jack A. Kavanagh, Howard S. Smucker, and Ralph W. Tyler, go my admiration and respect for providing guidance and leadership and for sharing both their professional abilities and their friendship. Their encouragement, counsel, critique, and support are invaluable. Dr. Tyler’s help in developing the Operational Definitions for this study is appreciated and valued.

To my Program Advisor, Mary Jane Gray, goes my promise to be as supportive of another student as she was of me.

To Larry Small and Bernard Osterberger, my mentors in Schaumburg during the year of my Doctoral Internship, and to Howard Smucker, my Internship Director, go my appreciation for the hours they spent training me; my desire to emulate their outstanding work; and my understanding of how Administration and Curriculum can be bonded together to form an exemplary process and product.

To the staffs of Armstrong School, the Science Center, and the Teachers Resource Center, go my grateful thanks for their wisdom, their support, and their friendship.

To the Schaumburg Fourth Grade Teachers named below and their classes of 1986-87, go my admiration for their skills and my delight in being permitted to share their science lessons:

Pilot Teachers: Margaret Dover, Lisa Juna, Karen Martin, Barbara Skiff; and Keith Anderson, Louis Axelrod, Elaine Beaghan, Judith Binder, Marie Burger, Mary Carlson, Felicia Cichy, Pat Cleek, Patricia Dewitt, Anne Donnell, Sara Engelson, Nancy Gaughan, Sanford Greenberg, Irene Hurban, Debra Kimball, Mary Lynch, Sandra Mestek, Darlene Muser, Edna Ortez, Donna Osmanski, Sandra Prescott, Patricia Russell, and Gary Whiting.

To my husband, Maury; our children, Alex and Jennie; and our parents, Reta and Zorro Ruben; go my grateful appreciation and abiding thankfulness for their patience, encouragement, and complete support throughout the completion of this study. To Alex Ben Lipowich go a special recognition and my gratitude for designing the computer program. To Scholl Communications, appreciation for their continuing personal and reprographic support.
Shelley Ann Lipowich was born in Chicago, Illinois, on April 17, 1939. Mrs. Lipowich earned a Bachelor of Science degree, with Honors, from the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign. Her Master of Arts degree was earned at Northeastern Illinois University in Chicago. Since November of 1987, Mrs. Lipowich has been an Academic Coordinator specializing in Science and Mathematics at the Lake County Educational Service Center in Illinois. She is Treasurer of Region 6 of the Illinois Junior Academy of Science and has served on the Board of the Northeast Illinois Mathematics Educators. She is the Project Director and Co-Editor, with Inna Kerrigan, of the Lake County Educational Service Center's "Local Math Assessment Instruments: Grades 3, 6, 8, and 11", and she edited, with Ralph W. Tyler, a set of "Operational Definitions for Process Skills in Science" that was developed by Lake County science teachers and administrators.

Mrs. Lipowich is the Facilitator for the Association of Supervision and Curriculum's Network on Designing District Evaluation Instruments for Math and Science Process Skills. She was also the convener and chair of an international Symposium on "Evaluating Process Skills in Science: The Real World and the Ideal World" that was held in April of 1988 at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</strong></td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VITA</strong></td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIST OF FIGURES</strong></td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENTS OF APPENDICES</strong></td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Problem</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Sputnik Science Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Search for Excellence</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Process Science</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Mandated Reforms in Science Education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for This Study</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHOD</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Research</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of Data</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalization Defined</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalizations: Categories and Examples</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorizing the Data</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. RESULTS</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Data</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data by Classes</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data by Units</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data by Sessions</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters of Skills</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highs and Lows</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Skills vs &quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's Happening in the Classroom vs What's on Paper</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS  (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DISCUSSION</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating Operational Definitions for the Process Skills</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Occurrence of Process Science Skills</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions for Future Study</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Science Reform in Illinois</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX E</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX F</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX G</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX H</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX 1</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Example of Schaumburg District 54's Process Science Objectives, Grade 4, Classified According to the State of Illinois' Goal 4 (Draft Copy)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Additional Categories</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cues and Codes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Verbalizations: Categories and Examples</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Summary Sheet of Verbalizations: Frequency of Process Science Skills-- Raw Scores and Percents by Unit, Class, and Session</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Class 1 Sessions 1-2 Buoyant Forces: Graph of Comparative Data</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Class 12 Session 1 Forces of Flying / Session 2 Mystery Powders: Graph of Comparative Data</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Artemia Salina: Graph of Comparative Data</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces: Graph of Comparative Data</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Forces of Flying: Graph of Comparative Data</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mystery Powders: Graph of Comparative Data</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Small Things: Graph of Comparative Data</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Comparison of Sessions 1 and 2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: Sessions 1 and 2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Grand Mean % Frequency: Sessions 1 and 2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Classes Observed Per Unit</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of &quot;Observation&quot; by All Classes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution by Unit: Artemia Salina</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution by Unit: Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Frequency Distribution by Unit: <strong>Forces of Flying</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Frequency Distribution by Unit: <strong>Mystery Powders</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Frequency Distribution by Unit: <strong>Small Things</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Process Science Skill Categories: Number of Times Each Class Tallied High(est) and Low(est)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Process Skills vs &quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Comparison of % Frequency of Occurrence with Process Science Objectives</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Reliability: Standard Deviation, by Skill Categories, from Identical Sessions Tallied One Week Apart</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Grand Mean % Frequency</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Operational Definition Formulation: Highs and Lows</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Percent Frequency of Occurrence: Process Science Skills vs (Direction, Discipline, Other)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>State of Illinois' State Goals for Learning and Sample Learning Objectives: Biological and Physical Sciences--Goals 1-4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Schaumburg District 54: Grade 4 Science Objectives Classified According to the State of Illinois' State Goals for Learning in the Biological and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The Science Lesson Analysis System, Figure 1, (Hacker, 1984)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Operational Definitions for Process Skills in Science Developed by Science Teachers in Lake County, Illinois</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Appointment Forms for Taping Classes</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sample Population</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Verbalizations: Percent Frequency of Process Science Skills--Raw Scores and Percents by Unit, Class, and Session (Spreadsheet)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of &quot;Observation&quot;: By Unit and By Class (Spreadsheet)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sputnik sparked the beginning of our exploration into space; Sputnik also sparked a very intensive look into science education in the United States. In 1957 concerned American scientists, educators, and politicians began to devote their time, skills, and dollars to improving secondary and elementary science education. The "alphabet" projects, such as BSCS (Biological Sciences Curriculum Study), SCIS (Science Curriculum Improvement Study), ESS (Elementary Science Study), and SAPA (Science-A Process Approach), emerged from this period in the nineteen-sixties. These projects all involve students in hands-on, problem-solving activities that call for such process science skills as classification, data collection, data organization, data interpretation, inference, and prediction.

In the "ideal science classroom," these activities are still alive and dynamic. In the "ideal science classroom," according to the 1988 National Assessment of Educational Progress' (NAEP) publication, The Science Report Card, students "have abundant opportunities to...design and conduct real experiments and to carry their thinking beyond the information given" (Mullis and Jenkins, 1988, p.16). Like real scientists, such students observe, measure, experiment, predict, infer, and communicate with each other. Such students do exist in school districts in the real world, but these districts are so few in the United States that the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) established a national program, the Search for Excellence in Science Education, to search for such districts and declare them "Exemplary." (Yager, 1984)
Responses from students taking the National Science Assessment in 1986 indicate that science instruction continues to be dominated by teacher lectures and textbooks. Meanwhile, activities such as experimentation and use of scientific equipment remain comparatively rare. Less than half of the teachers of students assessed in 1986 reported that they had access to a general purpose laboratory for use in science instruction, thus reducing students' opportunities to engage in 'doing' science (Mullis and Jenkins, 1988, p.101).

The evidence from NAEP's most recent assessment shows that we are not putting into practice what we have learned. Research has shown that "the most effective learners are those who are actively engaged in the learning process and accept responsibility for their own learning" (Mullis and Jenkins, 1988, p.13). The Science Report Card notes that the 'NAEP data support a growing body of literature urging fundamental reforms in science education--reforms in which students learn to use the tools of science to better understand the world that surrounds them" (p.17). Certain state legislatures, including Illinois and California, have now mandated that local school districts teach "process science skills" to their students and evaluate their students' progress.

**The Problem**

In 1985 the State of Illinois passed an educational reform package that included requirements for local school districts to write down their learning objectives in science; to match these objectives in Grades 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12, to the "areas" in the State of Illinois' **State Goals for Learning and Sample Learning Objectives: Biological and Physical Sciences** (Illinois State Board of Education Department of School Improvement Services [ISBE], 1986); to devise tests to measure whether these "areas" were being met; and to report the results of these tests to the general public. Each district's Learning Assessment Plan for science was to be filed in Springfield, Illinois, by August 31, 1988. Appendix A contains pages 5-8 of the state science goals and their "knowledge and skill" statements. State and local science assessment is to begin in the school year 1989-90 for Grades 3, 6, and 8. Grade 11 is to assess in the
following year.

Figure 1 on the next page shows that Illinois's Goal 4 in science meets the NAEP guidelines for the "ideal science classroom" very well—on paper at least. Included as knowledge and skill areas are all of the basic science process skills that are found in the "alphabet" projects. It is now mandated that teachers shall teach these skills, students shall be assessed to see if they have learned these skills, the results of the assessment shall be reported to the public, and the school district shall write a "School Improvement Plan" based upon its evaluation of the assessment.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Inference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Data collection, organization, and interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Operational definition development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Question and hypothesis formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Model formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Results verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Scientific equipment use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessment, or testing, of this goal, however, poses a very different and difficult problem. Traditionally, measurement of the process skills, if done at all, has been done by performance tests. Either a student "performs" the skill and turns in a product to which the teacher can apply some kind of "uniform grading standard", or the teacher observes the student actually performing the skill and, using a checklist with pre-determined standards of uniform scoring, notes the extent to which the student has achieved the skill.

This description of performance testing is mostly theoretical, at least at the elementary level. Elementary teachers simply do not have the preparation time needed to set up a performance test, or a "practical", unless they come in very early before school or stay very late after school.

There are some junior high teachers and some high school teachers who do present students with "practical" tests. The "practicals", at the junior and senior high schools, though, are generally designed to separate the A students from the B and so on down the scale. They are not the kind of criterion referenced measurement instruments that could be used to show that all students have achieved the desired skills. The intent of the reform package in Illinois is to see that all students achieve this success in the skills defined by the State Goals.

Just what are the "desired skills"? In Illinois, the mandated skills were set down on paper by a committee of science education experts in a "verb" format to emphasize the concept that "science is doing". Figure 1, taken from the final, published version, lists the skills in "noun format".

The differences between noun and verb are minor compared to the differences that occur when one sits down with a committee of teachers and administrators to try to reach consensus on just what each process skill involves. From project to project, from district to district, and from teacher to teacher, there is no commonly understood or agreed upon national or international standard of operational definitions for the process skills in science. R. W. Tyler
suggested very succinctly and correctly that it's almost as if we lacked a "common language" upon which to proceed (personal communication, March, 1988).

How, then, can local districts fulfill the mandated requirements for assessment that begin in Illinois in the 1989-90 school year? How can student achievement in activities in science skills be measured validly, reliably, and efficiently at the local district level?

In terms of efficiency, experts are beginning to develop and validate paper and pencil tests that purport to measure the science process skills. However, even "the most recent NAEP science assessments did not include measures of students' ability to 'do' science—that is, their ability to use laboratory equipment and apply higher-order thinking skills in experimental situations" (Mullis and Jenkins, 1988, p. 21).

NAEP did do a pilot study of hands-on activities in 1986 that was basically in the form of a "practical", or a performance test. Learning by Doing: A Manual for Teaching and Assessing Higher-Order Thinking in Science and Mathematics describes this pilot study, but does not give enough guidance to allow a district to reproduce the results (National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP], 1987).

If one puts performance testing aside as not being practical, in terms of efficiency, to do with hundreds of students, then the whole issue of construct validity needs to be addressed. Construct validity refers to whether a given item actually does measure a given objective. The base question here is whether paper and pencil forced-choice tests can be used to measure what are normally considered to be performance skills.

The states that mandate testing are accepting face validity for test items professing to measure science process skills. Face validity means that if "expert
educators" say that a given test item "measures" a given objective, then that test item
does, indeed, measure that given objective.

Student achievement, in activities in all the science skills mandated in Illinois,
and elsewhere, cannot be measured validly, reliably, and efficiently, at this time.
However, it is possible to measure evidenced student participation in the process
science skills as students work in a classroom. If one then has a "common language" of
operational definitions for what the process science skills are, a computer's
assistance for efficiency in tabulating results, and a very simple microphone set-up,
one can obtain a valid, reliable, and efficient measurement of participation in the
process science skills at the local district level.

The Purpose

The purpose of this study is to establish a quantitative base-line of the frequency of
occurrence of process science skills in Illinois's Schaumburg Elementary School District 54, a
district that has been declared "Exemplary" by both the National Science Foundation (NSF) and
the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) under the Search for Excellence in Science
Education (SESE) program (Penick, 1983). The district's science curriculum is also housed in
the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D.C., as an example of an outstanding, elementary
science curriculum. Schaumburg Elementary School District 54 is also the largest elementary
school district in the state of Illinois.

The question of what might be a base-line is exceptionally important at this time, at the
local, state, national, and international level. Many states in the United States have mandated
that process science skills be taught. These states have also mandated that student
achievement in the process science skills be measured and publicly reported. Yet, science
educators do not, at this time, have nationally standardized, valid, reliable, and efficient instruments to assess all of the process science skills that have been mandated to be taught.

Even though science educators do not, at this time, have the necessary instruments to measure process science skills, there is still a need to determine whether these skills are indeed taking place within a given classroom. Many districts in states that have mandated reform in science education are looking at their science programs and trying to determine the materials and methods needed to bring their districts closer to a process science program. Both time and money will be spent in the attempt to improve science education within the district, and some method of establishing a base-line of the current state of process science education is badly needed. One cannot determine if one's methods are effective if one cannot see where one has been in the past and where one is in the present.

The specific aim of this study is to determine the extent to which fourth grade students in Schaumburg Elementary School District 54 are demonstrating the skills and general knowledge in process science listed under Goal 4 of the Illinois State Goals for Learning in the Biological and Physical Sciences (Figure 1 and Appendix A).

Appendix B is a detailed listing of the Grade 4 Science Objectives classified according to the State of Illinois' State Goals for Learning in the Biological and Physical Sciences. The listing document was produced by this investigator, under the direction of Larry Small, in 1986-87, using a draft copy of the State Goals for Learning. Figure 2 illustrates the format of Appendix B. Note that the process skills were still in the "verb format" at that time. What are now called "skill and knowledge statements" were called "outcomes" in the draft version.
Secondary aims of this study are: (1) to produce a set of understandable, teacher-written, operational definitions of the process science skills mandated by the State of Illinois; (2) to develop an inexpensive, relatively simple, computer-assisted method of counting the frequency of occurrence of process science skills within a given classroom; and (3) to match student and teacher verbalizations from fourth grade classes in Schaumburg Elementary School District 54 to the twelve, Illinois, process science skills in Goal 4 to determine the extent to which students are evidencing use of these skills in their science lesson activities.

It is hoped that teachers, administrators, and/or researchers will be able to use the method developed herein to compare the frequency of occurrence of process science skills within a given fourth grade classroom to that of the fourth graders in Schaumburg's exemplary, elementary science programs. It is further hoped that teachers, administrators, and/or researchers might use the base-line herein to compare the frequency of occurrence of process science skills at other grade levels to that of the Schaumburg fourth graders.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Computer and hand searches of the related literature were conducted in order to find out whether or not any national or international studies had been undertaken previously to measure students' achievement in performing the process skills in science, on a skill by skill basis, as listed by the State of Illinois in its State Goals for Learning and Sample Learning Objectives: Biological and Physical Sciences (ISBE, 1986). See Figure 1 and Appendix A. The resources used were: Dissertation Abstracts International; Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC); the Education Index; and the Current Index to Journals in Education. Schaumburg Elementary School District 54's Science Resource Center and Teachers' Resource Library also provided resources of current literature as well as relevant out-of-print materials. Only two studies were discovered that came close to meeting the given criteria: those of the National Assessment of Educational Progress' (NAEP) five National Science Assessments in the United States in 1970, 1973, 1977, 1982, and 1986 (Mullis and Jenkins, 1988), and the Hacker Science Lesson Analysis System (SLAS) studies of the 1980's (Hacker, 1984) in Australia. Both of these studies were of national groups of students over multiple grade levels, and both of these studies attempted measures of student performance of hands-on, process science on a skill by skill basis. In terms of the commonality of number and definition of process skills, both studies had enough overlap with the Illinois skills to be useful. The NAEP instruments involved paper and pencil forced choice questions that were well supplemented with graphics, as well as performance tests with a written product in a 1986 pilot study of hands-on activities (NAEP, 1987). The Hacker study involved performance observations by trained staff with very high inter- and intra-rater reliability. (See Appendix C for
Both studies were funded and supported by national bodies.

**Post-Sputnik Science Education**

Sputnik may have sparked off the beginning of our exploration into space, but it also sparked off a very intensive, national look at and funding of science education projects in the United States. As a result of Sputnik, funding was made available to develop the "alphabet" projects, such as the Elementary Science Study, (ESS), the Science Curriculum Improvement Study (SCIS), and Science--A Process Approach (S-APA). All of these projects involve students in hands-on, problem-solving, process science activities.

ESS was developed by the Educational Development Center, formerly known as Educational Services Incorporated. ESS has approximately 56 independent units that are not specific to any one grade level. The units include life and physical science and begin with a problem, go on to an open-ended exploration that includes hands-on activities, and then conclude with a discussion that is meant to bring together the students' experiences. Evaluation is basically informal observation of students while they are working.

SCIS was developed by Robert Karplus and a team of educators, scientists, and psychologists at Lawrence Hall of Science at the University of California, Berkeley. The program is based upon interrelated scientific concepts, such as "matter", "organism", and "interaction"; process-oriented concepts, such as "property", "variable", and "system"; and attitudes, such as "curiosity", "inventiveness", "critical thinking," and "persistence" (Knott, Lawson, Karplus, Thier, and Montgomery, 1978). Process is also addressed in the SCIS program beginning with an exploration of new and interesting materials, a chance to explore and "discover" a new concept, and a culminating activity to begin to apply the new concept to different situations. Evaluation is to be done by teacher observation of students during their activities and through examination of students' work in their Student Record Books.
The development of S-APA was directed by the Commission on Science Education of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). In contrast to both ESS and SCIS, S-APA's content was highly structured into units called modules, or "mods", that were designed specifically to teach individual science processes in a developmental manner. Thus, there are "Observation" mods, "Operational Definition" mods, and "Classification" mods -- at different grade levels -- all building upon discrete process skills. S-APA defines eight basic and six advanced science processes. Each process is broken down into separate steps for instruction, and all of the processes are operationally-described by student behavior. S-APA, like SCIS, is sequenced hierarchically. Life, physical, and earth sciences are included in the content. Evaluations for each of the mods is provided for use with both individual students and/or whole classes. (Science-A Process Approach [S-APA], 1965)

Smergilio and Honigman's study, published in 1973, (cited in Bredderman, 1982) noted that these new post-Sputnik programs all have the following characteristics:

1. They are jointly developed by practicing teachers, scientists, administrators, and psychologists.

2. They have been extensively field tested on students and have been revised after the field testing.

3. Developmental cognitive growth of children is a part of the projects' guidelines.

4. The programs are all activity oriented involving students directly in psychomotor endeavors.

5. The programs are not textbook oriented. They do provide manuals and guidelines for the teachers, however, and SCIS provides manuals, or record books, in which the students can record data they've gathered.

6. The programs come with the necessary materials needed for experimentation provided in boxes called "kits".

7. The programs all have an in-service qualification component for the teachers.

8. The programs are process skill oriented.
Hands-on activities like those described above have been linked to success in increasing the participation of minorities and females in science careers (National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology, 1983). NAEP has also found that "seventh- and eleventh-grade students who reported classroom activities that were challenging and participatory were likely to have higher science proficiency" (Mullis and Jenkins, Eds., 1988, p. 97). Whether the students had higher proficiency to begin with and thus were placed in more challenging, interesting classes, or whether the classes resulted in higher proficiency cannot be determined without further research into the question.

However, in spite of the renewed interest in science in the 1960's, in the 1970's, enrollment in secondary school science courses continued to drop. The new curriculum studies took some of the blame and were perceived to have been inadequate for the job. In actuality "none of the new K-12 curricula ever succeeded in getting a nationwide adoption of more than 25 percent" (Shymansky, 1982). Added costs, difficulty in securing and maintaining materials, additional time required for preparation of activities, and resistance from some teachers who had not been given an opportunity to help select the new programs: all contributed to a decline in the use of process science materials and a "back-to-basics" request for more traditional, textbook programs.

The Search for Excellence

In 1978 the National Science Foundation funded Project Synthesis to summarize and analyze twenty years of research on what ought to be happening in pre-college science classrooms. Five teams of nationally recognized science educators came up with a three part analysis: they established what should be happening in K-12 science classrooms; they compared this to what was actually happening; and they made recommendations on how to narrow the differences between the "Desired States" and the "Actual States". The timing was
perfect for Project Synthesis. Four major works had just been finished, and Project Synthesis was able to draw upon all four: the National Assessment of Educational Progress's Science: 3rd Assessment (National Assessment, 1978); Ohio State University's The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955-1975 (Helgeson, et al., 1977); the University of Illinois's Case Studies in Science Education (Stake & Easley, 1978); and the Center for Educational Research and Evaluation's Report of the 1977 National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education (Weiss, 1978).

Project Synthesis's report painted a very bleak picture of elementary school science twenty years after Sputnik. The Search for Excellence in Science Education (SESE) began, in 1982, an effort to find and identify the exception(s) to this bleak picture. Jointly sponsored by the National Science Foundation and the National Science Teachers Association, SESE asked science consultants in each of the fifty states to identify and nominate districts whose science programs most closely matched the criteria of the "Desired States" in Project Synthesis. Twelve elementary programs were selected as meeting that criteria. The twelve are described in detail in the NSTA monograph Elementary Science in the Focus on Excellence series (Penick, 1983). One of the twelve programs selected was the K-8 science program in District 54 in Schaumburg, Illinois.

The Schaumburg program is a teacher-written, teacher-piloted, teacher-inserviced, hands-on, process science curriculum. Its units are based primarily on ESS and SCIS units that are now in the public domain. Groups of teachers from within the district meet during the summer and the school-year to write units that go one step beyond the "alphabet kits" by incorporating local environments, interests, and needs (Small, 1988).
Science education objectives vary: from expert to expert, from project to project, from state to state, and from district to district. L. Klopfer (Klopfer, 1971, p. 561) writes that "it is...not possible at present to state one set of objectives to which all teachers of science at each educational level would subscribe." Klopfer notes that in the seventies, the "most serious problem of evaluation in science is the disparity between the methods and techniques which are available to the science teacher and what generally happens in the science classroom."

(637) Klopfer also notes that without detailed descriptions of the behaviors involved, one cannot begin to evaluate performance. He goes on to state that: "In comparison with the techniques already at hand for testing and evaluating in the cognitive domain, the means of evaluation in the affective domain and in scientific literacy are flaccid and unsophisticated." (638)

L. Henkin and R B. Davis, in Testing, Teaching and Learning, note that "Mathematical understanding of a given phenomenon involves not merely knowing the facts involved, but also possessing insight into 'why' that facts are as they are." (in Tyler & White (Chairmen), 1978, p.90) Mathematics is often spoken of as the language of science, and the process skills in both subjects are similar. Telling "why" something happened may be "inferring". The authors note that "To test for understanding of the kind just described, it is natural to ask for an explanation." (p. 91) Henkin and Davis have also noted that (1) the student may not be able to articulate an explanation and (2) the explanation may not be an inference; it may simply be recall of a prior explanation from a teacher or a book that the student is simply repeating, but does not really understand. In the Appendix to this article, the authors give an extreme, but cogent example:

"To take an extreme example, we encountered a student who could not respond properly to the request 'Can you write down an example of a quadratic equation', yet who was able to use without hesitation two of the standard algorithms to obtain the correct roots of q.e.'s that were given to her, and was familiar with the term 'quadratic formula.' It is a fair inference that the term 'quadratic equation' was mentioned in this student's class when the topic was first considered, but it was not a term actively employed in
subsequent class work, and hence did not remain a part of her active vocabulary." (p. 97)

R. Taylor, in 1978, in commenting on the minimum competency programs set in place in the seventies, states that "Initial minimum competency programs were often hastily conceived and implemented with the naive assumptions that higher achievement could be legislated, that no special funds were needed for testing and remediation programs, and that suitable tests were readily available." (in Tyler & White (Chairmen), 1978, p.98) In 1988, ten years later, three of those issues are still very much alive: can higher achievement be legislated? can testing and remediation be done without special funds? and are suitable tests readily available to test what has been mandated be tested?

J. Schwartz and E. F. Taylor describe "Project TORQUE", an assessment project that is concerned with alternatives to the present assessment models in the elementary schools. Project TORQUE's materials are criterion-referenced and can be used for both teaching and assessing--for formative and summative evaluation. The "tests are designed and validated by observing children perform on specially designed games and in 'real life' activities." (p. 261) One of the Project TORQUE packages involves measurement, which, in Illinois, is a "skill" in science and a "goal" in mathematics. The TORQUE measurement tests have been validated for construct validity using children's performance in real-life activities and correlating that performance with the children's performance on the pencil and paper tasks.

In assessing performance, once again, the question remains as to whether forced choice tests have construct validity. N. Frederiksen discusses "alternatives to multiple-choice tests". (in Tyler & White (Chairmen), 1978, p.186) He notes that "real-life problems do not ordinarily appear in multiple-choice form with all the options clearly presented." (p.188)

"Multiple-choice tests can no doubt measure much of the knowledge and some of the skills involved in the process, but they will certainly not reflect the whole problem-solving procedure. I believe we should develop testing procedures that will assess
aspects of the thinking process not adequately dealt with by multiple-choice tests...There may be many important dimensions of performance other than the number of correct answers." (pp. 188-189)

Klopfer, in his section on "materials that would be helpful to those designing evaluation instruments for science" mentions Bloom's and Krathwohl's taxonomies of cognitive and affective domains and states that both books have "helped to improve the precision of communication among educators concerned with evaluation." (p. 635) It is particularly telling to note that although Klopfer praises Bloom's classification, nonetheless, Klopfer uses a different classification for student behaviors in measuring science. The categories used in Hacker's work in Australia "might be regarded as a condensed version of Klopfer's (1971) behaviours or as a version of the categories of Eggleston et al. (1975), expanded to include behaviours likely to occur in primary school science lessons." (Hacker, 1984, p. 140) Since there is no common language or standard in the evaluation of process science skills, each research group comes up with its own "dialect", thus compounding the already inherent difficulties of assessment.

State-Mandated Reforms in Science Education

In the 1980's there has been a major attempt to set forth statewide sets of goals and objectives as part of a move toward accountability in education. State legislatures are mandating reforms in education. They are stating that school districts must publicly state their objectives, evaluate their students' meeting of those objectives, publicly report their results, and devise school improvement plans based on this process. In accordance with the National Science Teachers Association's recommendations in Science/Technology/Society: Science Education for the 1980's (Penick and Meinhard-Pellens, 1984), some states are mandating, in their reform packages, the teaching of "process" science as a part of the total science program.

This ideal-world mandate, however, poses a major problem: the instruments to evaluate "process" science are still very much "state-of-the-art". The state of the real-world, at
this time, is that educators do not have nationally recognized, valid, reliable, and efficient (paper and pencil) instruments to assess all of the process science skills that states have mandated be taught and tested. Educational researchers, policy makers, and practitioners are now in the process of dealing with this real-world problem of science assessment of process skills at the district, state, regional, national, and international level. Some researchers and policy makers in different states and countries have been working in the area of assessing process science skills for many years. The products of their research and experience can help other educators begin to translate research into practice.

R. Tyler and S. H. White, in their Chairmen's Report in *Testing, Teaching and Learning*, note that:

"Not only a student's answer, but also the efficiency of the solution strategy are of interest. Easily-graded standardized tests for these more complex problem solving procedures have been difficult or impossible to devise, so that a very important class of educational objectives has been left untested and thus undervalued." (p. 16)

One pair of researchers, M. Padilla and D. McKenzie, at the University of Georgia, have addressed the question of whether one can assess this kind of performance activity with paper and pencil, forced choice items. Padilla and McKenzie have been working on the construct validity of paper and pencil items for measuring various graphing skills. They have triangulated their "Test of Graphing in Science (TOGS Test) by having 69 students do a real graphing task, on paper with pencil. The correlation between the students' actual graphing tasks and their scores on the TOGS Test was .73. "This indicates a reasonable degree of criterion validity for TOGS" (Padilla, 1988, p. 7). M. Padilla and M. Twiest are currently getting ready to present work on the construct validation of the Test of Basic Process Skills (BAPS Test), an elementary, paper and pencil test that covers the process skills of:
observation, inference, prediction, measurement, communication, and classification. Original attempts to obtain a construct validity for this test were "confusing and disappointing" (p. 8), but more recent efforts using a different approach have been more successful (personal communication, August, 1988).

M. Padilla, in his paper "Testing for Higher Order Understanding in Science", cites John Bransford's work and stresses the need to identify and define the problem in any kind of problem solving (Padilla, 1988). This identification and definition process is needed within any group discussing any problem. Researchers, administrators, teachers, and students within a given group need to have a common language if they are to discuss a common problem.

This concept of using a common language is one of the most critical concepts in assessing science process skills. Padilla uses the definitions from Science - A Process Approach (S-APA, 1965). Allen Olson, Director of the Northwest Evaluation Association's Science Curriculum and Assessment Project, supplies the operational definitions used for the Project's "Concepts" and "Processes" with the items in the Project's Item Bank (Olson, 1988). Larry Small supplies operational definitions for the science processes assessed in his district, Schaumburg Community Consolidated District #54 in Schaumburg, Illinois (Small, 1988). Roger Hacker operationally defined each process science category in the Science Lesson Analysis System (SLAS) (Hacker, 1984). In supplying operational definitions with their assessment instruments, Padilla, Olson, Small, and Hacker make it possible for others to understand and utilize their work.

One of the major problems of writing or collecting process science assessment items is the question of content versus process. Ralph W. Tyler has stated that a behavioral objective needs to be content specific and grade level specific (personal communication, March, 1988).
Oregon’s project allows for both content and process by having separate “content categories,” “process categories”, and “concept categories”. The basic question, however, remains: “Can one really assess process without content?”

In setting up situational questions, the “set-up” of the question can become very “wordy”, and the item may end up having a very heavy “test of reading ability” component. Padilla comments on this question of reading difficulty and the steps taken to counteract the difficulty in the construction of the Middle Grades Integrated Process Skill Test (MIPT), intended for students in Grades 6-9 (Padilla, 1988). Students in a given grade in a given district might well be reading below grade level. Where an assessment’s purpose is to show that all students are achieving a given process skill, reading level is definitely a factor to consider.

One of the major issues still to be answered is whether a paper and pencil test can really test process skills. Is the process being tested, or is recognition or recall of the process being tested when a student has to choose between “given” responses? Yet, to observe a student going through a process, to question that student about that process, to uniformly decide whether the student has “successfully” gone through the process requires more staff training, hours, and dollars than most local districts or states can afford to, or are willing to, spend. This “observational” process of evaluation is not “efficient” with large numbers of students. The question then becomes, is there a process of evaluation that is efficient, and is also valid and reliable? Norman Stenzel suggests that computer-based strategies have “a good chance to be more valid” than paper and pencil tests “in respect to the dynamics of processes” (Stenzel, 1988). Stenzel also points out another very critical issue: what is “new” for one student may well be “recall” for another student. This issue of a student’s prior knowledge is one of the most difficult to ascertain and cannot easily be addressed in a paper and pencil, multiple choice format. One student may truly be “predicting”, while another, giving an identical surface response, may be “recalling”.

The question of construct validity is always prime. Is the item measuring what it purports to measure, or is it measuring some other attribute? Validity is measured most often by "experts" who match assessment items to assessment objectives, or to skill and knowledge statements, giving a face validity. However, Padilla has attempted to establish construct validity. The Georgia group has correlated the Test of Graphing in Science (TOGS) (McKenzie and Padilla, 1986) to a "pencil and paper graphing task" and obtained a correlation of .73 with 69 students (Padilla, 1988). Cronin, Padilla, and Twiest undertook a validity study of their Test of Basic Process Skills (BAPS) using an interview technique with 32 students, but got very mixed results. They are currently reassessing BAPS with a new, different interview instrument. Padilla notes the importance of developing individual interview and station study items to validate paper and pencil items. The difficulty of what these researchers are attempting is immense, but their example and methodology can be enormously helpful to others. In the ideal-world, every researcher developing an instrument for assessment would show construct validity. In the real-world, one is fortunate to have "experts" to grant face validity.

In the real-world, the local district, charged with developing a local assessment instrument to assess its local objectives, has the most difficult task. Larry Small put together a team in Schaumburg Elementary District #54, Schaumburg, Illinois, to develop assessment instruments for process science skills in Grades 3, 6, and 8, as mandated by the State of Illinois. Their model of cooperation: with university level researchers, such as Padilla, in Georgia, and John Staver, in Illinois; with Illinois State Board of Education evaluation personnel, such as Norman Stenzel; with district testing experts such as Joyce Zitnan, Fred Tarnow, Marianne Zito, Mary Kelly, and the many, expert, process science teachers in Schaumburg District 54 and Hinsdale Elementary School District 181; is a model other large districts could follow.

The Oregon Project is able to provide valuable resources to any group that would like to
develop its own assessment instrument: its Item Development and Review Process set up excellent methods of procedure. Smaller districts, without "test experts" are getting assistance with some of these procedures by banding together and working with such groups as state Educational Service Centers.

One of the largest studies done of process science skills was done in Australia; the study was first done in science and then its methodology was extended into social studies. The methodology is far different from the paper and pencil forms discussed elsewhere in this grouping of studies. The methodology is that of observers entering actual classrooms and observing, classifying, and recording interactions between and among students and teachers. The "SLAS data can be used to confirm the extent to which students are afforded the opportunity to develop, practice and refine emergent intellectual abilities in science classrooms" (Carter & Hacker, 1988). What is particularly striking, however, is that Carter's and Hacker's "intellectual abilities practiced" in Australia are "science process skills" in the United States. Carter and Hacker also record non-verbal interactions with science materials and multi-media materials. Since a user's manual and a full observer training program were developed with the SLAS, one could "transport" the system to the United States and see how American interactions correlated with Australian.

Need for This Study

The March, 1988, ASCD Update, asks the following questions in its "Issues" section: "Do current testing programs do an adequate job of assessing student thinking?" and "If not, what progress is being made to improve them?" (O'Neil, 1988, pp. 4-5) The six experts responding to the questions are: Peter Kneedler, a research and evaluation consultant in the California State Department of Education; William Corbett, Principal of The James Russell Lowell School in Watertown, Massachusetts; Bena Kallick, an independent consultant for the
Connecticut State Department of Education; Robert Marzano, Director of Research at the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory; Kenneth Haskins, former Head of the Harvard Principals' Center; and Richard Wallace, Superintendent of Schools, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

"Student thinking" is very much a part of "process science skills"; one should not be doing any of the skills without first engaging in some kinds of mental processes. The educators above responding to the two questions of the "Issue" note six major points:

1. No adequate instruments currently exist at the national level that do an adequate job of assessing the process of thinking in a reliable, valid, and efficient way.

2. One of the major reasons no such instrument exists is because educators and psychometricians have not yet come to major agreement on just what "thinking" is.

3. There is a great need at this time to precisely define what these process skills are so that we can both teach them and evaluate them.

4. Current tests do not cause students to generate responses; they cause them to react to several offered choices.

5. The best method educators have to evaluate process, at this time, is through practical exercises done within the classroom over time.

6. Even though educators do not have adequate instrumentation to measure process at this time, it is still important for states to mandate that thinking be taught and assessed. (pp. 4-5)

The general consensus of the group is that continued attempts to teach thinking skills and measure them will improve process assessment instruments, improve the definitions of thinking skills, and improve educational outcomes.

T. Bredderman, in his meta-analysis of controlled studies on the effects of activity-based elementary science programs on student outcomes and classroom practices, used the following list of "science processes" (p. 12, 1982):
analyzing
predicting
manipulating variables
problem solving
inferring
explaining from data
identifying variables
describing change and interaction based on observations
measuring
constructing histograms
observing properties and reporting on them.

The study, however, does not give "operational definitions" for each process. Thus, "analyzing" may well have one meaning for an elementary teacher and quite another meaning for a secondary teacher.

The California Assessment Program of the California State Department of Education, in its Survey of Academic Skills: Grade 8 Science Rationale and Content. Draft Copy, gives operational definitions for seven science processes (California State Department of Education, 1988, pp.55-56). Their assessment matrix then places the seven processes into three content areas: biological, earth, and physical. California's seven processes are:

- observing
- communicating
- comparing
- organizing
- relating
- inferring
- applying.

With operational definitions given, other groups have at least a basic idea of whether they're speaking that "common language" needed for communication to take place.

A. Olson and S. Smoyer (1988, p. 4) list the 15 processes and 29 concepts that serve as the framework for the Science Curriculum and Assessment Project set up by the Northwest Evaluation Association. The processes and concepts, operationally defined in Appendix B
(pp. 17-20), are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause-Effect</td>
<td>Classifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entropy</td>
<td>Controlling Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>Defining Operationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Designing Experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradient</td>
<td>Formulating Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariance</td>
<td>Hypothesizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Inferring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Interpreting Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Measuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>Observing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Predicting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetry</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Using Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>Relating Time-Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R. W. Tyler writes: "Education is a process of changing the behavior patterns of people. This is using behavior in the broad sense to include thinking and feeling as well as overt action" (Tyler, 1949). In Michigan (Michigan State Board of Education, 1985, p. 59) and Anchorage, Alaska (Anchorage School District, date unknown), dimensions of feeling are added which are not present in the objectives for the State of Illinois: the dimensions of "attitudes and values". What is the relationship of these "attitudes" to "process" skills? Is Alaska's "Use of Scientific Inquiry" the same skill as Illinois's "Experimenting"? Anchorage's "Recording Data" is placed apart from the "Process Skills" category, under a separate and distinct category entitled: "Communication Skills". In Illinois, "recording data" is part of a "knowledge and skill" statement entitled: "Data collection, organization, and interpretation".
Michigan Science Attitude Categories

- Longing to Know and Understand
- Questioning of All Things
- Search for Data and Their Meaning
- Demand for Verification
- Respect for Logic
- Consideration of Premises and Consequences
- Respect for the Order and Beauty of Nature
- Demonstration of Confidence and Satisfaction
- Values the Scientific Heritage

Anchorage’s Attitudes and Values

- Curiosity/Persistence
- Use of Scientific Inquiry
- Developing Self Confidence

How do these projects’ lists of processes compare with the State of Illinois’s? One cannot know with any certainty until the State of Illinois develops, adapts, or adopts operational definitions of the process skills for use within the state. However, Sample Learning Objectives have been given for each process skill for Grades 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12, and comparisons might be made using the examples given (ISBE, 1986).

Schaumburg Elementary School District 54 has classified its science objectives according to the State of Illinois’ State Goals for Learning in the Biological and Physical Sciences. Appendix B has the Grade 4 objectives for all four state goals. Each fourth grade unit has multiple objectives calling for students to: observe, classify, infer; predict; measure; communicate; collect, organize and interpret data; develop operational definitions; formulate questions and hypotheses; experiment; formulate models; verify results; and use scientific equipment. The categories are those listed in a draft copy of the State of Illinois’ State Goals for Learning in the Biological and Physical Sciences and are in their original “verb format”.

Schaumburg has broad curricular models in place that call for regular assessment of its students to be sure that objectives are being met. However, assessment of process skills is a very difficult process. Schaumburg’s science testing program, prior to the 1986-87 school year, has been criterion referenced to the content taught in each unit, with the addition of
questions to determine student attitudes toward science. In the summer of 1986, a team of teacher-writers from Schaumburg, Fred Tarnow and Marianne Zito, and Mary Kelly, from Community Consolidated School District 181 in Hinsdale, Illinois, worked on a paper and pencil, forced choice, process skills test for Grade 3 in an attempt to begin testing for the process skills themselves. The test is to be read aloud to students by their teachers, with the students circling correct answers on an answer sheet. NAEP released items from prior national assessments and items from M. Padilla's work in Georgia helped to provide templates for designing the Schaumburg items. The test is not content-free, but is criterion referenced to the Schaumburg science objectives, and was piloted in Schaumburg just prior to June of 1987. The test covers seven of the twelve process skills set out in Goal 4 of the Illinois Goals. Since June of 1987, items from the Schaumburg test have been piloted by the Illinois State of Board of Education in other areas throughout the state. (Small, 1988)

If one wanted to see whether all of the science problem-solving skills in Schaumburg's exemplary science curriculum are being evidenced by students in its classrooms, one could set up a model based on Flanders' basic work in interaction process analysis and combine it with the categories in the State of Illinois' State Goals for Learning (Flanders, 1970). However, in order to do so with any great degree of accuracy, one would almost have to videotape hours and hours of classes. When one brings a videocamera into a classroom, one disrupts, immeasurably in any practicable sense, exactly what one hopes to study—a normal, everyday, science classroom lesson.

Attempts have been made to study process science lessons, but most of these studies revolve around either secondary classrooms or issues regarding teacher's abilities and student achievement (Aiello-Nicosia, Sperandeo-Mineo, and Valenza, 1984), interaction analysis and staff development (Gorham, 1985), classroom climate (Chavez, 1984), and/or wait-time (Rowe, 1974 and Tobin, 1984).
Attempts have also been made to improve the ease of obtaining the needed data, such as Hoover's use of computer technology combined with Flanders' interaction analysis system (Hoover, 1975, 1984). However, only one study (Hacker, 1984) seems to actually classify the problem-solving behaviors evidenced by students in elementary science classes in a way that would least disturb the normal progress of the classroom lesson.

Roger Hacker devised the Science Lesson Analysis System (SLAS) in a study that involved the classification of behaviors of 3,751 students in 864 elementary science lessons taught by 144 science teachers. His categories included such abilities as: interpreting observed or recorded data, inferring from observed or recorded data, and designing novel experimental procedures. (See Appendix C.) His study covered children from the age of 6 (beginning their primary years) through children at the upper secondary level (years 11 and 12) in 62 state schools in Western Australia. His observers had very high inter- and intra-observer reliability measures. Hacker suggested in his study that other populations of science classrooms could be tested using his instruments and model. (Hacker, 1984)

The results of this literature search indicate that there is a definite lack of instrumentation that will validly, reliably, and efficiently determine whether or not all of the science problem-solving skills in a given science curriculum are being evidenced by students inside their science classrooms. There is also a very great need to provide a common language from which a given body of teachers and administrators can work. This study will build a set of Operational Definitions for Process Skills in Science: Lake County, Illinois, to cover the thirteen process science skills mandated to be taught in Illinois (Lipowich and Tyler, Eds., 1988). These operational definitions will be jointly developed by a regional body of teachers and administrators and will be field-tested in district in Lake County for clarity and exactness. The operational definitions will provide the framework for categorizing student and teacher verbalizations on a skill by skill basis. Additional categories will be provided to cover the giving of
directions for work, discipline, and off-task activity. This study will then provide both a valid, reliable, and efficient methodology for finding the frequency of occurrence of process science skills within a given classroom and/or district and a baseline of comparison, on the fourth grade level, with a federal, exemplary, elementary science program, that of Schaumburg Elementary School District 54, in Schaumburg, Illinois.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Type of Research

The purpose of this study is to construct a base-line description of the frequency of occurrence of process science skills in an exemplary, elementary science program: Schaumburg Elementary School District 54 in Schaumburg, Illinois. In order to provide a framework and a common language on which to construct the description, Operational Definitions for the thirteen process science skills in Illinois’ State Goals for Learning and Sample Learning Objectives: Biological and Physical Sciences are to be developed. In order to provide an efficient method for tallying the data, a computer program is to be designed that will permit immediate entry of categorized verbalizations without the need for costly and time-consuming transcriptions of the audio tapes to be made. A base-line study such as this comes under the heading of “descriptive research” (Issac and Michael, 1971).

Procedure

Audio tapes are to be made of students’ (and teachers’) verbal interactions during normal, uninterrupted, fourth grade science classes. The student commentary on these tapes will be analyzed and classified according to the knowledge and skill statements of Goal 4 of the Illinois’ State Goals for Learning in the Biological and Physical Sciences (Appendix A). The framework for categorizing the verbalizations will be the Operational Definitions for Process Skills in Science: Lake County, Illinois (Lipowich & Tyler, Eds.) A copy of these operational definitions is in Appendix D. Verbalizations: Categories and Examples (Figure 6) serves as a set of guidelines to the decisions made in discriminating among various possible categories.
Principals are to hear about the project first, at two meetings called by the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction. Suggestions are to be solicited from the principals as to implementing the study with the least possible disruption to their buildings. Aid in setting up a building meeting and in encouraging their teachers to participate is also to be sought. The principals are then to ask their teachers if the teachers are willing to discuss the project with the investigator at a meeting in their own building. Volunteer teachers for the project are to be sought through meetings in those buildings where fourth grade teachers are willing to listen to a description of the project. See Appendix E for the appointment forms that were used.

Two appointments with the volunteer teachers are to be made by the investigator, the second appointment to be during a different week from the first. Two tapes will be made of each volunteer teacher's classroom. The only interruption of the classroom will be for an introduction of the investigator and a very brief explanation of why the investigator is present and what the investigator will be doing. The explanation will be:

"Hi. My name is Mrs. Lipowich. I'm here right now because I'm a real scientist, and I'm doing a real, scientific investigation. The purpose of my investigation is to see what goes on in a real science class in Grade 4 in Schaumburg, Illinois. I'm setting up this tape recorder to run for the whole time your class has science today. I'll be moving it from group to group while you're working. Now, the best way you can help me is to pretend that I'm just not here, that you can't even see me. I'd love to sit down and talk with you about what you're doing...but I can't. I can't even talk to M---, your teacher, because that would spoil the investigation. If I really want to see what's going on in a normal, every-day class, I can't be a part of that class myself...in any way. Now, do YOU have any questions about what I'm going to be doing?" The investigator will answer all questions honestly.
A 4" x 6" portable tape recorder, holding Sony HF 120 cassette tapes (sixty minutes each side) is to be moved from group to group within the classroom. Placement of the recorder is to be on the working space, but "out of the way". Each group is to be taped for a given time to equal the lesson time divided by the number of student work teams. The recorder is to be moved in a set pattern of left to right, and front to back.

Operational definitions for the process skills are to be developed, as well as an accompanying set of examples for each category. The examples and the accompanying explanation are to be used to match student verbalizations to the skill categories. The set of operational definitions is to be content validated by the approximately 60 developers, R. Tyler, and the investigator. This content, or face validation, is to consist of these persons' agreement that the operational definitions for each skill category are appropriate. In addition, the categorization examples of verbalizations for each category are to be content validated by an "expert panel", consisting of Larry Small, Science Coordinator for Schaumburg Elementary School District 54; Fred Tamow, Science Coordinator for the North-Cook and West-Cook Educational Service Centers; Mary Kelly, Science Coordinator for Hinsdale Elementary School District 181; and the investigator, Science and Mathematics Coordinator for the Lake County Educational Service Center. In addition, the investigator will be using the set of operational definitions in local school districts in Lake County, Illinois, with teachers and administrators in Grades K-12, in the process of developing district Science Objectives, Learning Assessment Plans, and School Improvement Plans to meet state-mandated requirements. Changes in the operational definitions are to be worked out, as needed, to clarify any definitions that are ambiguous. The verbalizations on the tapes are then to be classified according to the State of Illinois' categories, and an analysis is to be made of the results evidenced.

Three categories are to be added to the state's in order to categorize other types of
verbalizations noted during a previous pilot study using this plan. The three categories and their operational definitions are given in Figure 3, Additional Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE 3 ADDITIONAL CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GUIDANCE: DIRECTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions given by teacher to students and/or students to students that help to guide the science activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATION: DISCIPLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalizations from teacher to students and/or from students to students and/or from student to self that are used to focus attention back to the science activity. These verbalizations are prompted by off-task behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APART: OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalizations from teachers, students, and/or outside sources that interrupt or do not have a bearing upon the science activity. These verbalizations indicate that persons in the classroom are off-task and not focused on the science activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4, Cues and Codes, notes the cues and codes for the skill categories and units that are used in various charts and spreadsheets throughout this study. Where the code letter does not match the first letter of the skill category, i.e. "O" for "Observation", the word that represents the letter chosen is shown in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/UNIT</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Obse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Clas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Infer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>T(alk)</td>
<td>Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection...</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational definition ...</td>
<td>N(aming)</td>
<td>OpDe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question and hypothesis ...</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Expe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model formulation</td>
<td>F(ormation of Models)</td>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results verification</td>
<td>V(erification)</td>
<td>Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific equipment use</td>
<td>U(se of ...)</td>
<td>SciEq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance: Direction</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Guid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation: Discipline</td>
<td>R(regulation)</td>
<td>Regu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apart: Other</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>B.F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>F.F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>M.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>S.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A computer program is to be designed to permit immediate entry of the categorized verbalizations directly from the audio tapes so that no transcriptions need to be made. This will also permit the person doing the categorization to take into account the tone of voice and the context of each verbalization.

Any generalizations coming from the analysis are to be shared with the volunteer teachers and the district. Strict confidentiality is to be maintained as to the identity of the teachers of each class. It is hoped that the data and the procedures will also form a base-line and a methodology for other districts to use.

The first time a class is taped is called Session 1 for that class; the second time, Session 2. Session 1 lessons are taped on Side A of a given tape; Session 2 lessons are taped on Side B. The tapes of the lessons range from 35 to 60 minutes in length. Since the lessons vary in length and in content, each skill category's results are given as a percentage frequency against the total number of verbalizations in that session. One hundred twenty (120) minute tapes are used, sixty minutes to each side. Thus, even though some lessons extend beyond sixty minutes, any remainder over sixty minutes is not taped.

After obtaining the tapes, the most important step is to develop the operational definitions for each process science skill and to match student verbalizations, in context, to the categories. The definitions are to be developed during a series of seven workshops, "Developing a Local Evaluation Instrument in Science", directed by the investigator at the Lake County Educational Service Center. Approximately 60 teachers and administrators, representing Grades 3, 6, 8, and 11, are to work in groups at grade level to develop the first draft of the document. Input is to be sought from throughout the county and from the Lake County ESC's Science Advisory Committee. The investigator and R. Tyler are to edit the definitions.

The second step is to develop the template of examples and explanation that will be
used to match student verbalizations to the process science skills. Figure 6, Verbalizations: Categories and Examples, gives a detailed description of the decisions that were made in categorization.

Thirdly, it is necessary to get the expert panel's practical validation of the categorization decisions made. The expert panel is to go through each skill and write down a sample verbalization that might occur in a fourth grade classroom. The verbalization is to be one the expert considers would be categorized under that skill. After all the experts have written down a sample verbalization for a given skill, discussion is to take place as to whether or not that particular verbalization is correctly categorized. Consensus is to be reached as to the appropriate categorization for each of the experts' samples, and re-writing of the verbalization(s) is to occur as needed. After four verbalizations for every skill have been "validated", trial runs are to be made to see if "consensus" can be reached on a three-minute section of actual classroom tape. If consensus can be reached on three three-minute sections, a trial run is to be held on a twenty-minute section. The following confidentiality agreement, Figure 5, is to be signed by each of the experts on the panel prior to hearing any of the recordings of the science lessons:

FIGURE 5
CONFIDENTIALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIDENTIALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, ____________________________, pledge that I will keep confidential the names of any students and teachers that I hear on the audio tapes made by Shelley Lipowich from Schaumburg District 54's Fourth Grade science classes. I further pledge that I will keep confidential the details of any classroom situations that occur on the tapes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

__________________________  ________________
name  date
Four Apple Ile computers, with printers, are to be used for the trial runs. A "LIST" of the computer program is to be found in Appendix G. The investigator and the author of the program give full permission herein for its use on the one condition that any person using the program attempts to give the investigator feedback on its use--problems or successes encountered and/or comparisons with the Schaumburg data and/or comparison data within another district.

Once the expert panel has validated the categorization rationale, every tape is to be heard, and every verbalization is to be classified. It is decided by the dissertation committee and the investigator that hearing and categorizing all the tapes in their entirety, rather than sampling them, will give a more accurate base-line frequency of occurrence.

The next step is to see whether using the computer actually does facilitate the process enough so that it's efficient for others to use in their classrooms. Once the categorization process is begun, reliability of the categorization is to be checked. A randomly chosen twenty-minute section, chosen from Classes 5-10, is to be categorized twice, with a minimum of one week between trial one (Session 1-1) and trial two (Session 2-2). A standard deviation is to be calculated for each of the categories and for the two trials. Another reliability check (Sessions 2-1 and 2-2), using the same method, is to be done on a randomly chosen twenty-minute section chosen from Classes 25-30. A standard deviation is also to be calculated to compare individual categories from the first tapings with individual categories from the second tapings, as well as all of the categories from the first tapings with all of the categories from the second tapings. The choice of a twenty-minute section is based on Eggleston, Galton, and Jones' work with the Science Teaching Observation Schedule (1975).

A spreadsheet function (Microsoft Works) of Standard Deviation (StDev(values-1, values-2,...)) is used to calculate the standard deviations for each category. The formula used
The formula used for the variance function is (p. 257):

$$\frac{n\cdot(\Sigma x^2) - (\Sigma x)^2}{n \cdot (n-1)}$$

This formula is the raw score formula, which is appropriate for use here since the number of scores are large, and the means end up as integers. The mean percent frequencies are multiplied by 100 to bring them to integer form. The standard deviations for Session 1 and Session 2 are taken from the mean percentage frequencies, multiplied by 100. A typical formula that is used on the spreadsheet for calculating a comparison of one category in one session against the same category in the second session is:

$$=\text{StDev}(B393, B397) \times 100$$

**Population**

Twenty-seven, fourth grade teachers, teaching approximately 775 students in 31 different classes in 12 schools, volunteered to permit this investigator into their classrooms to make two audio tapes, at least one week apart, of their science lessons. Appendix F details the sample population. One tape, that of a combination health/science class was made, but a decision was made not to use it in the data set because half of one session was the completion of a health unit. The sample population represented 53% of the fourth grade classes and 60% of the buildings in the district. One group of fourth grade students was deliberately excluded from the invitation to participate; that group was part of a gifted, Grade 4-5-6 group being taught in one, multi-grade classroom.

District policy and practice require that all teachers whose classes are taped be volunteers. Since the sample of teachers and classes is not a random sample, the results
cannot be generalized to describe every classroom in District 54.

**Materials**

A Sony ECM-D15 electret condenser microphone with a solar battery and a battery check is to be used on a small, portable tape recorder to make the tapes. This microphone is able to pick up the voices of a small group around it and **screen out the background noises**. This quality is very important in a process science classroom where many small groups are working independently on exciting projects and, while working, are communicating with each other.

**Measurement of Data**

Data categories (nominal data) are to be mutually exclusive. A verbalization, defined below, is to belong to only one category. **Operational Definitions for Process Skills in Science** (Appendix D); **State of Illinois, Goal 4, Process Skills in Science** (Figure 1); and **Verbalizations: Categories and Examples** (Figure 6) define the mutually exclusive categories. There is no logical order to the categories.

**Verbalization Defined**

A "verbalization" is defined, for this study, as **one, intelligible** voice speaking with respect to **one** of the **designated categories**. See Figure 6, **Verbalizations: Categories and Examples**, and Appendix D, **Operational Definitions for Process Skills in Science**.

A "**new verbalization**" begins with: a **new speaker or a new category** by the **same speaker**. A verbalization may be **one word** or may be **several sentences** or **several minutes** in length. For example, a verbalization under **Guidance: Directions**, when made by a teacher
giving instructions at the beginning of a class, may be several minutes in length and still be
tallied as only one verbalization.

As explained in the Introduction, before one can categorize any verbalization, one must first have an understanding of what that category is. In order to develop a common language for what the process skills in science are, operational definitions for the process skills were developed, over a period of seven months, by Lake County, Illinois, science teachers and administrators (from Grades 3, 6, 8, and 11), Ralph W. Tyler, and Shelley Ann Lipowich. During the period of development, these definitions were used and refined in local districts as districts worked on writing objectives required by state mandate. Lake County Educational Service Center provided the coordination for this activity; Lipowich served as the curriculum consultant to the districts as this work was done; and Tyler brought clarity and focus to the project.

Verbalizations: Categories and Examples

Once the definitions were developed, they were used as the basis for categorizing the verbalizations from the Schaumburg tapes. Figure 6, Verbalizations: Categories and Examples, gives models for each of the thirteen State of Illinois process skills in science and the three categories added for the purpose of this study. Each model, or example, is categorized from context. What comes before and after each verbalization must be considered in making the category decision. The examples are taken from the Schaumburg classroom tapes.
### FIGURE 6
VERBALIZATIONS: CATEGORIES AND EXAMPLES* (1/8)

*Each example is categorized from context. What comes before and after each verbalization must be considered in making the category decision.

### OBSERVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;This thing exploded.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;It's floating.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;Even the big one without paper is floating.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 4A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;That water's hot!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tape 1A | (T) "What are the characteristics of the crayons we had the other day? In other words, how are they alike, and how are they different?"
(T) "Some had paper, and some didn't."
| Tape 7A | (T) "Can you think of another type of cells that you've heard about?"
(S1) "What about like blood cells."
(S2) "Muscle cells."
(S3) "Cells in your skin?"
(S4) "Like a jail, maybe? Cells?" |
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*Each example is categorized from context. What comes before and after each verbalization must be considered in making the category decision.

CLASSIFICATION (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 7B</td>
<td>(S) &quot;Yeah, those are air bubbles.&quot; [as opposed to epithelial cells]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3A</td>
<td>(S1) &quot;It won't float any more because the paper is soggy.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S2) &quot;...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S1) &quot;Yeah, when it gets soggy, it won't work any more.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;It's sinking. It had too many holes in it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tape 4A | [(S1) "How can I get mine to hold more weights?"
|         | (S2) "Maybe if you make the bottom thinner?" [it will hold more weights] |
| Tape 6B | (T) "What could have made a difference--what kinds of things could have made a difference in what you saw"? [under the microscope]
|         | (S1) "How thick it [onion skin] was."
|         | (S2) "What kind of stain we used." |
| Tape 7A | [in response to: (T) "Do you think an onion's a 'living' thing?"]
|         | (S1) "It's a living thing because its, if it's not living it can't come out of the ground."
|         | (S2) "and it can't grow roots." [therefore, it is living] |
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*Each example is categorized from context. What comes before and after each verbalization must be considered in making the category decision.

PREDICTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1A (T)</td>
<td>&quot;Would anyone like to draw a conclusion from what we have so far? It's pretty skimpy right now with all the information we have. Would anyone like to venture a guess as to what [crayon] floats and what doesn't--based on our three characteristics?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (S) | "Skinny ones'll float."
| Tape 1A (T) | "Raise your hand if you think this piece of clay will float."
| Tape 4A (S) | "It should hold a lot."
| Tape 4B (T) | "What did you guess it would hold?" [it = the "cargo" of a larger plastic cup after students had measured the "cargo" of a smaller plastic cup]

MEASUREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tape 1A (S) | [a crayon floated] "...like for four." [count of four]
| Tape 3A (T) | "We weighed our clay yesterday."
| Tape 4A (S) | "Ours is much bigger, though."
| Tape 5B (S) | "Ours holds six."
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TALKING: COMMUNICATION

SOURCE       EXAMPLE
Tape 1A      (S1)  "Remember, I pick it up, and you take it down."
               (S2)  "O.K."
Tape 4A      (S1)  "You know you put a little water on the desk, and it helps it
               stick better."
               (S2)  "O.K., I'll try that."

DATA COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION, AND INTERPRETATION

SOURCE       EXAMPLE
Tape 1A      (T)  "How many of you had paper covered crayons that sank?"
               (S)  "Me, yes and no. I have this blue that has paper and its
               skinny and its long and it floated ..."
Tape 4A      (S)  "...five, six, seven..."
Tape 4B      (T)  "Everyone write their own guess on the plastic one."
               [how many weights a plastic cup will hold]
Tape 4B      (T)  "So, you're going to figure out how much your
               boat, number 1, can hold and you can fill in the chart for
               number 1, and then, number 2, and then, number 3."

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION DEVELOPMENT

SOURCE       EXAMPLE
Tape 1A      (T)  "What is floating?...Is an object floating if it stays up in the
               water for a few seconds and then sinks?...We're looking
               for a definition of 'What is floating'. Is it floating if it sits in
               the middle of the water? Is it floating if it attaches to the
               side?"
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*Each example is categorized from context. What comes before and after each verbalization must be considered in making the category decision.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Tape 6A  (T)  "What do we mean by 'focused'?"
(S1)  "You can see it better.
(S2)  "It's clearer."

Tape 12A  [(T)  "What do we call the force that holds a plane back?"]
(S)  "Grab."  [for "drag"]

QUESTION AND HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION

SOURCE   EXAMPLE

Tape 1A  (T)  "Does the color make a difference?"

Tape 4A  (S)  "I want to try something. I want to see if it makes a difference in hot or cold water."

Tape 6A  (S)  "What is that?"

EXPERIMENTATION

SOURCE   EXAMPLE

Tape 1A  (S)  "I tried orange, and it floated."

Tape 1A  (S)  "Well, see, if paper makes it float better, you take a lot of crayons that have paper on 'em and do more of it and put them in one bucket and a lot of them that don't have paper and put 'em in another bucket and see which ones float or not and see how many of the paper ones sink and how many of them float and then you compare them."

Tape 3A  (S)  "Try the paper half on and half off."

Tape 4A  (S)  "O.K., now let's make our own shape and then compare it."
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MODEL FORMULATION

SOURCE  EXAMPLE

Tape 1A  (T)  "Do we have enough information here to draw a rule or a generalization about this stuff? B---, what do you say? Could you make a rule now about what floats and what doesn't--in crayons?"
  (S)  "Not really, but...."
  (T)  "Haven't figured it out yet? All right. Neither have I."

Tape 4A  [the sequence below is in response to: (S) "How did you get it [clay boat] to hold so much?"]
  (S1)  "What you have to try and do is get the skinny bottom and the skinny sides...."
  (S2)  "Real tall, though."
  (S1)  "Yeah, I know."
  (S2)  "And they have to curve in a little."
  (S1)  "Yeah, they have to curve so the water doesn't come in so much."

RESULTS VERIFICATION

SOURCE  EXAMPLE

Tape 1A  (T)  "Can we find that all of you had the same results? How many of you had orange-red crayons that floated? Did they also have paper on them?"

Tape 1A  (T)  "Did anyone have an orange-red crayon that sunk?"

Tape 4A  (S)  "I'm going to try that again."

Tape 4B  (T)  "Try to make two boats of the same weight so you can see if you made a better boat."
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SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1A</td>
<td>(T) &quot;How many of you have used a balance before?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S1) &quot;I have.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S2) &quot;Me, too.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 5A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;Hey, look through this!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 5A</td>
<td>(T) &quot;All right. Is there anyone who hasn't practiced using the cover slip?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 5A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;I got it!&quot; [when focusing a microscope]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 6A</td>
<td>(T) &quot;How can you tell if your mirror is adjusted?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S) &quot;You can see the light.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUIDANCE: DIRECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1A</td>
<td>(T) &quot;Those of you who didn't get the Buoyant Forces booklet the other day, raise your hand.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1A</td>
<td>(T) &quot;I'd like to get everyone together, now, into one conversation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1A</td>
<td>(T) &quot;Thank you, Z--, that's generous.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 2B</td>
<td>(S) &quot;Don't move that part.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 4B</td>
<td>(S) &quot;You, guys, put this on the top 'cause you remember yesterday I spilled the water.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 5A</td>
<td>(S) &quot;Can you help me?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 6 (Continued)
VERBALIZATIONS: CATEGORIES AND EXAMPLES* (8/8)

*Each example is categorized from context. What comes before and after each verbalization must be considered in making the category decision.

REGULATION: DISCIPLINE

SOURCE       EXAMPLE
Tape 1A   (T)  "We have a lot to do today, and when the noise stops, I'll know you're ready to begin."
Tape 2B   (S)  "Go away. I have to focus."
Tape 4A   (S)  "Knock it off."

APART FROM THE REST: OTHER

SOURCE       EXAMPLE
Tape 1A   (S1)  "She left her recording thing on."
               (S2)  "Oh, oh."
Tape 4A   (S)  "Man Overboard!"
Tape 6A   (S)  "Me and A--- are friends again."
Tape 8A   (T)  "Island of the Blue Dolphin--anyone check it out from the library?"

Categorizing the Data

Any group analyzing classroom tapes and categorizing the data must make jointly agreed upon decisions so that they are all using a common standard or rubric. While Figure 6, Verbalizations: Categories and Examples, and Appendix D, Operational Definitions for Process
Skills in Science, provide the framework for this study, a more detailed look at the decision making process involved in setting up the system is needed. This section denotes the choices made for this study. Other groups of experts might have made other choices. The critical factor here is that a rubric must be constructed that is jointly agreed upon and followed.

EXAMPLE

Tape 1A  (T)  "How many of you had paper covered crayons that sunk?"
(S)  "Me, yes and no. I have this blue that has paper, and it's skinny, and it's long, and it floated like for four [count of four]."

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Data...  (T)  "How many of you had paper covered crayons that sunk?"
Data...  (S1)  "Me, yes and no. I have this blue that has paper, and it's skinny, and it's long, and it floated..."
Measurement  (S1)  "like for four [count of four]."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE:

"Data..." is tallied twice because the speaker changed. Measurement is also tallied because the verbalization shows that quantification of an event occurred, and thus, the category has changed even though the speaker has not.

EXAMPLE

Tape 1A  (S)  "This thing exploded."

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Observation  (S)  "This thing exploded."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE

Is this verbalization an "Observation" or a "Communication"? For this study, communication is tallied only where there is an "exchange". "Exchange is defined as one
speaker's verbalization and another's response. If no apparent direct response is heard, the verbalization is not counted as "Communication".

**EXAMPLE**

Tape 1A (T) "Did anyone have an orange-red crayon that sunk?"

**CATEGORY** VERBALIZATION

Results Ver... (T) "Did anyone have an orange-red crayon that sunk?"

**DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE**

Is this example "Classification" or "Results Verification"? The example is tallied under "Results Verification" because, in context, the teacher was attempting to lead the students into seeing that there were some orange-reds that had floated and some that had sunk. As a result of the discussion, students decided to go back and try to verify their results.

**EXAMPLE**

Tape 1A (S) "I tried orange, and it floated."

**CATEGORY** VERBALIZATION

Experiment... (S) "I tried orange, and it floated."

**DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE**

Is this example "Observation"; "Data Collection, Organization, and Interpretation"; or "Experimentation"? Truly all three. The student is making an observation--"using the senses to obtain information". The student is classifying crayons into the categories of "floats" or "doesn't float"--"grouping or sorting into categories using similar or dissimilar characteristics". The student is experimenting by trying out various crayons to see which float and which do not float--"carrying out an activity to test a hypothesis" (Lipowich & Tyler, Eds.)

Because experimentation involves multiple processes, and because multiple processes are involved in this verbalization, this example was tallied under "Experimentation".
One must also note what went "before" a verbalization. In this case, the verbalization was not one of a series of observations or classifications. Rather, it is a "recall" of a process that had been done prior to the current discussion. Since the verbalization is in the nature of a "summary" statement of several steps that were done over time, it is best placed under "Experimentation".

Note: Verbalizations are placed under only one category heading. Placement is done rapidly, keying the categories into the computer. If each verbalization were subjected to the intensive type of discussion needed to determine "how many" categories it would fall under, the whole efficiency of this classification method would be lost.

In an ideal process-science classroom, one hopes that students will begin to take on some of the leadership roles that traditionally a teacher has had. Thus, students may find themselves proposing new directions for work, bringing other students back to the task at hand, and asking questions of themselves and others in their group. Teachers, acting as facilitators, also take on the role of question-asker--not directly questioning the student looking for a one correct answer, but rather modeling the kinds of questions about the work that the teacher hopes the students will then begin to ask.

EXAMPLE

Tape 1A (T) "Do we have enough information here to draw a rule or a generalization about this stuff? B---, what do you say? Could you make a rule now about what floats and what doesn't--in crayons?"

(S) "Not really, but..."

(T) "Haven't figured it out yet? All right. Neither have I."
CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Model Form...  (T)  "Do we have enough information here to draw a rule or a
generalization about this stuff? Brian, what do you say?
Could you make a rule now about what floats and what
doesn't--in crayons?"
(S)  "Not really, but..."
(T)  "Haven't figured it out yet? All right. Neither have I."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE

In this example the teacher and the students are not yet able to form a model for what is
going on, but the verbalizations indicate that an attempt is being made to do so. Therefore,
three tallies are made under the category "Model Formulation". There is real value for the
students in understanding that further experimentation would have to go on before a model
could be formed.

Students need to understand that models are not always correct, that models are
constantly being tested against new data to see if the model does indeed remain "consistant
with" all of the data (Lipowich & Tyer, Eds.)

Thus, the exercise of attempting to construct that model is of great value and legitimately can
be tallied--even though a model was not achieved--at this time.

EXAMPLE

Tape 1A  (T)  "I'd like to get everyone together, now, into one
conversation."

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Guidance...  (T)  "I'd like to get everyone together, now, into one
conversation."

Why isn't this example tallied under "Regulation: Discipline"? In a process science
classroom, the teacher's role is that of facilitator. Students' interaction is encouraged.
Frequently, and ideally, many conversations take place at the same time. In the verbalization
above, the teacher is not complaining about the noise level; the teacher simply wants all the
students to be able to hear all the shared data so that the students can relate data from others to their own work.

EXAMPLES

Tape 4B (S) "You, guys, put this on the top 'cause you remember yesterday I spilled the water."

Tape 5A (S) "Can you help me?"

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Guidance... (S) "You, guys, put this on the top 'cause you remember yesterday I spilled the water."

Guidance... (S) "Can you help me?"

In a process science classroom, it is hoped that students will take a leadership role in giving help to each other. Thus, help or instruction, given or received, whether by student or teacher comes under the heading of "Guidance: Directions".

The reading of directions aloud is also tallied under "Guidance: Directions", unless the directions involve instructions for silent (written) work that the students will be doing during the class session. The next example shows this type of situation.

EXAMPLE

Tape 4B (T) "Now, it's not a picture graph because we're not going to draw little pictures. When you fill [it] in, it's going to look like a bar. So, you're going to figure out how much your boat, number 1, can hold and you can fill in the chart for number 1, and then, number 2, and then, number 3."
CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Guidance:... (T) "Now, it's not a picture graph because we're not going to draw little pictures. When you fill [it] in, it's going to look like a bar."

Data... (T) "So, you're going to figure out how much your boat, number 1, can hold and you can fill in the chart for number 1. and then, number 2, and then, number 3."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE

In this example, the first part of the same speaker comes under "Guidance: Directions", and the second part comes under "Data Collection, Organization, and Interpretation".

EXAMPLES

Tape 1A (S) "I tried orange, and it floated."

Tape 1A (S) "Well, see, if paper makes it float better, you take a lot of crayons that have paper on 'em and do more of it and put them in one bucket and a lot of them that don't have paper and put 'em in another bucket and see which ones float or not and see how many of the paper ones sink and how many of them float and then you compare them."

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Experiment... (S) "I tried orange, and it floated."

Experiment... (S) "Well, see, if paper makes it float better, you take a lot of crayons that have paper on 'em and do more of it and put them in one bucket and a lot of them that don't have paper and put 'em in another bucket and see which ones float or not and see how many of the paper ones sink and how many of them float and then you compare them."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLES:

The first example is that of a student carrying out someone else's activity to test a hypothesis. The second example is that of a student designing his own activity to test a hypothesis.
EXAMPLE

Tape 4A (S1) "You know you put a little water on the desk, and it helps it stick better."
(S2) "O.K., I'll try that."

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Talking: Com... (S1) "You know you put a little water on the desk and it helps it stick better."
Talking: Com... (S2) "O.K., I'll try that."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE

This is a clear example of the "Talking: Communication" category because two people are sharing information gained by (S1)'s prior experimentation.

EXAMPLE

Data... "six, seven, eight..."
Meas. "Ours holds eight."

These distinctions fall into the range of "executive" decisions, but a decision does have to be made. For the purpose of this study, actual counting verbalizations are considered to be "Data Collection..." because the students are in the process of "gathering information". Summary statements of quantification are considered to be "Measurement" since they "quantify the description of an object" (Lipowich & Tyler, Eds.)

EXAMPLES

Tape 1A (T) "Does the color make a difference?"
Tape 4A (S) "I want to try something. I want to see if it makes a difference in hot or cold water."
CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Quest... (T) "Does the color make a difference?"

Quest... (S) "I want to try something. I want to see if it makes a difference in hot or cold water."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLES

The first example comes from a teacher during a discussion session. It meets the criteria of the first part of "Question and Hypothesis Formulation" and is basically and simply a question, an "expression of uncertainty" (Lipowich & Tyler, Eds.).

In the second example a student is "expressing an uncertainty" ("Questioning and Hypothesis Formulation") and is also trying to find out if water temperature is a factor in the experiment. The student is "deciding upon a logical explanation as the basis for further investigation to see whether the results are consistent with the explanation" ("Questioning and Hypothesis Formulation"). In other words, the student's underlying statement is: "The temperature of the water is a factor in whether an object floats or not." Thus, this example meets the criteria of both parts of "Question and Hypothesis Formulation" (Lipowich & Tyler, Eds.)

EXAMPLE

Tape 3A (S) "Even the big one without paper is floating."

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Observation (S) "Even the big one without paper is floating."

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE

This example is a very difficult one to categorize. For this study, it was categorized under "Observation", since it uses the eyes to "obtain information". It could equally well have been tallied either under "Classification", "since it "group[s] or sort[s] into categories" of size, paper, and floatation, or under "Data Collection...", since observations are a part of "gathering
information" (Lipowich & Tyler, Eds.)

Since a basic decision was made not to double-tally any one verbalization in this study, this statement is tallied under "Observation" because, in context, it came in the middle of simpler observations. Context, what came before and what came after, has to be the deciding factor in a situation like this one.

EXAMPLES

Tape 1A  
(T) "How many of you have used a balance before?"
(S1) "I have."
(S2) "Me, too."

Tape 5A  
(S) "Hey, look through this!"

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Sci. Equip....  
(T) "How many of you have used a balance before?"
(S1) "I have."
(S2) "Me, too."

Sci. Equip....  
(S) "Hey, look through this!"

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLES

The first example is similar to the written version that is used by Larry Small in Schaumburg in evaluating whether or not students have used a given piece of scientific equipment during a given year. The question, "Have you used a microscope this year?", appears on fourth grade students' annual district evaluation.

The second example, heard in context, indicates that a student has focused a microscope, seen something, and wants to share what has been seen. If the statement had been "Look at this!", the tally would have gone under the "Observation" category. The word, "through", and the context surrounding the verbalization indicates that the student's excitement is about his focusing and his ability to obtain a clear picture, rather than about what he is viewing.
EXAMPLE

Tape 8A (T) "Island of the Blue Dolphin--anyone check it out from the library?"

CATEGORY VERBALIZATION

Apart...: Other (T) "Island of the Blue Dolphin--anyone check it out from the library?"

DISCUSSION OF THE EXAMPLE

It's important to realize that "off-task" verbalizations can originate with the teacher or from outside the classroom, as well as from students.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Summary Data

Narrative results are to be augmented with figures that describe patterns, differences, uniqueness, and possible explanations for the data. Spreadsheets of the data may be found in Appendix H, Verbalizations: Percent Frequency of Process Science Skills--Raw Scores and Percents by Unit, Class, and Session (Spreadsheet) and Appendix I, Frequency Distribution of "Observation" by Unit and Class (Spreadsheet). The template for the basic spreadsheet used to analyze the data may be seen from the layout of Figure 7, Summary Sheet of Verbalizations: Percent Frequency of Process Science Skills--Raw Scores and Percents by Unit, Class, and Session (Spreadsheet).

FIGURE 7
SUMMARY SHEET OF VERBALIZATIONS:
PERCENT FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS--RAW SCORES AND PERCENTS BY UNIT, CLASS, AND SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X %</th>
<th>Obse</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Infer</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Mes</th>
<th>Conr</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OpDe</th>
<th>Quest</th>
<th>Expe</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Resu</th>
<th>SciEq</th>
<th>Teach</th>
<th>Disc</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cue)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X % Sessions 1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X % Sessions 2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand X Percent</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data by Classes

Audio tapes from sixty classrooms were analyzed, and a total of 12,680 verbalizations were categorized. The data from each classroom, Sessions 1 and 2 together, was then graphed for study. Seventy-seven percent (23/30) of the classes analyzed for Sessions 1 and
2 were working in one unit for both sessions. Figure 8, Class 1 Sessions 1-2 Buoyant Forces: Graph of Comparative Data, is an example of this type of class.

Twenty-three percent (7/30) of the classes analyzed were working in one unit during Session 1 and a different one during Session 2. Figure 9, Class 12 Session 1 Forces of Flying / Session 2 Mystery Powders: Graph of Comparative Data, is an example of a two-unit class.

No particular patterns or trends emerged from the study of individual classes, looked at class by class.
When the sessions were grouped by the units each class studied, however, trends did begin to emerge. Figures 10-14 show these trends.
Each of the units show strengths in skill areas that are built into the units. For example, Artemia Salina, in Figure 10, is a unit that introduces both the use of the microscope and the study of brine shrimp. Thus, it is logical to see the unit ranking high in both "Observation" and "Communication".

Data by Sessions

Students in Schaumburg are frequently observed by adults from their own district and from outside the district. Visitors are generally noted, introduced, and then classes go on as usual. Visitors may be individuals or teams, but their presence does not seem to interfere with normal, classroom activity. Nevertheless, taping was done in two Sessions to see if there would be a major difference between the tapes obtained from Sessions 1 and 2. Figure 15 compares the mean percentage frequencies, in each category, from all thirty classes in Session 1 with all thirty classes in Session 2.

Figure 16 shows the standard deviations between Session 1 and Session 2 for each category. The S.D.'s range from .03 to 1.17 showing that both sessions were remarkably similar in percent frequency of occurrence of the process skills.
FIGURE 16
STANDARD DEVIATION: SESSIONS 1 AND 2

APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS—RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNF

SUMMARY SHEET: STANDARD DEVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Code)</th>
<th>Obse</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Infer</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Meas</th>
<th>Comr</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OpDe</th>
<th>Quest</th>
<th>Expe</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Resu</th>
<th>SciEq</th>
<th>Guidi</th>
<th>Regu</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cue)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD DEVIATION: SESSIONS 1 AND 2

| X % Sessions 1 | 12% 3% 2% 2% 4% 17% 5% 0% 5% 8% 1% 3% 4% 24% 3% 6% |
| X % Sessions 2 | 13% 4% 2% 2% 5% 18% 5% 0% 4% 6% 1% 2% 4% 26% 4% 5% |
| StDev: Skills  | 1.17 0.29 0.10 0.42 0.76 0.60 0.28 0.03 0.31 1.49 0.33 0.55 0.08 0.87 0.36 1.16 |

Figure 17 shows the grand mean percentage frequency of occurrence for Sessions 1 and combined. Each and every skill category required by the state is present in fourth grade classrooms in Schaumburg District 54.

While the "Apart: Other" category has a higher percent frequency of occurrence in Session 1, so do the categories of: "Prediction", "Operational Definition Formulation", Questioning and Hypothesis Formulation", "Experimentation", "Model Formulation", and "Results Verification".
It seems reasonable to assume that the data from Session 1 is representative of a "normal classroom" with a slight rise in off-focus activity because of the presence of the tape recorder.

**Clusters of Skills**

Figure 18, Classes Observed Per Unit, shows that classrooms working in the units **Buoyant Forces** and **Small Things** were observed for 24 and 22 classes respectively, while the other three units were observed three to six classrooms. **Buoyant Forces** is based on the ESS unit **Clay Boats**, while **Small Things** is also based on the ESS unit of the same name. These referents should be helpful to other districts, both because of the availability of the ESS units and the large number of classes in Schaumburg that were analyzed. The Schaumburg objectives for their versions of the ESS units are in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENCE UNITS</th>
<th>CLASSES OBSERVED PER UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percent frequency distribution of one skill, "Observation", by all classes does not show any resemblance to a pattern. Figure 19 shows this lack of pattern. However, when one groups the skill "Observation" by unit, rather than by class, one can see clustering in the two units, **Buoyant Forces** and **Small Things**, that have broad coverage of all the lessons within the unit. See Figures 20-24, grouped on the next two pages.
FIGURE 19
PERCENT FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF "OBSERVATION" BY ALL CLASSES

FIGURE 20
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF "OBSERVATION" BY UNIT: ARTEMIA SALINA
Highs and Lows

In an effort to see whether "one class" had a higher percentage frequency of occurrence of the skills than "other classes", the total sample was grouped for highest, second highest, lowest, second lowest percent frequency of occurrence, by category. Figure 25, Process Science Skill Categories: Number of Times Each Class Tallied High(est) and Low(est) in a Given Category, shows that, while Classes 17 and 21 appear to be ranking high, 23/30, or 77% of all the classes ranked at least once in the High(est) percent frequency of occurrence. Moreover, 14/30, or 47%, scored in both highest and lowest ranks of percent frequency of occurrence, by category.

Figures 10-14, Graphs of Comparative Data, by units, reinforces the above observation that it is the unit, rather than the class, that seems to be the stronger indicator of whether or not a particular class will score high(est) or low(est) in a given category.
Process Skills vs "Other"

A comparison was made between the percent frequency of occurrence of the process science skills and the "Other" categories of Guidance: Directions; Regulation: Discipline; and Apart: Other (Figure 26 and Appendix I).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS SKILLS VS &quot;OTHER&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance: Direction 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation: Discipline 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apart: Other 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Science Skills 66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What's Happening in the Classroom vs What's on Paper

Finally, a category-by-category comparison between (each category's percent of the total number of process science objectives in Schaumburg) and (the mean percent frequency of occurrence of that category in fourth grade classrooms) is made in Figure 27. Appendix B lists the Schaumburg objectives, by skill categories, so that a comparison can be made to similar units of study outside Schaumburg.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Limitations of the Study

This study is a quantitative description of the frequency of occurrence of process science skills. It seeks to establish a base-line of data for one middle grade, the fourth, in a federal, exemplary, elementary science program, Schaumburg Elementary School District 54. Its intent is "to collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena" (Isaac & Michael, 1984), and not to make judgments as to the quality of the count. The data is presented, along with the methodology of obtaining it, in order to establish a base-line for future, controlled-variable studies.

No parametric assumptions can be made about the data because:

1. The sample population was not randomly selected. District policy and practice require that all teachers whose classes are taped be volunteers. The investigator was not "invited" by each building to give the basic presentation within the building, so not every teacher was invited to participate in the study in the same way. Every building that did hear the presentation did not participate in the study. Sixty percent of the K-6 buildings, twelve out of twenty, that were open and in service in 1986-87 had teachers who volunteered to have their classrooms taped. In each of the twelve buildings that did participate, all of the teachers who taught science to heterogeneously grouped fourth graders in that building did volunteer. Twenty-seven out of fifty-nine teachers (53%) teaching at that grade level in that year did volunteer. It was felt that asking teachers to fill out a questionnaire about why they had volunteered would reduce the number of classes available for the sample. The intent was to obtain as many teachers and lessons as possible to get closest to what might be a base-line.

The year 1986-87, for many reasons connected with the new mandates for reform, appeared to
be a stressful year in terms of additional requirements put upon teachers and administrators in
general. Therefore, it was decided that the teachers not be given an additional task, that of
filling out a questionnaire about their motivations for participation, or nonparticipation, in the
study. Moreover, there was no way to ascertain what happened within every building after the
administrators had attended the two meetings held to outline the proposed study. The
sample is definitely skewed, but it is the sample that was available at the time of the study.

The number of classes taped, for each unit, is not equal. Again, the sample of units
represents those taught at the times that could be arranged for tapings; the times for the
tapings were dependent upon: teachers' schedules, building schedules, and the investigator's
schedule. Choice of the appointment times were originally to be at the discretion of the teacher
and the teacher's administrator; however, many of the appointments were revised, some more
than once. In addition, the schedule for rotation of the units between teachers and buildings
had been set up prior to the study, and the units being taught by the teachers at the times of
the tapings could not be controlled by this study. This is one area wherein this study is flawed,
but another might be controlled. Groupings appear by units, rather than by classes, leading one
to want to try to group for the lessons within the units.

2. The distribution of scores in the population, within a class, would be very
difficult to determine. Students move from place to place within a room, usually freely, to share
observations and techniques for working. From the "high/low" groupings that were made,
individual classes appear to rank high in a particular skill according to the unit they're studying. If
the skill is not built into the unit, it generally does not appear on the tally sheet.

3. It is also possible that the samples are not independent. Students transfer from
school to school in Schaumburg, and it is possible that a fourth grade student might have been
taped in more than one class. To the investigator's knowledge, this did not happen, but with
the number of students involved in the study, approximately 775, it was not possible to "take attendance" in each class without causing additional disruption to the process of obtaining an "as normal as possible" lesson sample.

Reliability

The investigator tallied two full classes twice, one week apart, to determine whether the investigator was categorizing in a reliable manner. Standard deviations were calculated between the first time and the second time for each category. The range of the standard deviation for the first reliability session was from .03 to 1.44. The range for the second session was from .18 to .71. See Figure 28, Reliability: Standard Deviation, by Skill Categories, from Identical Sessions Tallied One Week Apart. This range, however, is for one investigator, an investigator who has been working on differentiating between these skills on a daily basis for over two years. The one attempt that was made to obtain an inter-rater reliability rating was not a success in that it did not achieve its purpose—an inter-reliability rating for all of the designated categories. It did demonstrate to all four of the "experts" that a great deal of discussion was needed to obtain any kind of consensus—even with prior agreement to accept the Operational Definitions attached to this study. Since three of the "experts" had not been involved in working out the operational definitions, the "acceptance level" was harder to achieve. The major consensus reached during the work session was that Directions should, at this time, be a separate category.
While the end data is quantitative, the process necessary to achieve the data is a very qualitative one. The methodology is simple to use, but cannot be used without having inter-rater consensus established within a given group prior to any attempt to categorize new data. One of the most difficult aspects of this study is in trying to reach consensus on a definition for each process skill. How does "Inference" really differ from "Prediction"? How does "Observation" really differ from "Data collection"? When "x" number of science teachers each write a definition for a given skill, one has "x" different definitions. The first task is to achieve
consensus at a given grade level. Then, one has to mesh the various grade level "consensus-
definitions" within a district. In this study, Grades 3, 6, 8, and 11 are the grades under
consideration since these are the grades that "must test" in Illinois. Is "Inference" the same skill
in Grade 3 as it is in Grade 11? Must an inference be "correct" to be tallied? Again, it is the
questions raised, considered, and answered, for the time being, according to one's local
conditions and needs, that are significant and are of benefit.

A teacher cannot facilitate a child's "inferring" until that teacher first understands what
inference is--concretely, in everyday terms, at grade level, and couched in both behavior and
content. Once a teacher has this knowledge, that teacher can facilitate the child's acquisition of
the skill. One cannot teach, much less evaluate, an unknown quality.

The weakest link in any attempt to replicate this study lies in the lack of that "common
language" between teacher and teacher, expert and expert. The greatest strength in any
attempt to replicate this study lies in the necessity of having to establish that "common
language". The "common language" established does not have to be that which was
established within this study; in fact, since the intent is to criterion-reference any process skills
to a local science curriculum, and since the skills are different in name from district to district,
only districts in Illinois will have all of these skills named in this manner. Nonetheless, the great
strength of replication remains that a similarly constructed framework of common reference
must first be established. It is from the discussion and common understandings gained during
this process that any benefits will accrue. The process becomes far more important than the
product.

Frequency of Occurrence of Process Science Skills in Schaumburg

What, then, can one say about the frequency of occurrence of process science skills in
the fourth grade of this one federal, exemplary elementary science district? This study shows that all of the skills are being practiced by some of the students in some of the classrooms.

Figure 29 shows the grand mean percent frequency from both sessions of taping combined.

FIGURE 29
GRAND MEAN % FREQUENCY

APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS—RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Cue)</th>
<th>Obse</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Infer</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Meas</th>
<th>Comr</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OpDe</th>
<th>Quest</th>
<th>Exper</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Resu</th>
<th>SciEq</th>
<th>Guida</th>
<th>Regu</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND X % FRE</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does a sheet like this mean that no "Operational Definition Development" is going on? Not at all. Figure 30, Operational Definition Formulation: Highs and Lows, shows that Class 1 had a 5% frequency of occurrence when it was studying Buoyant Forces. Is this because the teacher was skillful in Class 1? On this skill, the second highest groups were also the second lowest.

FIGURE 30
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION FORMULATION: HIGHS AND LOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION 1</th>
<th>SESSION 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGHEST % Freq</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit:</td>
<td>B.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd HIGHEST % Freq</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit:</td>
<td>S.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWEST % Freq</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes:</td>
<td>25 Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units:</td>
<td>1-A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-B.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-F.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-S.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd LOWEST % Freq</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes:</td>
<td>23/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units:</td>
<td>A.S./B.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2nd Highest-2nd Lowest (same classes)
One recommendation might be to look at some of the units from S-APA that were built upon Operational Definition Development and incorporate similar activities into Schaumburg units. Another possibility might be to compare the lessons Schaumburg already has in its curriculum, on a lesson by lesson comparison. Using this kind of lesson-by-lesson comparison, it might be possible to see what roles various other factors play.

Figure 31 shows the percent frequency of occurrence of the science process skills, across the fourth grade classes studied. Compared with "other" aspects of a fourth grade classroom, almost sixty-seven percent of the verbalizations involve the process skills of science. Figure 31 also shows that approximately one-fourth of the verbalizations involve guidance or direction.

Directions for Future Study

Ideally, future directions for this kind of study would involve two aspects:

1. a lesson-by-lesson, rather than a unit-by-unit approach;
2. a re-working of the operational definitions on a national basis, similar to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics "Standards" committees; and
3. cooperation with other disciplines to see what "over-lap" exists from discipline to discipline in the "process skills".

"Experimentation" is going on constantly in the classrooms that were observed, but it does not rank as high as "Observation". It is very possible that, in practice, the process skills in Goal 4 in Illinois are not discrete, mutually exclusive skill categories. There is a very real need to decide what these process skills are so that educators do have a "common language" in which to communicate--from teacher to teacher, from district to district, and from region to region.

Implications for Science Reform in Illinois

This study strongly indicates that science reform in Illinois exists in both the real world and the ideal world. Pages 5-8 of the State Goals are definitely in accord with the highest recommendations coming from such national groups as NAEP, NSF, and NSTA. Districts providing such a program to all of their students would indeed be exemplary. Approximately eight to twelve percent of the districts in this nation have process science curricula. There is no question that the such districts are rare, nationally, and in Illinois. Implementing a process science curriculum requires measures that Illinois has yet to fully support. In exemplary districts, such as Schaumburg, these programs have evolved through time--many years' time. These programs have also involved heavy staff development and training in both process science skills and cooperative learning techniques. The exemplary programs have also been shown to have a very high degree of commitment, from both the administration and the community. Where exemplary programs have evolved, there have also been dollar and
personnel commitment: these districts have set aside dollars for equipment and have had a science "ombudsperson" to facilitate the process.

The "real world" aspect of reform is "assessment". We cannot reliably, validly, and efficiently measure achievement in most of the process skills in science at this point. We can, however, begin to look at whether students are demonstrating the process science skills within their class sessions. This study shows clearly that the process skills are tied closely to the curriculum that is used. Observation of students' work within the class setting, while they are doing process science activities, is still the best method available for looking at student performance at the local district level. Thus, the first steps for a textbook-only district are: process science within the science curriculum, staff development, and materials. At the same time, it is crucial that educators and psychometricians work toward developing, first, a common language for what the process skills are, and then, valid, reliable, and efficient methods for their assessment.
SUMMARY

This study establishes a quantitative base-line of the frequency of occurrence of process science skills in Illinois's Schaumburg Elementary District 54, a district declared "Exemplary" by both the NSF and the NSTA under the Search for Excellence in Science Education.

In this time of state-legislated reform and accountability, many states have mandated that process science skills be taught, achievement measured, results publicly reported, and programs revised, based upon the assessment results. Yet, educators do not have nationally standardized, valid, reliable, and efficient instruments to assess all of the process science skills.

This study matches 12,680 student and teacher verbalizations from sixty class periods, thirty different classes from twelve schools, to sixteen categories (Observation; Classification; Inference; Prediction; Measurement; Communication; Data collection, organization and interpretation; Operational definition development; Question and hypothesis formulation; Experimentation; Model formulation; Results verification; and Scientific equipment use) in order to determine the extent to which students are demonstrating the use of these skills in their classroom activities.

This study includes: Operational Definitions for Process Skills in Science: Lake County, Illinois, developed by a group of 60 educators, representing Grades 3, 6, 8, and 11 and edited by Lipowich and Tyler, R. W.; a computer-assisted method of counting the frequency of occurrence of process science skills; and the Schaumburg objectives, listed by skill categories, so that comparisons can be made.

The Schaumburg units are based on public domain units such as Clay Boats and Small.
Things. Each unit shows strengths in the skill areas that are built into the unit. The results indicate that it is the unit, rather than the class, that is the stronger indicator of whether or not a particular class will score high(est) or low(est) in a given category.

All skill categories required by Illinois are present in fourth grade classrooms in Schaumburg. Frequencies of occurrence are given by category, by class, by unit, and by session. Using the grand mean results from all sixty class periods, Process Science Skills occurred 66.7% of the time.

This methodology can be used to compare another fourth grade classroom or another grade level to Schaumburg's fourth grade.
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BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES

STATE GOAL FOR LEARNING 1

As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the concepts and basic vocabulary of biological, physical, and environmental sciences and their application to life and work in contemporary technological society.

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS RELATED TO GOAL 1

The following knowledge and skills are related to this State Goal for Learning:

A Symmetries or patterns in the natural and physical world.
B Orderliness in nature and the schemes we use to express this order.
C Fundamental units used to express the structure of nature.
D How two or more things interact and the effect each has on the other.
E Common characteristics of plant and animal communities.
F Characteristics of energy and matter.
G Equilibrium applied to simple systems.
H Influence of a field on objects within its domain.
I Cause and effect relationships which allow predictions to be made.
J Cycles in which conditions or events are repeated at regular intervals.
K Systems as defined by boundaries.
L Stages, mechanisms, and rates of change.
M Organism as a system which can be characterized by the processes of life.
N Relationship of structure to function.
O The nature of force.
P Perception as our way of interpreting the world.
Q Time and space as dimensions which separate things and events.
BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES

STATE GOAL FOR LEARNING 2

As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the social and environmental implications and limitations of technological development.

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS RELATED TO GOAL 2

The following knowledge and skills are related to this State Goal for Learning:

A. Relationships between science and technology.
B. Selected nonrenewable and renewable natural resources.
C. Relationships between the natural and technological world.
D. Influence of scientific and technological research on the needs, interest, and financial support of society.
E. Application of scientific research to consumer decision making.
F. Application of selected ecological concepts to human and environmental situations.
G. Society's responsibility for improving the environment and protecting natural resources.
H. Environmental issues in light of scientific and technological knowledge and ethical principles.
BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES

STATE GOAL FOR LEARNING 3

As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the principles of scientific research and their application in simple research projects.

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS RELATED TO GOAL 3

The following knowledge and skills are related to this State Goal for Learning:

A Ethical practices which include:

1. Honesty and integrity in the recording and reporting of the results of scientific inquiry;
2. Disclosure, including open discussion of ideas, techniques and results;
3. Rights of subjects, humanness and respect for life.

B Basic scientific standards and research abilities which include:

1. Accuracy, skill and safe practices in laboratory activities;
2. Application of an operational definition using terms to physically describe the activity or result of a procedure;
3. Good experimental techniques which will be evident by the precision practiced during the investigation;
4. Systematization of data to maintain an orderly manner of review;
5. Effectiveness in communicating laboratory procedures and results;
6. Ability to analyze, evaluate or replicate the experimental work of others.
STATE GOAL FOR LEARNING 4

As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the processes, techniques, methods, equipment and available technology of science.

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS RELATED TO GOAL 4

The following knowledge and skills are related to this State Goal for Learning:

A Observation.
B Classification.
C Inference.
D Prediction.
E Measurement.
F Communication.
G Data collection, organization and interpretation.
H Operational definition development.
I Question and hypothesis formulation.
J Experimentation.
K Model formulation.
L Results verification.
M Scientific equipment use.
APPENDIX B
OUTCOME STATEMENT 1: As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the concepts, principles, theories, and laws of physical, biological and environmental sciences and their application to life and work in contemporary technological society. Because science demands student participation and involvement in both laboratory and field situations at all grade levels, students should demonstrate the ability to:

OUTCOME A: Identify symmetries or patterns in the natural and physical world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>L.OBJ.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Understand that brine shrimp belong to a family similar to spiders, lobsters, and insects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Identify similarities in a set of common household powders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Recognize similarities in animal and plant cells.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOME B: Identify orderliness in nature and the schemes we use to express this order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>L.OBJ.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Understand that matter has qualities, called properties, that help identify a material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Understand that properties help determine for what purposes a material can be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOME C: Identify fundamental entities which are useful in expressing the structure of nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>L.OBJ.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Understand that acids have a sour taste and turn litmus paper red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Understand that bases have a bitter taste, feel slippery, and turn litmus paper blue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Understand the importance of standardized units in comparing cargo carrying ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Identify gravity as a force that affects flight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Identify lift as a force that affects flight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Identify thrust as a force that affects flight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Identify drag as a force that affects flight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Recognize that living organisms have a common unit called a cell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTCOME D: Describe interactions of two or more things and the effect each has on the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>L. OBJ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Understand the effect water has on dried brine shrimp eggs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Understand how natural bodies of water become salty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of gravity &amp; air pressure: upside-down water-filled cup &amp; paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of air pressure (air bag) and a table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of air pressure and gravity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Describe the effect of lift on an airplane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Describe the effect of drag on an airplane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Describe the effect of gravity on an airplane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Describe the effect of thrust on an airplane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of heat with the common household powders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of warm water with the common household powders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of peroxide with the common household powders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of alcohol with the common household powders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of food coloring with the common household powders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Describe the interaction of iodine with the common household powders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Recognize that a microscope changes the appearance of the units seen, not the size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Describe what effect stains may have on clothing, fingers, and cells.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOME E: Describe populations that have similarities or common characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>L. OBJ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Recognize that all the members of a brine shrimp population will have common characteristic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOME F: Describe energy/matter and their various forms and relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>L. OBJ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Observe that air pushes down equally on water in a glass &amp; water in a straw in that glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Understand that energy may occur as heat, light, or electricity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Understand that energy is needed or given off for a chemical change to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Differentiate among elements, compounds, and mixtures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Observe the circumstantial evidence that atoms and molecules do exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Observe the heat energy given off when plaster of Paris hardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mystery Powders

Understand that heat energy is applied until no more changes occur.

OUTCOME G: Describe equilibrium and its affecting factors.

GRADE: UNIT: L. OBJ:
4 Artemia Salina
Understand that litmus paper that turns red indicates the presence of an acid.
4 Artemia Salina
Understand that litmus paper that turns blue indicates the presence of a base.
4 Artemia Salina
Understand that litmus paper that does not change color is neutral.

OUTCOME H: Describe how a field influences objects within its domain.

GRADE: UNIT: L. OBJ:
4 Artemia Salina
Understand that brine shrimp live in salt water and die in fresh water.
4 Buoyant Forces
Understand the different effects on an object in an ocean and in a fresh body of water.

OUTCOME I: Understand cause and effect relationships which allow predictions to be made.

GRADE: UNIT: L. OBJ:
4 Forces of Flying
Understand the effect of a propeller or jet engine on an airplane.
4 Forces of Flying
Understand the effects of gravity and drag on an airplane.
4 Forces of Flying
Understand what the source of thrust is for a glider.
4 Mystery Powders
Understand that an indicator can show the presence of a given substance.
4 Mystery Powders
Understand that an indicator can show the absence of a given substance.

OUTCOME J: Understand cycles in which conditions or events are repeated at regular intervals.

GRADE: UNIT: L. OBJ:
4 Artemia Salina
Understand the food chain beginning with brine shrimp.
4 Artemia Salina
Understand the life cycle of brine shrimp.

OUTCOME K: Understand systems as defined by boundaries.

GRADE: UNIT: L. OBJ:
4 Artemia Salina
Observe the circulation in a living brine shrimp.
Artemia Salina
Observe food in the gut of a living brine shrimp.
Artemia Salina
Observe eggs in the egg sac of a living brine shrimp.
Artemia Salina
Understand that brine shrimp belong to a family that has tough armor and joined feet.
Artemia Salina
Describe the properties of brine shrimp eggs.
Forces of Flying
Understand that paper gliders do not belong to the engine-powered airplane system.
Mystery Powders
Distinguish between physical and chemical properties.
Small Things
Distinguish between living and non-living.

OUTCOME L: Understand change including its rate, stages and mechanisms.

GRADE: L. OBJ.:
Artemia Salina
Understand change as it relates to the life cycle of brine shrimp.
Artemia Salina
Understand that the first batch of eggs of a brine shrimp hatch inside the female body.
Artemia Salina
Understand that the second batch of eggs of a brine shrimp hatch outside the female body.
Artemia Salina
Understand that the second batch of eggs of a brine shrimp must dry out before hatching.
Buoyant Forces
Understand that changing the shape of a lump of clay does not change its weight.
Forces of Flying
Change the rotational direction of a whirligig by changing its top panels' direction.
Mystery Powders
Understand that when materials change size, a physical change takes place.
Mystery Powders
Understand that when materials change form or state, a physical change takes place.
Mystery Powders
Understand that when a material is heated and expands, a physical change takes place.
Mystery Powders
Understand that in most physical changes, a material can be changed back to the original.
Mystery Powders
Understand that a material that has undergone chemical change is a new material.
Mystery Powders
Understand that a chemically changed material cannot be changed back to the original.
Mystery Powders
Understand that energy is either needed or given off for a chemical change to occur.
Mystery Powders
Understand why sugar dissolves faster in hot water than in cold water.
Small Things
Recognize that the units seen in cork are empty cell walls—no longer alive.
Small Things
Investigate the effect of using different dilutions of stain on the rate of change.
Small Things
Understand that different stains darken different parts of the cell structure.
Small Things
Understand that a cell without a nucleus may have broken open during preparation of slide.
Small Things
Understand that a cell wall breaks down with cooking of the material.

OUTCOME M: Understand organism as a system which can be characterized by the processes of life.
GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina

L. OBJ.: Understand the organism, brine shrimp, as a system characterized by the life processes. Compare the results of brine shrimp activities with students' own environment.

OUTCOME N: Understand structure and function.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina

L. OBJ.: Understand the organism, brine shrimp, as a system characterized by the life processes. Compare the results of brine shrimp activities with students' own environment.

OUTCOME O: Understand force as push or pull.
**OUTCOME P:** Understand perception as our way of interpreting the world.

**GRADE:** 4  
**UNIT:** Buoyant Forces  
**L. OBJ.:** Understand buoyancy as an upward push (force) of a fluid on an object immersed in it.
Understand that the fluid pushing upward may be a liquid (water) or a gas (air).
Understand that when an object is placed in a fluid, the object displaces fluid.
Understand that the weight of the displaced fluid is equal to the buoyant force.
Understand that an object floats if its weight = the weight of the displaced fluid.
Understand that an object sinks if its weight > the weight of the displaced fluid.
Understand that the amount of cargo held by boats of the same size & shape is identical.
Understand wind as a source of energy for a sailboat.
Understand the relationship between floating in water and lighter-than-air craft.
Understand that a piece of paper must push air aside as the paper falls to the ground.
Understand drag as a force that slows an object's forward movement.
Understand thrust as a force that pushes an object forward.
Understand lift as a force that moves an object up.
Understand gravity as a force that pulls an object downward.
Understand which force of flight works against lift.
Understand which force of flight works against drag.

---

**GRADE:** 4  
**UNIT:** Forces of Flying  
**L. OBJ.:** Understand that what appears to be green water is really algae, food for brine shrimp.
Understand that what appears to be just brown stuff may be dried brine shrimp eggs.
Understand what a small amount is in terms of using yeast as to
Understand that what appears to be brine shrimp may be dried brine shrimp eggs.
Understand which common household powders by color and texture.
Understand which common household powders by odor.
Understand which common household powders by hardness.

**OUTCOME Q:** Understand time and space as dimensions which separate things and events.

---
OUTCOME STATEMENT 2: As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the social and environmental implications and limitations of technological development. Because technological development has a direct effect on society, students should demonstrate the ability to:

OUTCOME A: Distinguish between science and technology.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Mystery Powders
L. OBJ.: Identify Claud Louis Berthollet as an innovator in physical and applied chemistry.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Mystery Powders
L. OBJ.: Investigate the relationship between chemistry and the career of a pharmacist.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Mystery Powders
L. OBJ.: Investigate the relationship between "mystery powders" and the career of a chemist.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Identify Van Leeuwenhoek as the first to study, measure, and draw specimens under a scope.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Identify technology (making of great lenses) attributable to Anton Van Leeuwenhoek.

OUTCOME B: Identify selected nonrenewable and renewable natural resources

GRADE: 4
UNIT: L. OBJ.:

OUTCOME C: Understand the relationship between the natural and technological world.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Identify environmental factors that affect brine shrimp.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Understand that chlorine is put into tap water to improve its quality for humans.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Understand that chlorine can be removed from tap water by letting the water stand.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Understand that chlorine in water is harmful to brine shrimp.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Investigate to find out what marine life has been seriously affected by water pollution.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Understand the relationship between disease organisms and vaccines.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Understand that technological improvements have waste products that can pollute.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Investigate the operation of a water treatment plan.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Investigate the operation of a water reclamation plan.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Buoyant Forces
L. OBJ.: Understand how a hydrometer is used to check anti-freeze in a car's radiator.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Buoyant Forces
L. OBJ.: Understand that a sailboat uses wind energy for power.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Buoyant Forces
L. OBJ.: Understand the relationship between floating in water and lighter-than-air craft.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Forces of Flying
L. OBJ.: Understand the relationship between man-made objects and the forces that help them to fly.
OUTCOME D: Understand how scientific and technological research is influenced by the needs, interest, and financial support of society.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: 4
L. OBJ.:
Artemia Salina
Understand the role of the Department of Agriculture in the protection of our food supply.
Artemia Salina
Understand the roles of the state and local Departments of Health.

OUTCOME E: Apply the results of scientific research in consumer decision making.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: 4
L. OBJ.:
Artemia Salina
Draw posters urging the prevention of pollution.
Artemia Salina
Understand the role of the Food & Drug Administration in protecting our medicines.

OUTCOME F: Apply selected ecological principles to human and environmental situations.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: 4
L. OBJ.:
Artemia Salina
Understand that pollution alters the environment.
Artemia Salina
Understand that pollution limits the usefulness of the environment.
Artemia Salina
Understand that people produce pollution.
Artemia Salina
Understand the term pollution to mean any material that dirties air, water, or soil.

OUTCOME G: Evaluate society's responsibility for improving the environment and protecting natural resources.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: 4
L. OBJ.:
Artemia Salina
Determine what laws have been enforced to protect our water and marine life.
Small Things
Recognize how life in pond water changes with age and quality of water.

OUTCOME H: Evaluate environmental issues using scientific and technological knowledge and ethical principles.

GRADE: 4
UNIT: 4
L. OBJ.:
OUTCOME STATEMENT 3: As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the principles of scientific research and of their application. Because scientific investigation requires accountability, students should:

OUTCOME A: Demonstrate ethical practices which include: A. honesty and integrity in the recording and reporting of the results of scientific inquiry; B. disclosure, including open discussion of ideas, techniques and results; C. rights of subjects, humaneness and respect for life.

GRADE: 4

UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Discuss experimental results with others.

UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Handle specimens humanely.

UNIT: Mystery Powders
L. OBJ.: Discuss experimental results with others.

UNIT: Mystery Powders
L. OBJ.: Compare students' direct observations.

UNIT: Mystery Powders
L. OBJ.: Understand that no one answer is "right".

UNIT: Mystery Powders
L. OBJ.: Understand that differences of opinion are good when they lead to real discussion.

UNIT: Buoyant Forces
L. OBJ.: Discuss experimental results with others.

UNIT: Buoyant Forces
L. OBJ.: Compare students' direct observations.

UNIT: Buoyant Forces
L. OBJ.: Understand that no one answer is "right".

UNIT: Buoyant Forces
L. OBJ.: Understand that wet weights could cause inconsistent results.

UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Develop a respect for life through studying brine shrimp.

UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Recognize that a swimming brine shrimp has graceful movements.

UNIT: Artemia Salina
L. OBJ.: Understand that we experiment with brine shrimp because they do not have a well-developed n

OUTCOME B: Demonstrate basic scientific standards and research abilities which include: A. accuracy, skill, and safe practices in laboratory activities; B. application of an operational definition using terms to physically describe the activity or result of a procedure; C. good experimental techniques which will be evident by the precision practiced during the investigation; D. systematization of data to maintain an orderly manner of review; E. effectiveness in communicating laboratory procedures and results; F. ability to analyze, evaluate or replicate the experimental work of others.

GRADE: 4

UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Discuss the importance of order to help ensure proper care of equipment--assigned scope.

UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Recognize the need for proper care of equipment--check scopes BEFORE use--use plastic bag.

UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Observe and compare other students' slides.

UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.: Recognize that stains are poisonous and should be handled with care.
Focus "up" rather than "down".

Understand the need not to draw conclusions on the basis of little evidence.

Use small samples to minimize waste.

Understand that iodine is a poisonous substance.

Understand that science can be somewhat messy, but still needs to be under control.

Construct tables categorizing unknown substances by characteristic differences.

Understand the importance of labeling by number each of the mystery powders.

Understand the need for protecting desk tops when working with certain substances.

Understand that contamination of powder sample may lead to different observations.

Use "bubbling" or "fizzing" to describe the giving off of carbon dioxide or another gas.

Use "goes into the water and disappears" to describe the process of dissolving.

Use "goes into the water and does not disappear" to describe insoluble.

Use "paper clip" or other item of uniform weight as a standardized unit of weight.

Use a shoebox to store certain objects for use in further experimentation.

Establish strategic spots in the classroom for garbage bags or boxes to help clean-up.

Understand the system of management for storing and passing out materials.

Recognize the need to wait after each weight addition to make sure the shape still floats.

Understand that scientists use graphs (pictographs) to give results in a clear form.

Follow the directions to dry the weights after each test for consistent results.

Measure the rigging lines to be sure all are equal in length.

Use a safe outdoor drop site for the parachute experiments.

Find new and better ways to help brine shrimp eggs hatch.

Evaluate your work on the activities for brine shrimp by using the Self-Evaluation Chart.

OUTCOME STATEMENT 4: As a result of their schooling, students will have a working knowledge of the processes, techniques, methods, equipment and available technology of science. Because science at all grade levels requires certain skills to answer questions and solve problems, students should in both laboratory and field settings:

OUTCOME A: Observe

GRADE: 4
UNIT: Small Things
L. OBJ.:

Distinguish between various size water-drop lenses.

Explore the cellular structure of a plant.
Explore the life in pond water.

Observe the smell of common household powders.

Observe the feel of common household powders.

Do NOT observe the taste of common household powders--NEVER taste an unknown.

Observe the color of common household powders.

Observe the heaviness of common household powders.

Observe the hardness of common household powders. OPTIONAL

Observe the elasticity of common household powders. OPTIONAL

Observe the melting and boiling temperatures of common household powders. OPTIONAL

Observe the ability of common household powders to dissolve in various solvents.

Observe the ability of common household powders to conduct heat and electricity. OPTIONAL

Observe which crayons float and which crayons sink.

Observe the differences between clay and aluminum foil boats.

Observe the different factors that determine how much cargo a given ship holds.

Observe the relative positions of a vial in water as more sand is added.

Observe how density affects buoyancy.

Observe how air pressure can lift a book, a table, and a student.

Observe repeated flights of a whirligig.

Observe gliders' flights to determine what qualities make a glider go a long distance.

Observe the effect of a moving stream of air above a column of water.

Observe thrust as air is released from an inflated balloon.

Observe the effects of drag on a racer holding a large piece of cardboard.

Observe the effects of drag created by running with an open versus a closed umbrella.

Observe the life cycle of brine shrimp on a daily basis.

Observe the effects of differing amounts of salinity on the hatching of brine shrimp.

Observe the short-term effects of overcrowding on a brine shrimp population.

Observe the long-term effects of overcrowding on a brine shrimp population.

Observe the results of overfeeding a brine shrimp population.

OUTCOME B: Classify

GRADE: UNIT: L. OBJ.:
4 Small Things  Differentiate between plant and animal cells.
4 Small Things  Compare the variety of cells in an onion bulb.
4 Small Things  Compare living and non-living substances to find out which are composed of cells.
4 Small Things
4 Small Things
4 Small Things
4 Mystery Powders
4 Mystery Powders
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying

Compare the similarities and differences between simple and compound microscopes.
Differentiate between thin as opposed to small.
Differentiate between air bubbles and cells.
Identify similarities and differences in a set of common household powders.
Differentiate between shades of white: i.e., grayish-white and yellowish-white.
Compare the volume of containers of various sizes and shapes.
Compare the weights of containers of various sizes and shapes.
Compare weight limits between floating objects of various sizes, shapes, and materials.
Differentiate the male brine shrimp from the female.
Classify different varieties of shrimp.
Classify California, Washington, and Utah as states having brine shrimp.
Classify ammonia as a base.
Classify vinegar as an acid.
Classify lemon juice as an acid.

OUTCOME C: Infer

GRADE:

UNIT:

L. OBJ.:

Formulate what might be done to make the inside of a cell easier to see.
Formulate the amount of stain needed to stain their specimen.
Formulate the effect of stain on clothes and fingers.
Formulate what the origin of the microorganisms in the hay infusion might be.
Predict the identity of a "mystery powder" by matching it with a "known" powder.
Analyze the factors that might be involved in the crayons' floating or sinking.
Suggest the various factors that might determine how much cargo a given ship holds.
Suggest relationships between weight, size, and shape in floating and sinking.
Suggest whether water, salt water, or alcohol is the most dense.
Suggest whether it would be easier for a person to float in fresh or salt water.
Understand the relationship between a parachute's canopy area and its drop time.
Determine if there is a relationship between a parachute's payload's weight & drop time.
Explain why an uncrumpled paper takes longer to fall than that same sheet crumpled up.
Discuss the question of whether a person could be lifted using the air bag procedure.
Determine the factors that make a glider go a long distance.
Account for what happens when a stream of air is blown between two hanging balloons.
Discuss how Bernoulli's principle might apply to flying.
Discuss how an atomizer sprays perfume.
Discuss whether a moving stream of air has more or less pressure than still air.
Discuss the relationship of angle of inclination to an airplane's take-off.
Infer what will happen next as the brine shrimp begin to hatch and grow.
Infer what the size of the organism will be based on the size of the brine shrimp egg.
Infer what will happen to increasing populations in a limited space.

OUTCOME D: Predict

GRADE: UNIT:

4 Small Things Predict whether dry grass infusion will produce an environment to support microorganisms.
4 Small Things Predict whether adding sugar to pond water would encourage growth of microorganisms.
4 Small Things Predict what are the best light and temperature conditions for growth.
4 Buoyant Forces Predict how many weights a plastic medicine cup will hold as cargo.
4 Buoyant Forces Predict how many weights an aluminum foil boat will hold.
4 Buoyant Forces Predict how many weights an aluminum foil boat of twice the size will hold.
4 Buoyant Forces Predict whether a tightly crumpled, solid ball of aluminum foil will float.
4 Buoyant Forces Predict whether other metals than aluminum will float.
4 Buoyant Forces Predict whether ten items will float or sink.
4 Forces of Flying Predict what kinds of shapes would fall through the air more quickly.
4 Forces of Flying Predict what kinds of shapes would stay in the air longer.
4 Forces of Flying Predict what a stream of air blown between two hanging balloons will do.
4 Artemia Salina Predict the origin and nature of the "brown stuff".

OUTCOME E: Measure

GRADE: UNIT:

4 Small Things Use a hair width (hw) as a standard unit of measurement to measure a specimen.
4 Small Things Identify the size of the microscope field.
4 Small Things Compare the size of specimens.
4 Mystery Powders Measure "powderiness" by rubbing in and blowing away powder from black construction paper.
4 Buoyant Forces Investigate the amount of weight a floating plastic cup will hold.
4 Buoyant Forces Identify the amount of weight a floating clay boat will hold.
4 Buoyant Forces Compare weight limits between floating objects of various sizes, shapes, and materials.
4 Buoyant Forces Use a "standardized unit" of uniform weight such as washers or paper clips.
4 Buoyant Forces
Use metric linear units to measure the size of crayons.
4 Buoyant Forces
Measure the volume of plastic medicine cups to make sure they all hold identical volumes.
4 Buoyant Forces
Measure the volume of two different sized containers.
4 Buoyant Forces
Compare the clay boat PLUS WEIGHTS to the same-shaped aluminum foil boat PLUS WEIGHTS.
4 Buoyant Forces
Use metric units of weight to measure vials of air and sand.
4 Buoyant Forces
Measure the densities of water, salt water, and alcohol with an hydrometer.
4 Forces of Flying
Measure the time it takes for a parachute to drop.
4 Forces of Flying
Measure the distance from the drop of a parachute to the ground.
4 Forces of Flying
Measure the length of a parachute.
4 Forces of Flying
Measure the width of a parachute.
4 Forces of Flying
Find the surface area of the canopy of a parachute.
4 Artemia Salina
Measure the water level on the side of the brine shrimp habitat using a crayon or tape.
4 Artemia Salina
Measure five drops of liquid with a medicine dropper.

OUTCOME F: Communicate

GRADE:
4 UNIT:
4 Small Things
4 Mystery Powders
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina

L.OBJ.: Report results of experiment and compare data with data collected by others.
4 Mystery Powders
Discuss the reaction of a given test between powder and test reagent.
4 Buoyant Forces
Discuss personal experiences with floating and sinking.
4 Buoyant Forces
Discuss results of experiments and compare data with data collected by others.
4 Buoyant Forces
Express generalizations about floating and sinking.
4 Buoyant Forces
Compare the graphs of the cargos of the aluminum foil boats.
4 Buoyant Forces
Discuss personal experiences with lighter-than-air craft.
4 Buoyant Forces
Relate through discussion floating in water with floating in air.
4 Forces of Flying
Follow directions cooperatively to use air pressure to lift heavy objects.
4 Forces of Flying
Compare experiences with parachutes.
4 Forces of Flying
Compare parachute data.
4 Forces of Flying
Report experiences with paper gliders.
4 Forces of Flying
Report the results of lowering the air pressure above a column of water.
4 Forces of Flying
Discuss what would happen to objects without gravity.
4 Artemia Salina
Describe the hatching of brine shrimp.
4 Artemia Salina
Describe the diet of brine shrimp.
4 Artemia Salina
Describe the growth of brine shrimp.
**OUTCOME G**: Collect, organize and interpret data.

**GRADE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT:</th>
<th>L.OBJ.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Small Things</td>
<td>Draw pictures of what is observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Small Things</td>
<td>Record finding on activity sheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Small Things</td>
<td>Compile a notebook of activity sheets and observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Small Things</td>
<td>Compare cells from different parts of different plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Collect, organize, interpret data from the interactions of the powders &amp; test reagents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Construct a table categorizing unknown substances by characteristic differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Identify and record the amount of weight a floating clay boat will hold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Record the linear sizes of the crayons that float and that sink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Draw shapes of clay that will float.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Record the cargo (variety of objects) held in the floating clay shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Record the number of ceramic weights held in the floating clay shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Compare the number of ceramic weights held in different floating clay shapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Review the making of a pictograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Create a pictograph to show various shapes &amp; the number of ceramic weights held by each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Draw the position of the plastic cup in the water after each weight is added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Create a pictograph to show the amount of cargo held by boats of the same size &amp; shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Use graph paper for more detailed drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Review the making of a vertical bar graph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Construct a graph of weights per volume of cargo in two different containers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Review the making of a horizontal bar graph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Construct a graph of weights per boat for three differently shaped aluminum foil boats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Understand that the clay boat PLUS WEIGHTS should EQUAL the aluminum boat PLUS WEIGHTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Construct a graph of floating hydrometers in various liquids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Use the hydrometer graph to interpret densities of the liquids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Draw a graph relating drop time to canopy area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Record the time it took for a parachute to drop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Record the site of a parachute drop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Record the distance from the drop of a parachute to the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Record the surface of a parachute's canopy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Identify and illustrate the development of brine shrimp from egg to adult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Record and interpret the activities and developments of brine shrimp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record observations on the chart: "How Much Is Enough?"
Record observations on the chart: "The More the Merrier"
Record observations on the chart: "Food, Glorious Food"
Record observations on the chart: "Pollution, Pollution"

OUTCOME H: Develop operational definitions.

GRADE: UNIT:
4 Mystery Powders
4 Mystery Powders
4 Mystery Powders
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina

L. OBJ.:
Describe the giving off of carbon dioxide or another gas as "bubbling" or "fizzing".
Describe the process of dissolving as "goes into the water and disappears".
Describe insoluble as "goes into the water and does not disappear".
Establish a "standardized unit" using uniform weights such as washers or paper clips.
Describe "air pressure" as the force that glides objects through the air.
Understand that brine shrimp is the common name for Artemia salina.

OUTCOME I: Formulate questions and hypotheses.

GRADE: UNIT:
4 Mystery Powders
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Buoyant Forces
4 Forces of Flying
4 Forces of Flying
4 Artemia Salina
4 Artemia Salina

L. OBJ.:
Formulate methods to identify "mystery powders".
Design and construct tests for floating objects.
Question the difference size, material, amount of added air, and dye made in the crayons.
Question what it is that causes a crayon to float or to sink.
Express and record hypotheses as to cargo carried by containers of different volumes.
Determine how the design could be altered to make a whirligig stay up longer.
Formulate a hypothesis as to whether a whirligig will always fly in the same pattern.
Formulate a hypothesis regarding how much salt is best for a brine shrimp environment.
Formulate a hypothesis regarding how much food is best for a brine shrimp environment.
Formulate a hypothesis as to what kind of food is best for a brine shrimp environment.
Develop hypotheses & work out experiments to answer more questions on brine shrimp.

OUTCOME J: Experiment
GRADE: 4 4 4 4
UNIT: Mystery Powders Small Things Small Things Small Things
L. OBJ.: Discover ways of detecting the presence of a specific powder in a mixture of powders.
Discover the function of the knobs, the mirror, and the lens of a simple microscope.
Use a microscope to discover the appearance and structure of minute objects.
Use a microscope to differentiate between living and non-living minute objects.
Use different dilutions of stain on specimens.
Investigate root, leaf, flesh, and outer skin of an onion.
Investigate the root system of annual rye grass for relationship of structure & function.
Investigate the living organisms in a hay infusion.
Investigate the behavior of the paramecium, euglena, and amoeba.
Construct and investigate floating shapes of clay.
Construct and investigate floating shapes of aluminum foil.
Investigate the amount of weight a floating plastic cup will hold.
Investigate the buoyant force of air pressure.
Demonstrate curiosity and persistence in the study of buoyancy.
Replicate investigations with liquids having a higher or lower density than water.
Replicate investigations adding other substances to the water, such as salt.
Detect what happens when salt is added gradually to water in which a hard egg is placed.
Complete an experiment in a pre-determined time.
Test and compare other metals to aluminum foil for floating properties.
Test a tightly crumpled, solid ball of aluminum foil for floating properties.
Test a hydrometer in water, salt water, and alcohol.
Investigate the functions of the moveable parts on a model sailboat.
Analyze that if the wind is at your back, you turn the rudder to the left to turn right.
Investigate the working of a lighter-than-air craft—a helium balloon.
Construct a glider that will fly long distances.
Construct a glider that will stay in the air for long periods of time.
Construct a glider that will fly accurately.
Demonstrate that air pressure can lift a book, a table, and a student.
Apply the air bag procedure to lift a table, chair, & student—all at one time.
Formulate additional whirligig experiments based on students' questions.
Create optical illusions by coloring stripes on the flaps of a whirligig.
Find a way to change the rotational pattern of a whirligig.
Make a working parachute.
Forces of Flying
Test a parachute several times to make sure it opens smoothly.
Test a parachute several times to make sure it descends without rocking.
Test a parachute several times to make sure it lands without damage to canopy or cargo.
Modify a parachute so that it operates well.
Modify a parachute's canopy with a hole at the center point to stabilize its flight.
Create a paper glider that will land accurately.
Create a paper glider that will stay in the air for a long time.
Create a paper glider that will travel long distances.
Create a paper glider that will travel along a straight line.
Establish what happens to a column of water when the air pressure above it is lowered.
Utilize lowered air pressure to lift a strip of paper.
Utilize lowered air pressure to lift a curved wing-like index card.
Test the control surfaces (ailerons, rudder, and elevators) of an airplane.
Artemia Salina
Conduct experiments to determine the presence of pollutants in brine shrimp environments.
Experiment to find the best environment for brine shrimp to live and grow.
Use soil-conditioned water for a brine shrimp habitat.
Use rainwater or melted snow for a brine shrimp habitat.
Use real seawater for a brine shrimp habitat.
Use dyed yeast to observe the brine shrimp's gut more clearly.
Find out what evaporated salt water looks like.
Observe what happens when brine shrimp are fed at different times of the day.

OUTCOME K: Formulate models.

GRADE:

UNIT:

L. OBJ.:

Small Things
Recognize that paramecium's behavior may be caused by lack of sight.

Mystery Powders
Construct tests to identify an unknown powder's physical properties.
Construct tests to identify an unknown powder's chemical properties.
Formulate ways of detecting the presence of a specific powder in a mixture.
Understand identification by the process of elimination: using negative test results.
Recognize that if a powder does NOT "fizz" with vinegar, it does NOT contain baking soda.
Determine a possible shape for the clay that will float.
Take a position on whether changing the shape of the clay changes its weight.

Formulate a model of a plastic cup that would float with a larger amount of cargo.
Buoyant Forces

Generate factors determining how much cargo a given ship holds.

Understand that given equal size and shape, a lighter vessel will float higher in fluid.

Understand that given equal size and shape, a heavier vessel will float lower in fluid.

Formulate a model of the relationship between density and floating.

Establish that it is air pressure that keeps an object up in the air.

Formulate a model relating the shapes of flying objects to air resistance.

Use a large washer as a model for a payload.

Observe the rotational pattern of a whirligig once the top panels have been changed.

Test to see whether a moving stream of air has more less pressure than still air.

Test the functions of the control surfaces (ailerons, rudder, & elevators) of an airplane.

Formulate a model of a good environment for brine shrimp to live and grow.

Formulate a model of how much an organism will eat based on that organism's size.

Draw conclusions from the experiments with pollutants.

OUTCOME L: Verify results.

GRADE: 

UNIT:

Small Things

Draw pictures of cells.

Describe the length and width of a cell in terms of hair widths.

Mystery Powders

Use test reagents, or indicators, to identify common household powders.

Use heat to make sugar melt, bubble, and turn black.

Mystery Powders

Use iodine to turn starch black.

Mystery Powders

Use vinegar to make baking soda "bubble" or "fizz".

Mystery Powders

Use iodine to turn baking soda orange.

Mystery Powders

Use iodine to turn plaster of Paris yellow.

Mystery Powders

Use starch to indicate the presence of iodine.

Mystery Powders

Use vinegar to curdle a solution of powdered milk.

Buoyant Forces

Test a possible shape of clay to see if it will float.

Buoyant Forces

Test the changed shape of clay to see if its weight has changed.

Buoyant Forces

Replicate twice more the test on cargos carried by boats of the same size & shape.

Buoyant Forces

Construct tests to show which factors determine how much cargo a given ship can hold.

Buoyant Forces

Test the predictions as to how much cargo an aluminum boat twice the size would hold.

Buoyant Forces

Test the ten predictions of objects that would sink or float.

Forces of Flying

Confirm the rotational pattern of a whirligig once the top panels have been changed.

Artemia Salina

Use controls and variables to observe the effects of pollution on brine shrimp.
OUTCOME M: Use scientific equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>L.OBJ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Construct and use a water drop magnifier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Become familiar with the simple microscope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Properly prepare a specimen for a slide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Properly prepare a slide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Become familiar with the compound microscope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Become familiar with the properties of lenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Become familiar with the properties of different stains on the parts of a cell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Use methyl cellulose or gelatin solution to slow down very active microorganisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Use a medicine dropper to transfer protozoa to a slide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Use a microprojector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>Observe function of a microprojector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Construct an individual &quot;chemistry kit&quot; of powders and testing agents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>Use a microscope to identify &quot;mystery powders&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Use a balance to measure the weight of lumps of clay in varying shapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Use uniform weights such as paper clips as standardized units for weighing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Use graph paper for recording more detailed observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Use a hydrometer in water, salt water, and alcohol to determine relative densities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Construct and investigate a wind-energy machine--a sailboat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Construct and investigate a lighter-than-air craft--a helium balloon gondola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Use multiple air bags to lift a table, chair, and student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Use a whirligig to learn about structure and function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Use a parachute as a device to learn about air pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Use a time piece to measure the time a parachute takes to fall to the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Understand the use of a micro-projector to enable a whole class to observe together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Use a microscope to observe brine shrimp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Use an observation chart to record the activities of brine shrimp and their habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Use red and blue litmus paper as indicators to test water samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Use slides with a well to study living brine shrimp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Use a hand lens to observe brine shrimp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Use a dye to color the yeast eaten by a living brine shrimp to see the gut more clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>Use a medicine dropper to measure drops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
### THE INTELLECTUAL ABILITY BEING PRACTISED:

1. Acquiring, recalling or confirming facts
2. Delineating scientific concepts, principles or theoretical models
3. Identifying problems
4. Solving concrete problems
5. Solving problems by applying scientific concepts, principles or models
6. Making or testing hypothesis or speculation
7. Identifying or describing apparatus, equipment or materials
8. Describing or practising conventional experimental procedures
9. Designing novel experimental procedures
10. Making, describing or recording observations
11. Interpreting observed or recorded data
12. Interpreting from observed or recorded data

### THE SCIENCE LESSON ANALYSIS SYSTEM

#### VERBAL INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER - INITIATED</th>
<th>STUDENT - INITIATED</th>
<th>SCIENCE MATERIALS</th>
<th>MULTI-MEDIA MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS answered by:</td>
<td>STATEMENT concerned with:</td>
<td>DIRECTIVE for the purpose of:</td>
<td>CONSULTATION with student for the purpose of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PROCESS SKILLS IN SCIENCE

Developed by Science Teachers in Lake County, Illinois

OBSERVATION:
Using the Senses to Obtain Information

CLASSIFICATION:
Grouping or Sorting into Categories Using Similar or Dissimilar Characteristics

INFERANCE:
Explaining HOW or WHY Something IS HAPPENING or DID HAPPEN, Using Some Kind of Logic, and Remaining Consistent with Known Facts or Observations

PREDICTION:
Determining a Possible Future Result, Telling WHAT MAY HAPPEN, Based on Concurrent and/or Prior Observations, Measurements, and/or Conclusions

MEASUREMENT:
Quantifying the Description of an Object or an Event, Using an Instrument or an Estimation, and Standard or Non-Standard Units

COMMUNICATION:
Sharing Ideas and Information, Verbally and/or Non-Verbally

---

1Operationally Defined by Lake County, Illinois, Science Teachers, Tyler, Ralph W., and Lipowich, Shelley Ann according to the General Knowledge and Skill Areas listed under Goal 4 of the Illinois' State Goals for Learning in Biological and Physical Sciences.
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PROCESS SKILLS IN SCIENCE
Developed by Science Teachers in Lake County, Illinois

DATA COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION AND INTERPRETATION:

a. Gathering Information
b. Organizing Information into
   Words, Tables, Charts, and Graphs
c. Examining the Information Looking for
   Patterns and Relationships
d. Explaining What the Information Means

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION DEVELOPMENT:

Using Words to Describe What Is Happening During a Process

For Example:

a. A student sees "effervescence" and calls it "fizzing".2
b. A student sees water boiling and says, "It's bubbling." 3
c. A student sees rapid oxidation and says, "It makes a glowing stick burn more brightly."4

QUESTION AND HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION:

QUESTIONING: Expressing Uncertainties

HYPOTHESIZING: Deciding Upon a Logical Explanation as the Basis for Further Investigation to See Whether the Results are Consistent with the Explanation.

1Operationally Defined by Lake County, Illinois, Science Teachers, Tyler, Ralph W., and Lipowich, Shelley Ann according to the General Knowledge and Skill Areas listed under Goal 4 of the Illinois' State Goals for Learning in Biological and Physical Sciences.
3Tyler, 1988.
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PROCESS SKILLS IN SCIENCE
Developed by Science Teachers in Lake County, Illinois

EXPERIMENTATION:

a. Designing an Activity to Test a Hypothesis
b. Carrying out an Activity to Test a Hypothesis
c. Designing a Different Activity to Test the Same Hypothesis

MODEL [SYSTEM] FORMULATION:

Creating an Explanation that Is Consistent with a Series of Observations

For Example:

"Magnets separate objects into those that are attracted to magnets and those that are not attracted to magnets. The category that is attracted to magnets must have some common characteristic."

RESULTS VERIFICATION:

a. Repeating an Experimental Procedure in the Same Way
b. Checking the New Results against the Results from a Previous Trial to See If the New Results Are the Same or Different
c. Comparing Results among Groups Doing the Same Activity

SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT USE:

a. Using a Given Piece of Scientific Equipment
b. Reading Measurements to an Appropriate Precision
c. Carrying, Handling, and Caring for the Equipment Appropriately
d. Choosing the Appropriate Equipment for the Intended Use

1 Operationally Defined by Lake County, Illinois, Science Teachers, Tyler, Ralph W., and Lipowich, Shelley Ann according to the General Knowledge and Skill Areas listed under Goal 4 of the Illinois' State Goals for Learning in Biological and Physical Sciences.
2 Tyler, 1988.
5 Tyler, 1988.
To: K-6 PRINCIPALS
From: Larry Small / Shelley Lipowich

Below is a copy of a letter to all Fourth Grade Teachers in our district. We would very much appreciate your distributing the letter in your building. We also ask that you please set up a meeting with those teachers and Shelley so that she can describe the study and answer any and all questions.

Thank you for your understanding and cooperation!

---

To: Grade 4 Teachers
From: Larry Small / Shelley Lipowich

Please Help!

Would you let us study some of your “really good” Science classes?

“Study” means:

- having an observer (Shelley) in your class;
- having a tape recorder running;
- complete anonymity as to individual class results (classes would be A., B., C.,...);
- and being able to share the results of the study.

Shelley will meet with you—at a convenient time—to further describe the study and answer any and all questions. If you’d like to talk with her before your meeting, please call the Science/Health Office at 885-6678.

Thank you for your help with this project!

Please return the bottom of the form AFTER your meeting with Shelley.

Send to: Small / Lipowich, Program Service Center

---

Larry / Shelley,

I’d be glad to help with the study. Please come visit my class on:

First Date
Date: ___________________
Time: __________ Room ________

Second Date
Date: ___________________
Time: __________ Room ________

Teacher’s Name _______________________
School: _____________________________

Please return to: Small / Lipowich, Program Service Center. Thank You!
To: Larry / Shelley

From: Principal

I've met with our fourth grade teachers:

[Space for names]

They will be able to meet with you on (any day except Wednesday):

First Choice: Date ________
Time ________
Room ________

Second Choice: Date ________
Time ________
Room ________

We understand that Shelley will call us and confirm one of the above dates. She also will send written confirmation to each teacher and principal involved.

Please return to: Small / Lipowich, Program Service Center. Thank You!
## SAMPLE POPULATION

**Schaumburg Elementary School District 54, Schaumburg, Illinois**

William Kritzmire, Superintendent of Schools

Eleanor Thorson, Assistant Superintendent

Larry Small, Science Coordinator

### 1986-87 Classes and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Sessions/Teacher</th>
<th>Classes Taped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Anderson</td>
<td>Blackwell School</td>
<td>Bernard Lucier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Axelrod</td>
<td>Churchill School</td>
<td>Daniel Farinosi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Beaghan</td>
<td>Blackwell School</td>
<td>Bernard Lucier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Binder</td>
<td>Hoover School</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Burger</td>
<td>Hoover School</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Carlson</td>
<td>Dooley School</td>
<td>Bill Shatkus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia Cichy</td>
<td>Fairview School</td>
<td>Marilyn Halliday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Cleek</td>
<td>Einstein School</td>
<td>Marv Husby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particia Dewitt</td>
<td>Macarthur School</td>
<td>Roy Johnson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Donnell</td>
<td>Link School</td>
<td>Judith Shipka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Dover</td>
<td>Armstrong School</td>
<td>Bernard Osterberger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Engelson</td>
<td>Blackwell School</td>
<td>Bernard Lucier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Gaughan</td>
<td>Link School</td>
<td>Judith Shipka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford Greenberg</td>
<td>Macarthur School</td>
<td>Roy Johnson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Hurban</td>
<td>Aldrin School</td>
<td>Leland Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Juna</td>
<td>Armstrong School</td>
<td>Bernard Osterberger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Kimball</td>
<td>Muir School</td>
<td>Milton Derr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lynch</td>
<td>Fox School</td>
<td>James Binder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Martin</td>
<td>Armstrong School</td>
<td>Bernard Osterberger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Mestek</td>
<td>Link School</td>
<td>Judith Shipka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Muser</td>
<td>Muir School</td>
<td>Milton Derr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Ortez</td>
<td>Aldrin School</td>
<td>Leland Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Osmanski</td>
<td>Hoover School</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Prescott</td>
<td>Fox School</td>
<td>James Binder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Russell</td>
<td>Einstein School</td>
<td>Marv Husby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Skiff</td>
<td>Armstrong School</td>
<td>Bernard Osterberger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whiting</td>
<td>Fairview School</td>
<td>Marilyn Halliday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
VARIABLES AND THEIR MEANINGS

INTEGER VARIABLES

REM VTX  this keeps track of vertical position on a page of text
REM HTX  this keeps track of horizontal position on a page of text
REM X    this is used for simple loops like timing delays...
REM TPNO number of topics that have been defined
REM SESNO input at first run, # of taping sessions
REM CLSNO input at first run, # of classes per session
REM ANS  a numerical value of what ANS$ may have been
REM A2ANS this holds the last round’s value of what ans was
REM CODE takes on a value in onerror goto in 3800 for dos errors
REM PROG array of progress values 40 long, -1=undone, 1=done
REM SN   array of 16x40 holds 40 classrooms, 16 topics/class
REM CSESS current session loaded up
REM CCLS current classroom being examined
REM DTIN this = -1 if CSESS isn’t read in to SN
REM BASE this is the total of items in a class, calculated at 4500
REM AVG an array used to calc % of items/topic at 4500
REM YES/NO yes is 1, and no is -1. used as logic devices in 4400
REM PF   printer flag, 1 = on, -1 means off set in 4800, 4850

STRING VARIABLES

REM ANS$  this is a multi-use variable for input responses
REM MANS$ menu answer stored here in case errors cause loss of point

ASSOC. TEXT FILE NAMES

REM START.DATA if exist, holds SESNO and CLSNO values
REM SESSION.X  X is 1-SESNO, file holds classes 1-CLSNO
INITIAL PARAMETERS

CLEAR

LET TPNO = 16: REM this is the number of topics
LET DS$ = CHR$(4): REM this is ctrl-d for dos access
DIM PROG$(40): REM 0=undone 1=done for each class
DIM SN$(40,16): REM 40 classrooms/16 topics
DIM AVG$(16): REM 16 topics- holds the % for each in a class
LET DTIN = -1: REM ie data not read in yet
LET YES = 1: LET NO = -1
LET PF = -1: REM This starts the printer as "off"

**** TITLE PAGE ****

PR# 3: REM turn on 80 columns
HOME: PRINT
VTAB 5: HTAB 25
PRINT "FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS"
PRINT: HTAB 27: PRINT "PROGRAMMED BY ALEX BEN LIPOWICH"
VTAB 20: HTAB 30
INPUT "HIT RETURN TO CONTINUE ";ANS$
GOSUB 3000
REM this holds a line for the return from 3000 routine.

**** OPENING MENU ****

LET VTX = 8: HTX = 30
HOME
VTAB 6: HTAB 35: PRINT "MAIN MENU"
VTAB 6: HTAB 10: PRINT "SESSION ": ";CSESSION
VTAB 7: HTAB 10: PRINT "CLASSROOM ": ";CCLASS
VTAB HTX
HTAB HTX: PRINT "1. COLLECT DATA"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "2. SHOW/PRINT/DELETE A CLASS"
650 HTAB HTX: PRINT "3. SHOW PROGRESS"
660 HTAB HTX: PRINT "4. SAVE PROGRAM"
670 HTAB HTX: PRINT "5. DELETE ASSOC. FILES"
680 HTAB HTX: PRINT "6. LEAVE PROGRAM"
690 HTAB HTX: PRINT "7. CHANGE SESSION/CLASS"
699 REM
700 VTAB VTX + 8: HTAB HTX: PRINT "ENTER YOUR CHOICE "; GET ANS$
701 REM
705 LET MANS$ = ANS$
710 IF VAL (ANS$) < > 0 THEN GOTO 730: REM screen bad input
720 PRINT CHR$ (7)
722 VTAB VTX + 8: HTAB HTX
724 PRINT "TYPE IN A NUMBER PLEASE"
725 FOR X = 1 TO 650: NEXT
726 GOTO 600: REM replot this menu at start
728 REM
730 IF ANS$ = "4" THEN GOTO 20000: REM save program on D1/2
731 IF ANS$ = "5" THEN GOTO 30000: REM delete those files
734 IF ANS$ = "6" THEN GOTO 10000: REM ie bounce out of pg
736 LET ANS$ = MANS$
737 IF ANS$ = "7" THEN GOSUB 3800: REM change session/class
739 ON VAL (ANS$) GOSUB 2000,4000,6000: REM ordered as above
740 REM
750 GOTO 600
900 REM **** END OF MAIN MENU ****
980 INPUT "HIT RETURN TO CONTINUE ";ANS$
1998 REM
1999 REM
2000 REM **** COLLECTING DATA ****
2001 REM \
2005 GOSUB 5000: REM READ IN CURRENT SESSION
2006 LET PROG(CCLS) = 1: REM now 1 shows completion
2010 HOME : VTAB 1: HTAB 25
2020 PRINT "DATA COLLECTING FOR SESSION ";CSESS;" CLASS ";CCLS
2030 LET VTX = 2: REM will use this for the "--->") positioning
LET HTX = 25
VTAB VTX: PRINT : REM the print will offset VTX by 1
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(O) Observation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(C) Classification"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(I) Inference"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(P) Prediction"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(M) Measurement"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(T) Talking: Communication"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(D) Data collect'n/organizat'n/interpretat'n"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(N) Naming: Operational definition development"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(H) Hypothesis: Question-hypothesis formulation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(E) Experimentation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(F) Formulation: Model formulation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(V) Verification: Results verification"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(U) Use: Scientific equipment use"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(G) Guidance: Directions"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(R) Regulation: Discipline"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(A) Apart from the rest: Other"
PRINT
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(1) ERASE mistake"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(2) END collecting data"
REM entry to get topic #
VTAB VTX + TPNO + 5: HTAB HTX
PRINT "TYPE LETTER TO ADD TO: >";
GET ANS$
VTAB VTX + TPNO + 5: HTAB HTX
PRINT " ";
REM assign a # to choice
LET ANS = -1
IF ANS$ = "O" THEN LET ANS = 1
IF ANS$ = "C" THEN LET ANS = 2
IF ANS$ = "I" THEN LET ANS = 3
IF ANS$ = "P" THEN LET ANS = 4
IF ANS$ = "M" THEN LET ANS = 5
IF ANS$ = "T" THEN LET ANS = 6
IF ANS$ = "D" THEN LET ANS = 7
IF ANS$ = "N" THEN LET ANS = 8
IF ANS$ = "H" THEN LET ANS = 9
IF ANS$ = "E" THEN LET ANS = 10
IF ANS$ = "F" THEN LET ANS = 11
IF ANS$ = "V" THEN LET ANS = 12
IF ANS$ = "U" THEN LET ANS = 13
IF ANS$ = "G" THEN LET ANS = 14
IF ANS$ = "R" THEN LET ANS = 15
IF ANS$ = "A" THEN LET ANS = 16
IF ANS$ = "1" THEN LET ANS = 18: REM note sequence out of order
IF ANS$ = "2" THEN LET ANS = 19: REM done to space display
REM screen out invalid entry
IF ANS$ <> -1 THEN GOTO 2230
PRINT CHR$(7)
VTAB VTX + TPNO + 6: HTAB HTX
PRINT "INVALID KEY TYPED"
FOR X = 1 TO 650: NEXT
VTAB VTX + TPNO + 6: HTAB HTX
PRINT " "
GOTO 2100

REM end of screen
REM point to choice
VTAB VTX + A2ANS: HTAB HTX - 5: PRINT "": REM erase old
VTAB VTX + ANS: HTAB HTX - 5: PRINT "--->": REM draw new
REM decrement last one
IF ANS$ <> "1" THEN GOTO 2260
FOR X = 1 TO 300: NEXT
VTAB VTX + ANS: HTAB HTX - 5: PRINT " "
VTAB VTX + A2ANS: HTAB HTX - 5: PRINT "XXX>
LET ANS = A2ANS: REM tricky but ensures erase of XXX>
GOTO 2480
REM IF ANS$ = "2" THEN GOSUB 2800: RETURN
REM *** TIME TO INCREMENT AN ARRAY ***
LET SN(CCLS,ANS) = SN(CCLS,ANS) + 1
REM *** END OF INCREMENT AN ARRAY ***
REM LET A2ANS = ANS: REM store in case need to erase later
GOTO 2100: REM go back, cont collection
REM Save the data here
HOME
REM *** LOAD DATA FROM DISK ***
REM HOME
REM ALL 1002: PRINT D$;"MON,I,C,0"
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"OPEN SESSION."; STR$ (CSESS);",L200"
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"WRITE SESSION."; STR$ (CSESS);",R"; STR$ (CCLS)
CALL 1002: PRINT PRG(CCLS): REM write a 0/1 ie empty/full
FOR X = 1 TO TPNO
PRINT SN(CCLS,X)
NEXT X
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"CLOSE SESSION."; STR$ (CSESS)
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"NOMON ,I,C,0"
RETURN
REM **** LOAD DATA FROM DISK ****
REM HOME
REM ALL 1002: PRINT D$;"MON,I,C,0"
VTAB 20: HTAB 30
PRINT " LOOKING FOR FILES "
ONERR GOTO 3300: REM so that if error, no interuption
LET CODE = 0: REM code is set in onerr goto if an error occures
PRINT
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"VERIFY START.DATA,D1"
POKE 216,0
3040 VTAB 2: HTAB 20
3050 IF CODE < > 6 THEN GOTO 3200
3055 HOME : PRINT : PRINT
3057 PRINT "THIS IS THE FIRST RUNNING OF THE PROGRAM." : PRINT
3058 PRINT "PLEASE ENTER THE FOLLOWING PARAMETERS:" : PRINT : PRINT
3059 INPUT "HOW MANY TIMES WILL YOU TAPE EACH CLASSROOM THIS YEAR? " ;SESNO
3065 INPUT "HOW MANY CLASSROOMS WILL YOU BE TAPEING " ;CLSNO
3080 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"OPEN START.DATA"
3082 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"WRITE START.DATA"
3084 PRINT SESNO
3086 PRINT CLSNO
3088 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"CLOSE START.DATA"
3089 REM
3090 FOR X = 1 TO SESNO
3100 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"OPEN SESSION." ; STR$ (X);","L200"
3105 REM
3110 FOR Y = 1 TO CLSNO
3120 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"WRITE SESSION." ; STR$ (X);","R" ; STR$ (Y)
3130 CALL 1002: PRINT - 1: REM -1 means unused, ie empty now
3140 NEXT Y
3150 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"CLOSE SESSION." ; STR$ (X)
3155 REM
3160 NEXT X
3165 REM
3200 REM if here, then files have been established
3210 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"OPEN START.DATA"
3212 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"READ START.DATA"
3214 INPUT SESNO
3216 INPUT CLSNO
3218 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"CLOSE START.DATA"
3220 VTAB 20; HTAB 30
3225 PRINT " FILES IN PLACE "; FOR X = 1 TO 1000: NEXT X
3226 IF CODE = 6 THEN GOTO 590: REM onerr loses return ptrs
3228 CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"NOMON,I,C,O"
3229 RETURN
REM ****  START OF ON ERROR CODING  ****
LET CODE = PEEK(222): REM gets error code
HOME
VTAB 20: HTAB 30
IF CODE = 6 THEN PRINT " NO PREVIOUS DATA "
IF CODE <> 6 THEN PRINT " OTHER ERROR ";CODE
FOR X = 1 TO 1000: NEXT X
POKE 216,0: REM this routine loses return pointers on the stack.
GOTO 3040: REM end of onerr code
REM ****
LET MANS$ = "0": REM HOPEFULLY FOOL INTO SKIPPING ON-GOTO
LET VTX = 15:HTX = 7
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX
PRINT "ENTER SESSION 1-";SESNO;
LET LO = 1:HI = SESNO;CV = VTX:CH = 25: GOSUB 4300
LET CSESS = ANS
VTAB VTX + 1: HTAB HTX
PRINT "ENTER CLASSROOM 1-";CLSNO;
LET LO = 1:HI = CLSNO;CV = VTX + 1:CH = 27: GOSUB 4300
LET CCLS = ANS
LET DTIN = -1: REM important, new CSESS may not be loaded
REM ET MANS$ = "0"
LET ANS$ = "0"
RETURN
REM ****
GOSUB 5000: REM READ IN CURRENT SESSION
GOSUB 4500: REM go and average the class
HOME: VTAB 1: HTAB 25
PRINT "DATA DISPLAY FOR SESSION ";CSESS;" CLASS ";CCLS
LET VTX = 2
LET HTX = 8
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "PERCENT","RAW"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(1),SN(CCLS,1),"Observation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(2),SN(CCLS,2),"Classification"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(3),SN(CCLS,3),"Inference"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(4),SN(CCLS,4),"Prediction"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(5),SN(CCLS,5),"Measurement"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(6),SN(CCLS,6),"Communication"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(7),SN(CCLS,7),"Data collect'n/organizat'n/interpret'n"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(8),SN(CCLS,8),"Operational definition development"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(9),SN(CCLS,9),"Question and hypothesis formulation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(10),SN(CCLS,10),"Experimentation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(11),SN(CCLS,11),"Model formulation"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(12),SN(CCLS,12),"Results verification"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(13),SN(CCLS,13),"Scientific equipment use"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(14),SN(CCLS,14),"Guidance: Directions"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(15),SN(CCLS,15),"Discipline"
HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(16),SN(CCLS,16),"Other"
IF PF=1 THEN GOSUB 4850: REM will turn off printer, and reset flag.
PRINT HTAB HTX: PRINT "(1) RETURN to main menu (3) PRINT this page"
HTAB HTX: PRINT "(2) DELETE this class data"
REM
VTAB VTX + TPNO + 5: HTAB HTX
PRINT "TYPE DIRECTIONS PLEASE >";
LET CV = VTX + TPNO + 5: CH = HTX + 26
LET LO = 1:HI = 3: GOSUB 4300: REM get a number input
IF ANS = 1 THEN RETURN
IF ANS = 3 THEN GOSUB 4800
IF ANS = 3 THEN GOTO 4010
IF ANS = 1 THEN RETURN
TO DELETE: CV = VTX + TPNO + 5: VTAB CV: HTAB HTX: PRINT "ARE YOU SURE YOU WANT
LET CH = HTX + 32: GOSUB 4400: REM get a y/n
IF ANS = NO GOTO 4010
FOR X = 1 TO TPNO
LET SN(CCLS,X) = 0
NEXT X
LET PROG(CCLS) = 0; REM
GOSUB 2800: RETURN ; REM
REM end of delete class
RETURN
REM
REM ***** END OF DISPLAY CLASSROOM *****
REM
REM ***** NUMBER INPUT ROUTINE *****
REM
REM LO = lowest number allowed
REM HI = highest number allowed
REM ANS = returned value of input into ANS$
VTAB CV; HTAB CH
INPUT ANS$
IF ( VAL (ANS$) > = LO) AND ( VAL (ANS$) < = HI) THEN 4390
VTAB 24; HTAB 5
PRINT CHR$ (7); *4365 PRINT "***** PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER (";LO;"-";HI;") THEN HIT RETURN *****
FOR X = 1 TO 600: NEXT X
HTAB"$; PRINT 
VTAB CV; HTAB CH; PRINT " "; HTAB CH
GOTO 4340
LET ANS = VAL (ANS$); RETURN
REM
REM ***** Y OR N INPUT ROUTINE *****
REM
VTAB CV; HTAB CH
INPUT ANS$
IF ( LEFT$ (ANS$,1) = "Y") OR ( LEFT$ (ANS$,1) = "N") THEN 4490
VTAB 24; HTAB 5
PRINT CHR$ (7);
PRINT "***** PLEASE TYPE Y/N FOLLOWED BY RETURN *****";
FOR X = 1 TO 600: NEXT X
HTAB 5: PRINT " *
VTAB CV: HTAB CH: PRINT " "; HTAB CH
GOTO 4440
IF LEFT$(ANS$,1) = "Y" THEN ANS = YES
IF LEFT$(ANS$,1) = "N" THEN ANS = NO
RETURN
REM **** GET AVERAGES FOR A CLASSROOM ****
LET BASE = 0: REM set total to 0 initially
FOR X = 1 TO TPNO
LET BASE = BASE + SN(CCLS,X)
NEXT X
IF BASE = 0 THEN BASE = 1: REM protect against /0
FOR X = 1 TO TPNO
LET I = (SN(CCLS,X) * 100) / BASE
GOSUB 4600: REM go round I
LET AVG(X) = I
NEXT X
RETURN
REM ROUNDDING A NUMBER 
LET FRAC = I - INT (I)
IF FRAC > 0.5 THEN I = INT (I) + 1
IF FRAC < .5 THEN I = INT (I)
RETURN
REM ********* TURN ON PRINTER *************
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"PR#1"
LET PF = 1: REM sets the printer pointer to on
RETURN
REM ***** END OF TURN ON PRINTER *****
REM
REM ***** TURN OFF PRINTER *****
REM
CALL 1002: PRINT D$"PR3"
LET PF = -1: REM sets the printer pointer to off
RETURN
REM ***** END OF OFF PRINTER *****

REM **** READ IN A SESSION ****
REM
IF DTIN = 1 THEN GOTO 5210: REM ie data loaded already
REM : CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"MON,I,C,O"
HOME
IF CSESS = 0 THEN GOSUB 3800
LET VTX = 18; HTX = 7
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX
PRINT "OK TO LOAD UP SESSION."; CSESS;
LET CV = 18; CH = 31: GOSUB 4400: REM goes and gets a Y/N
IF ANS = YES THEN GOTO 5090: PRINT
PRINT : HTAB HTX
PRINT "ENTER SESSION TO LOAD 1-"; SESNO; " ";
LET CV = VTX + 2; CH = 34; LO = 1; HI = CSESS: GOSUB 4300: REM get CSESS
LET CSESS = ANS
PRINT
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"OPEN SESSION."; STR$(CSESS);","L200"
FOR X = 1 TO CLSNO
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"READ SESSION."; STR$(CSESS);","R"; STR$(X)
INPUT PROG(X): REM should be 0/1 0empty/1filled
IF PROG(X) = -1 THEN GOTO 5190
FOR Y = 1 TO TPNO: REM tpno = # topics
INPUT SN(X,Y): REM X=classroom, Y=topic
NEXT Y
NEXT X
CALL 1002: PRINT D$;"CLOSE SESSION."; STR$(CSESS)
PRINT : CALL 1002: PRINT D$; "NOMON, I, C, 0"

LET DTIN = 1: REM  ie now data loaded for C sess
RETURN

REM **** END OF SHOW DATA ****

REM **** SHOWING PROGRESS ****

REM

GOSUB 5000
HOME

VTAB 2: HTAB 30: PRINT "PROGRESS"

VTAB 5: PRINT "TAPE NUMBER";

HTAB 15: PRINT " 1 2 3 4"

HTAB 15: PRINT "123456789012345678901234567890"

PRINT "SESSION,"; CSESS

VTAB 7: HTAB 15

FOR X = 1 TO CLSNO

IF PROG(X) = -1 THEN PRINT "0";

IF PROG(X) = 1 THEN PRINT "X";

NEXT X

LET VTX = 17; HTX = 30: VTAB VTX; CV = VTX + 3; CH = HTX + 20

HTAB HTX: PRINT "(1) RETURN to main menu"

HTAB HTX: PRINT "(2) EXAMINE session totals"

PRINT

HTAB HTX: PRINT "TYPE IN SELECTION >";

LET LO = 1; HI = 2: GOSUB 4300

IF ANS = 1 THEN RETURN

IF ANS = 2 THEN GOSUB 7000: RETURN

REM

REM **** END OF PROGRESS ****

REM **** DISPLAY A SESSION/SESSIONS TOTALS ****

REM

GOSUB 7500: REM

DECIDE WHAT TO SHOW

LET VTX = 2

LET HTX = 25
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "PERCENT"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(1), "Observation"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(2), "Classification"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(3), "Inference"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(4), "Prediction"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(6), "Communication"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(7), "Data collect'n/organizat'n/interpretat'n"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(8), "Operational definition development"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(9), "Question and hypothesis formulation"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(10), "Experimentation"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(11), "Model formulation"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(12), "Results verification"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(13), "Scientific equipment use"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(14), "Guidance: Directions"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(15), "Discipline"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT AVG(16), "Other"

PRINT
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "(1) RETURN to main menu"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "(2) CHOOSE different display"

REM
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "TYPE DIRECTIONS PLEASE >";
LET CV = VTX + TPNO + 5: HTAB HTX
LET LO = 1: HI = 2: GOSUB 4300: REM get a number input
IF ANS = 1 THEN RETURN
IF ANS = 2 THEN GOTO 7000
RETURN
REM
MENU FOR CHOOSING ONE/ALL SESSIONS
REM
HOME
VTAB VTX
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "1. SHOW FOR JUST ONE SESSION"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "2. SHOW FOR ALL SESSIONS"
VTAB VTX: HTAB HTX: PRINT "ENTER YOUR CHOICE";
LET CV = VTX + 3: CH = 19 + HTX: LO = 1: HI = 2: GOSUB 4300
7590 IF ANS = 1 THEN GOSUB 7600: RETURN
7595 IF ANS = 2 THEN GOSUB 7700: RETURN
7599 REM
7600 REM SET UP DISPLAY ARRAY WITH ONE SESSIONS DATA
7610 REM
7612 FOR X = 1 TO TPNO: AVG(X) = 0: NEXT X
7615 HOME
7620 GOSUB 5000: REM load up with session data
7625 LET CV = 10: HTX = 10: VTAB CV: HTAB HTX: CH = HTX + 21
7626 PRINT "SUM UP CLASS 1 TO >";
7627 LET LO = 1: HI = CLSNO: GOSUB 4300
7628 LET CND = ANS: REM cnd is for class end of summation
7630 FOR x = 1 TO TPNO: REM go though the topics
7635 FOR Y = 1 TO CND: REM go up to class end chosen
7640 LET AVGCX) = AVGCX) + SN(Y,X)
7650 NEXT Y
7660 NEXT X: REM
7665 LET I = (AVGCX) / CND) * 100
7670 GOSUB 4600: AVG(X) = I: REM 4600 rounds I for us
7680 NEXT X: REM now do the next topic
7699 RETURN
7700 REM SET UP DISPLAY ARRAY WITH ALL SESSIONS DATA
7799 RETURN
9999 REM
10000 HOME : REM end of the program
10010 VTAB 12: HTAB 25
10020 PRINT "THANK YOU, COME AGAIN"
10030 END
20000 LET D$ = CHR$(4)
20009 PRINT : CALL 1002
20010 PRINT D$; "SAVE THEESIS,D2"
20020 PRINT D$; "SAVE THEESIS,D1"
20030 GOTO 100
30000 REM ***** DELETE ASSOCIATED FILES *****
30001 PRINT : PRINT : HTAB HTX
30003 PRINT "YOU ARE ABOUT DESTROY ALL DATA"
30004 HTAB HTX: PRINT "ARE YOU SURE YOU WANT TO DO THIS"
30005 LET CV = 19: CH = HTX + 33: GOSUB 4400
30008 IF ANS = NO GOTO 600
30009 REM ALL 1002: PRINT DS; "MON, I, C, O"
30010 CALL 1002: PRINT DS; "OPEN START.DATA"
30020 CALL 1002: PRINT DS; "READ START.DATA"
30030 INPUT SESNO
30040 INPUT CLSNO
30050 CALL 1002: PRINT DS; "CLOSE START.DATA"
30060 CALL 1002: PRINT DS; "DELETE START.DATA"
30100 FOR X = 1 TO SESNO
30110 CALL 1002: PRINT DS; "DELETE SESSION."; STR$(X)
30120 NEXT X
30125 CALL 1002: PRINT DS; "NOMON, I, C, O"
30130 GOTO 100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Code)</th>
<th>Obse</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Infer</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Meas</th>
<th>Comr</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OpDe</th>
<th>Ques</th>
<th>Expe</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Resl</th>
<th>SciEq</th>
<th>Guide</th>
<th>Regu</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cue)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 1: SESSION 1**

UNIT: Buoyant Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>223</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq:</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 1: SESSION 2**

UNIT: Buoyant Forces

| Raw Score | 19 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 23 | 28 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 57 | 6 | 2 | 191 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|--|---|----|---|--|--|---|----|---|---|----|
| % Freq:   | 10%| 1%| 3%| 2%| 12%| 15%| 5% | 1%| 7% | 8% | 1%| 1%| 2%| 30%| 3% | 1% | 100% |

**CLASS 2: SESSION 1**

UNIT: Small Things

| Raw Score | 51 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 78 | 17 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 88 | 10 | 12 | 375 |
|-----------|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|--|---|----|---|--|--|----|----|---|---|----|
| % Freq:   | 14%| 8% | 0%| 0%| 1%| 21%| 5% | 0%| 2% | 3% | 0%| 0%| 17%| 23%| 3% | 3% | 100% |

**CLASS 2: SESSION 2**

UNIT: Small Things

| Raw Score | 26 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 89 | 24 | 15 | 254 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|--|--|----|----|---|---|----|
| % Freq:   | 10%| 2%| 0%| 0%| 0%| 28%| 0% | 0%| 0% | 7% | 0%| 0%| 0%| 35%| 9% | 6% | 100% |

**CLASS 3: SESSION 1**

UNIT: Buoyant Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq:</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 3: SESSION 2**

UNIT: Buoyant Forces

| Raw Score | 24 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 74 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 73 | 12 | 14 | 271 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|--|---|----|---|--|--|----|----|---|---|----|
| % Freq:   | 9% | 1%| 1%| 1%| 9%| 27%| 7% | 0%| 0% | 4% | 2%| 2%| 0%| 27%| 4% | 5% | 100% |
APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS--RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNIT, CLASS, & SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 4: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Buoyant Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>11 8 3 5 40 66 44 0 9 19 3 31 0 63 14 19 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>3% 2% 1% 1% 12% 20% 13% 0% 3% 6% 1% 9% 0% 19% 4% 6% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 4: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Buoyant Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>2 0 0 14 17 77 31 0 1 1 0 11 0 64 9 3 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>1% 0% 0% 6% 7% 33% 13% 0% 0% 0% 0% 3% 28% 4% 1% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 5: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>15 2 1 0 2 29 0 0 0 0 2 16 65 12 31 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>9% 1% 1% 0% 1% 17% 0% 0% 0% 0% 1% 9% 37% 7% 18% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 5: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>28 7 0 0 0 0 60 0 0 1 8 0 0 14 66 26 47 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>11% 3% 0% 0% 0% 23% 0% 0% 0% 3% 0% 0% 5% 26% 10% 18% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 6: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>52 23 0 0 8 85 7 6 7 5 0 0 23 54 0 15 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>18% 8% 0% 0% 3% 30% 2% 2% 2% 2% 0% 0% 8% 19% 0% 5% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 6: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>21 11 6 0 4 36 10 0 5 4 0 4 9 21 3 3 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>15% 8% 4% 0% 3% 26% 7% 0% 4% 3% 0% 3% 7% 15% 2% 2% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS–RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNIT, CLASS, & SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERBALIZATION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>VERBALIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cue) Obse Class Infer Pred Meas Comfr Data OpDe Ques Expe Mode Resl SciEq Teac Discij Other</td>
<td>O C I P M T D N H E F V U G R A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASS 7: SESSION 1
UNIT: Small Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>% Freq: Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10, 6, 5, 12, 4, 10, 3, 4, 12, 5, 0, 6, 5, 48, 2, 4</td>
<td>7%, 4%, 4%, 9%, 3%, 7%, 2%, 3%, 9%, 4%, 0%, 4%, 35%, 1%, 3%, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASS 7: SESSION 2
UNIT: Small Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>% Freq: Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27, 12, 2, 0, 10, 54, 10, 0, 2, 12, 0, 2, 24, 64, 9, 10</td>
<td>11%, 5%, 1%, 0%, 4%, 23%, 4%, 0%, 1%, 5%, 0%, 1%, 10%, 27%, 4%, 4%, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASS 8: SESSION 1
UNIT: Small Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>% Freq: Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68, 33, 5, 0, 12, 77, 4, 0, 8, 2, 0, 2, 39, 49, 5, 10</td>
<td>22%, 11%, 2%, 0%, 4%, 25%, 1%, 0%, 3%, 1%, 0%, 1%, 12%, 16%, 2%, 3%, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASS 8: SESSION 2
UNIT: Small Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>% Freq: Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22, 18, 4, 1, 7, 52, 3, 0, 4, 7, 0, 11, 19, 62, 4, 19</td>
<td>9%, 8%, 2%, 0%, 3%, 22%, 1%, 0%, 2%, 3%, 0%, 5%, 8%, 27%, 2%, 8%, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASS 9: SESSION 1
UNIT: Small Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>% Freq: Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12, 8, 3, 0, 3, 27, 4, 0, 9, 9, 0, 0, 20, 56, 8, 23</td>
<td>7%, 4%, 2%, 0%, 2%, 15%, 2%, 0%, 5%, 5%, 0%, 0%, 11%, 31%, 4%, 13%, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASS 9: SESSION 2
UNIT: Small Things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>% Freq: Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15, 6, 1, 0, 5, 33, 2, 0, 3, 3, 0, 0, 24, 67, 6, 10</td>
<td>9%, 3%, 1%, 0%, 3%, 19%, 1%, 0%, 2%, 2%, 0%, 0%, 14%, 38%, 3%, 6%, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS–RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNIT, CLASS, & SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERBALIZATION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>VERBALIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cue)</td>
<td>Obse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLASS 10: SESSION 1 UNIT: Small Things

- **Raw Score**: 28 6 4 0 10 66 7 1 4 22 8 2 16 58 13 55 300
- **% Freq**: Session 9% 2% 1% 0% 3% 22% 2% 0% 1% 7% 3% 1% 5% 19% 4% 18% 100%

### CLASS 10: SESSION 2 UNIT: Small Things

- **Raw Score**: 18 2 0 1 1 48 4 0 5 9 0 0 19 48 17 37 209
- **% Freq**: Session 9% 1% 0% 0% 0% 23% 2% 0% 2% 4% 0% 0% 9% 23% 8% 18% 100%

### CLASS 11: SESSION 1 UNIT: Buoyant Forces

- **Raw Score**: 7 0 6 1 46 45 28 0 13 24 1 21 0 79 7 15 293
- **% Freq**: Session 2% 0% 2% 0% 16% 15% 10% 0% 4% 8% 0% 7% 0% 27% 2% 5% 100%

### CLASS 11: SESSION 2 UNIT: Forces of Flying

- **Raw Score**: 34 6 19 22 7 51 2 0 34 51 6 12 0 72 12 3 331
- **% Freq**: Session 10% 2% 6% 7% 2% 15% 1% 0% 10% 15% 2% 4% 0% 22% 4% 1% 100%

### CLASS 12: SESSION 1 UNIT: Forces of Flying

- **Raw Score**: 6 0 14 16 12 35 2 0 10 31 0 14 0 78 7 6 231
- **% Freq**: Session 3% 0% 6% 7% 5% 15% 1% 0% 4% 13% 0% 6% 0% 34% 3% 3% 100%

### CLASS 12: SESSION 2 UNIT: Mystery Powders

- **Raw Score**: 52 52 3 1 4 23 13 2 7 7 0 0 0 45 11 3 223
- **% Freq**: Session 23% 23% 1% 0% 2% 10% 6% 1% 3% 3% 0% 0% 0% 20% 5% 1% 100%
### APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS–RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNIT, CLASS, & SESSION

| (Cue) | Obse | Clas | Infere | Predi | Meas | Comr | Data | OpDe | Quesi | Expe | Mode | Resu | SciEq | Guida | Regu | Other |
|-------|------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------|
| (Code) | O | C | I | P | M | T | D | N | H | E | F | V | U | G | R | A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 13: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Buoyant Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>22 9 2 5 7 29 20 0 10 25 3 3 4 54 13 10 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>10% 4% 1% 2% 3% 13% 9% 0% 5% 12% 1% 1% 2% 25% 6% 5% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 13: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Buoyant Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>24 11 5 4 37 26 42 1 13 31 6 6 0 48 10 35 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>8% 4% 2% 1% 12% 9% 14% 0% 4% 10% 2% 2% 0% 16% 3% 12% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 14: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>18 11 2 0 1 30 6 0 4 4 0 1 28 50 8 4 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>11% 7% 1% 0% 1% 18% 4% 0% 2% 2% 0% 1% 17% 30% 5% 2% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 14: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>10 1 0 0 7 20 3 0 3 5 0 0 11 41 4 1 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>9% 1% 0% 0% 7% 19% 3% 0% 3% 5% 0% 0% 10% 39% 4% 1% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 15: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Artemia Salina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>29 21 1 0 5 35 2 0 3 6 0 5 16 48 5 6 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>16% 12% 1% 0% 3% 19% 1% 0% 2% 3% 0% 3% 9% 26% 3% 3% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 15: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Buoyant Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>2 3 1 11 19 13 18 0 8 11 1 4 0 35 5 4 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>1% 2% 1% 8% 14% 10% 13% 0% 6% 8% 1% 3% 0% 26% 4% 3% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Verbalizations: % Frequency of Process Science Skills--Raw Scores & Percents by Unit, Class, & Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbalization Categories</th>
<th>Verbalizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cue</td>
<td>Obse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class 16: Session 1
#### Unit: Buoyant Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sess</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class 16: Session 2
#### Unit: Buoyant Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>298</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sess</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class 17: Session 1
#### Unit: Forces of Flying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sess</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class 17: Session 2
#### Unit: Mystery Powders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>336</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sess</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class 18: Session 1
#### Unit: Buoyant Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>184</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sess</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class 18: Session 2
#### Unit: Buoyant Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>241</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sess</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 19: Session 1</td>
<td>Unit: Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 19: Session 2</td>
<td>Unit: Forces of Flying</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 20: Session 1</td>
<td>Unit: Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 20: Session 2</td>
<td>Unit: Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 21: Session 1</td>
<td>Unit: Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 21: Session 2</td>
<td>Unit: Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cue)</td>
<td>Obse</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Infer</td>
<td>Predi</td>
<td>Meas</td>
<td>Comr</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>OpDe</td>
<td>Ques</td>
<td>Expe</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Resl</td>
<td>SciEq</td>
<td>Guida</td>
<td>Regu</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>VERBALIZATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 22: SESSION 1**

**UNIT: Buoyant Forces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 22: SESSION 2**

**UNIT: Buoyant Forces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 23: SESSION 1**

**UNIT: Buoyant Forces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>268</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 23: SESSION 2**

**UNIT: Forces of Flying**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 24: SESSION 1**

**UNIT: Small Things**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent % Freq</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASS 24: SESSION 2**

**UNIT: Small Things**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>163</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessic</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS—RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNIT, CLASS, & SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERBALIZATION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>VERBALIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td>(Cue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OpDe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SciEq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASS 25: SESSION 1

**UNIT:** Artemia Salina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>171</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Sessi</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASS 25: SESSION 2

**UNIT:** Artemia Salina

| Raw Score | 78 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 28 | 1 | 2 | 208 |
|-----------|----|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| % Freq: Sessi | 38% | 0% | 7% | 2% | 3% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 7% | 13% | 0% | 1% | 100% |

#### CLASS 26: SESSION 1

**UNIT:** Small Things

| Raw Score | 30 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 46 | 19 | 0 | 12 | 24 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 4 | 203 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| % Freq: Sessi | 15% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 23% | 9% | 0% | 6% | 12% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 20% | 1% | 2% | 100% |

#### CLASS 26: SESSION 2

**UNIT:** Small Things

| Raw Score | 52 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 44 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 63 | 21 | 32 | 264 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| % Freq: Sessi | 18% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 15% | 3% | 0% | 4% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 9% | 22% | 7% | 11% | 100% |

#### CLASS 27: SESSION 1

**UNIT:** Artemia Salina

| Raw Score | 44 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 42 | 12 | 2 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 46 | 1 | 2 | 197 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| % Freq: Sessi | 22% | 0% | 5% | 3% | 4% | 21% | 6% | 1% | 8% | 5% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 23% | 1% | 1% | 100% |

#### CLASS 27: SESSION 2

**UNIT:** Artemia Salina

| Raw Score | 41 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| % Freq: Sessi | 28% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 24% | 3% | 0% | 5% | 12% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 24% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
## APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS—RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY CLASS, UNIT, & SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 28: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Buoyant Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>26 0 14 15 9 35 12 0 18 25 0 8 0 27 0 1 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session 14% 0% 7% 8% 5% 18% 6% 0% 9% 13% 0% 4% 0% 14% 0% 1% 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 28: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Buoyant Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>5 0 1 0 44 27 27 2 8 6 4 30 0 43 3 1 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session 2% 0% 0% 0% 22% 13% 13% 1% 4% 3% 2% 15% 0% 21% 1% 0% 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 29: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>27 0 1 0 0 45 7 0 3 9 0 2 2 44 5 9 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session 18% 0% 1% 0% 0% 29% 5% 0% 2% 6% 0% 1% 1% 29% 3% 6% 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 29: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Small Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>57 0 1 0 0 42 3 0 5 1 0 0 37 34 0 0 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session 32% 0% 1% 0% 0% 23% 2% 0% 3% 1% 0% 0% 21% 19% 0% 0% 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 30: SESSION 1</th>
<th>UNIT: Forces of Flying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>12 0 6 2 3 34 0 0 8 14 5 4 0 40 1 0 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session 9% 0% 5% 2% 2% 26% 0% 0% 6% 11% 4% 3% 0% 31% 1% 0% 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 30: SESSION 2</th>
<th>UNIT: Mystery Powders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>37 3 2 4 2 54 13 6 2 12 0 0 0 52 2 5 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freq: Session 19% 2% 1% 2% 1% 28% 7% 3% 1% 6% 0% 0% 0% 27% 1% 3% 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H: VERBALIZATIONS: % FREQUENCY OF PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS—RAW SCORES & PERCENTS BY UNIT, CLASS, & SESSION

**SUMMARY SHEETS 1/2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Cue)</th>
<th>Obse</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Infere</th>
<th>Predi</th>
<th>Meas</th>
<th>Comr</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OpDe</th>
<th>Ques</th>
<th>Expe</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Resu</th>
<th>SciEq</th>
<th>Guide</th>
<th>Regu</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MEAN % FREQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Obse</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Infere</th>
<th>Predi</th>
<th>Meas</th>
<th>Comr</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OpDe</th>
<th>Ques</th>
<th>Expe</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Resu</th>
<th>SciEq</th>
<th>Guide</th>
<th>Regu</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 7</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 10</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GRAND X % FRE

<p>| | Obse | Class | Infere | Predi | Meas | Comr | Data | OpDe | Ques | Expe | Mode | Resu | SciEq | Guide | Regu | Other |
| | 13%  | 3%    | 2%     | 2%    | 5%   | 17%  | 5%   | 0%   | 5%   | 7%   | 1%   | 2%   | 4%   | 25%   | 3%   | 5%   | 100.00% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Cue)</th>
<th>Obse</th>
<th>Clas</th>
<th>Infere</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Meas</th>
<th>Comr</th>
<th>Data1</th>
<th>OpDe</th>
<th>Ques</th>
<th>Expe</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>ResL</th>
<th>SciEq</th>
<th>Teac</th>
<th>Disc</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Force</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Force</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Powder</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions 1 (1-10)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions 1 (16)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions 2 (1-10)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions 2 (16)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X % Freq Sess1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X % Freq Sess1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand X % Freq</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cue</td>
<td>Obse</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Infer</td>
<td>Predi</td>
<td>Meas</td>
<td>Comr</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>OpDe</td>
<td>Ques</td>
<td>Expe</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Resu</td>
<td>SciEq</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>Regu</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARD DEVIATION: SESSIONS 1 AND 2**

|   | % Sessions 1 |   | % Sessions 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|-------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X | 12%         | 13% | 2%          | 4% | 5% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 8% | 1% | 3% | 4% | 24% | 3% | 6% |   |

| StDev: Skills | 1.17 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.76 | 0.60 | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.49 | 0.33 | 0.55 | 0.08 | 0.87 | 0.36 | 1.16 |
| (Code) | O | C | I | P | M | T | D | N | H | E | F | V | U | G | R | A |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rating Session 1-1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Raw Score | 12 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 130 |
| % Session 1-1 | 9% | 0% | 5% | 2% | 2% | 26% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 11% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 31% | 1% | 0% | 100% |
| Rating Session 1-2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Raw Score | 11 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 128 |
| % Session 1-2 | 9% | 0% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 28% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 9% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 33% | 2% | 0% | 100% |
| St.Dev./Skill | 0.45 | 0 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 1.39 | 0 | 0 | 0.48 | 0.98 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0 | 1.44 | 0.56 | 0 |
| Rating Session 2-1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Raw Score | 51 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 78 | 17 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 88 | 10 | 12 | 375 |
| % Session 2-1 | 14% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 21% | 5% | 0% | 2% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 17% | 23% | 3% | 3% | 1 |
| Rating Session 2-2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Raw Score | 54 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 74 | 16 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 90 | 9 | 14 | 374 |
| % Session 2-2 | 14% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 20% | 4% | 1% | 2% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 18% | 24% | 2% | 4% | 1 |
| St.Dev./Skill | 0.59 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 0.18 | 0.71 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0 | 0 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
**COMPARISON: % OF EACH SKILL AS A PART OF THE TOTAL PROCESS SCIENCE (SKILL) OBJECTIVES**

VS % FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF EACH SKILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS SCIENCE OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Code)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obse</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pred</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comr</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpDe</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ques</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expe</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resl</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciEq</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regu</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No. of Objective | 30 17 23 13 21 17 35 6 11 55 22 18 31 | 299 |
| % of Total Pr    | 10% 6% 8% 4% 7% 6% 12% 2% 4% 18% 7% 6% 10% | 1  |
| Grand X % Fre    | 13% 3% 2% 2% 5% 17% 5% 0% 5% 7% 1% 2% 4% | 66.37% |

**PERCENT FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE**

PROCESS SCIENCE SKILLS VS (DIRECTION, DISCIPLINE, OTHER)

| Guidance: Direction | 25% |
| Regulation: Discipline | 3% |
| Apart: Other | 5% |
| Process Science Skills | 66% |
APPENDIX I

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF "OBSERVATION": BY UNIT AND BY CLASS

**BY UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Freq</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Salina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant Forces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces of Flying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Powders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Things</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY CLASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Freq</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Freq</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Freq</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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