

A study of teachers' views towards practical work in secondary schools in England and Wales

Abrahams, Ian; Sağlam, Murat

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Abrahams, I., & Sağlam, M. (2010). A study of teachers' views towards practical work in secondary schools in England and Wales. *International Journal of Science Education*, 32(6), 753-768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690902777410>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



A study of teachers' views towards practical work in secondary schools in England and Wales

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2008-0258.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	laboratory work, practical work, secondary school, teacher beliefs
Keywords (user):	views towards practical work



Abstract

Many teachers view practical work as an essential feature of science education. This study examined whether there had been any changes in the relative importance of the aims science teachers assign to the use of practical work, across the full secondary age range (11-18), since the last such national survey undertaken by Kerr (1963).

A stratified sample of representative schools was used in which 912 teachers were sent a questionnaire on their views towards the use of practical work in science with a total of 393 responses (42.5 percent) being received. The coefficient of concordance (Kendall, 1955) of the various rankings and their significance were calculated, as too were the z-scores.

The findings suggest that whilst there have been substantial changes in teachers' views about the use of practical work at Key Stages 4 and 5 (age 15-18) there have been no substantial changes at Key Stage 3 (age 11-14). Furthermore, the results are remarkably similar across subject specialism, teacher gender, and years of teaching experience although this paper will only focus on subject specialism. It appears that changes to the assessment criteria, notably the introduction of Science Investigation (Sc1) at Key Stage 4, and a growing desire amongst educational policy makers to improve the image of science, have had an effect on how those in the teaching profession perceive the value and aims of practical work particularly at Key Stages 4 and 5.

Introduction

In many countries practical work is an essential feature of the teaching and learning of science and considerable time and money is spent on teaching science through practical work and it is therefore important to be clear about the aims of practical work. In an important study in England and Wales, Kerr (1963) identified ten aims of practical work (Table 1) and subsequent national and international studies into the aims of practical work are broadly in agreement with the aims suggested by Kerr (Johnstone and Al-Shuaili, 2001).

As in many countries, much has changed in the educational system in England and Wales in the forty-five years since Kerr (1963) reported the findings of the first published survey of teachers' views towards the aims of practical work across the full 11-18 age range in secondary schools following a traditional grammar type curriculum. Indeed, the tripartite system of grammar, secondary modern and technical schools, in which only a minority of pupils, educated in grammar schools, followed an academically orientated science curriculum whilst the majority received a more general, vocationally based, science education in secondary modern and technical schools, no longer exists. Furthermore, the introduction of widespread comprehensive education in the mid 1960s gave rise to the development of a range of new approaches to the teaching of science such as Nuffield Secondary Science in the late 1960's – with its emphasis on the use of practical work to develop scientific methods of thought and its aim to enable pupils to find out through investigation (Gott & Duggan, 1995) and Warwick Process Science in the 1980's with its emphasis on the use of practical work as a means of developing transferable process skills such as observing and interpreting (Screen, 1998, 1986). The importance of these changes, or any

1
2
3 changes to teachers working environments, is, in terms of the evolutionary model
4 developed by Johnson, Monk and Swain, (1998), that they lead to changes in
5 teachers' practice and opinion. If this model is correct then future changes to the way
6 science is taught and/or assessed have the potential to change the way in which
7 teachers view the role of practical work and, as a consequence, use it. The
8 introduction of a National Curriculum in 1989, which saw science become a 'core'
9 subject, has meant that teachers are now required to teach science to all pupils
10 throughout the compulsory phase of their secondary school education (age 11-16). A
11 possible consequence of this is that teachers now find themselves trying to maintain
12 pupils' interest in a subject that, prior to the introduction of a National Curriculum,
13 many would have chosen to drop at the end of Key Stage 3 (see Table 2 and the note
14 at the end of the paper for additional explanation of Key Stages). It might therefore be
15 expected that the potential affective value of practical work might be seen by teachers
16 as more important than might otherwise have been before science became a core
17 subject as a result of the evolutionary pressures (Johnson, Monk & Swain, 1998) that
18 its introduction have created in the educational environment in which science teachers
19 operate.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Therefore whilst the Third International Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS,
47 1999) has shown performance in science, and most notably in practical work (Kind,
48 1999), has improved amongst pupils in England and Wales over the last decade it is
49 important to consider whether these improvements reflect any changes in the relative
50 importance of the aims science teachers assign to the use of practical work. The
51 findings of this study may be of interest to researchers, policy makers and science
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 educators in the countries where there have been substantial changes in the structure
4
5 of science education.
6
7

8 **The need for an enquiry**

9

10 Following a grant by the Gulbenkian Foundation in 1960 Kerr undertook the first
11
12 extensive survey to investigate the nature and purpose of practical work within the
13
14 framework of grammar school science teaching in England and Wales. The study
15
16 involved 151 schools, 56% boys' schools, 26% girls' schools and 18% co-educational,
17
18 all of whom followed a common 'grammar type' curriculum and involved a total of
19
20 701 science teachers.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Despite the fact that some of the teachers appeared to be responding to the questions
28
29 without those responses reflecting their actual beliefs or practices (Abrahams &
30
31 Millar, 2008), the study did provide the first large-scale insight into practicing
32
33 teachers' views as to the nature and purpose of school practical work in England and
34
35 Wales. The findings, which involved the teachers arranging ten suggested aims
36
37 (purposes) for practical work in order of perceived importance, are summarised in
38
39 Table 1.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **TABLE 1 GOES HERE**
48
49
50

51
52 In conclusion Kerr (1963) reported that whilst most science teachers placed strong
53
54 emphasis on individual practical work this work had become relatively "inflexible,
55
56 repetitive, outmoded and often inadequately integrated with the theory... In all
57
58 science subjects, there was plenty of practical work being done but it was not well
59
60

1
2
3 integrated with the theory and it was unlikely to achieve the unique educational value
4 often claimed [by educational theorists] for it” (pp. 95-96).
5
6
7
8
9

10
11 However, despite all of the changes that have occurred over the last four decades there
12 have only been two subsequent published national studies of teachers’ views about the
13 aims of practical work in England and Wales (Lynch & Ndyetabura, 1983 and
14 Wilkinson & Ward, 1997 carried out two similar studies in Australia). Whilst the first
15 of these (Thompson, 1975), focused solely on teachers’ views about practical work at
16 Key Stage 5 (age 17-18) the second (Beatty, 1980) only considered views about
17 practical work amongst teachers of pupils within part of Key Stage 3 (age 11-13).
18 Furthermore, both of these subsequent studies used an expanded questionnaire in
19 which teachers were required to rank twenty aims of practical work – developed by
20 Thompson (1975) – that, whilst subsuming the original ten aims of practical work used
21 by Kerr (1963), prevented any direct comparison of either of their results with that
22 initial study. The expanded questionnaire differed from the original in that the
23 additional aims were designed to accommodate potential changes to teachers’ aims for
24 using practical work that, it was felt, might have arisen from the introduction of
25 Nuffield Science.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 As this study was specifically designed to examine whether there had been any
50 changes to teachers’ views about the aims of practical work across the *entire*
51 secondary school age range and across all three traditional sciences, it was felt more
52 appropriate to use the original ten aims devised by Kerr (1963) so as to enable a direct
53 comparison with Kerr’s broader findings to be made.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Plan of enquiry

The questionnaire

Whilst there are advantages and disadvantages to the use of postal surveys (Bailey, 1994; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Robson, 1993) the decision to undertake a national study meant that a postal questionnaire survey was the most cost-effective and convenient method for collecting a relatively large amount of data from across a wide geographical area. Despite these advantages it is important to recognise two main reasons why questionnaire surveys can lead to fallacious results (Belson, 1986; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Verma & Mallick, 1999) and appropriate steps were taken to prevent, or at least reduce, the impact that these might have on the findings of the study. The first reason, although not restricted solely to questionnaires, is that there is no way of ascertaining, short of receiving back all of the questionnaires, whether the returned questionnaires are truly representative of the entire sample who received them. To reduce the potential that the responses received were not representative of the sample as a whole this study sought to maximise the response rate through the use of phased follow-up letters (Bailey, 1994; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Hoinville & Jowell, 1978; Verma & Mallick, 1999) achieving a final response rate of 42.5 percent. Additionally a check was made on how representative the returned questionnaires were by comparing the proportion of questionnaires sent out to those returned by school type (Table 3) which showed there to be no major discrepancy.

The second reason that a questionnaire survey, and in particular a postal questionnaire, can lead to fallacious results is that the researcher is unable to ensure that the questions are fully understood and/or answered in the way stipulated in the

1
2
3 written instructions (Belson, 1986). Whilst it was hoped that asking teachers to rank
4
5 the same ten aims as those piloted and used successfully by Kerr (1963) would reduce
6
7 the likelihood of teachers failing to understand what was required of them the views
8
9 of a focus group of science teachers (N = 7) regarding the clarity of the questions was
10
11 also sought. As a result of feedback from the focus group it was deemed necessary to
12
13 make two changes to the original Kerr (1963) questionnaire to make it easier for
14
15 current teachers to understand what was being asked of them and it is to these changes
16
17 that we now turn.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 The first of these changes was that whilst Kerr had asked teachers to respond to the
26
27 questionnaire in terms of three Year group categories 1-2, 3-5 and 6th Form the
28
29 current study opted to use the three Key Stages from the National Curriculum that, it
30
31 was felt by the focus group, would be more easily recognised and better understood
32
33 by current teachers. Furthermore, it was felt that in England and Wales Key Stages
34
35 provide natural transition points in the teaching of science at which teacher's views
36
37 about the use of practical work might be more likely, if they were to change at all, to
38
39 do so. Table 2 shows the changes to the way pupils are categorised by Year group in
40
41 both studies.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE 2 GOES HERE

Secondly, the focus group felt that because pupils were, at the time of this study,
assessed on their performance of a practical investigation (Sc1), and this contributes
to their grade in the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) – a public
examination taken at age 16 - the aim “To fit the requirements of practical

1
2
3 examination regulations” (Kerr 1963 p. 27) needed to be modified so as to make
4
5 explicit that this also included the potential aim of practical work as a means of
6
7 preparing pupils for the assessed practical investigation (Sc1). The modified aim, used
8
9 in this study, was “To prepare pupils for assessed practical work – including Sc1
10
11 investigations”.

12
13
14
15
16 The instructions in the questionnaire asked teachers to rank the aims, in each of the
17
18 three Key Stages, in order of their perceived importance by putting ‘1’ in the
19
20 appropriate column to the right of the aim which was viewed as being most important
21
22 ‘2’ alongside the next, ‘3’ alongside the third and so on to ‘10’ opposite the least
23
24 applicable with each number from one to ten to be used one only in each column. The
25
26 full questionnaire was piloted by the focus group with science teachers (N = 15) in
27
28 their respective schools with no difficulties being reported.
29
30
31
32

33 34 35 *The sample*

36
37 Whilst the Kerr (1963) study was limited to teachers within 151 secondary schools
38
39 following a traditional grammar type curriculum, this study used a stratified sample of
40
41 304 representative schools, selected from across the state and independent (privately
42
43 funded) sectors, with three questionnaires being sent to the head of science at each
44
45 school. A total of 912 questionnaires were sent out with 388 being returned (42.5%)
46
47 of which 25 were excluded from analysis for various reasons. The frequency
48
49 distributions of the questionnaires sent out and those returned are listed in Table 3.
50
51
52 There was no statistically significant difference between the frequency distributions
53
54 (chi-square = 2.408, $df = 3$, not significant). This indicates that the responses closely
55
56 reflected the stratified sample from which they were drawn.
57
58
59
60

TABLE 3 GOES HERE*Method of analysis*

This study examines whether there have been any changes in the importance teachers attached to the aims of practical work, across the entire secondary age range and across all three traditional sciences, since the Kerr (1963) study in England and Wales. Since there are three Key Stages and three science subjects in the study, there are nine comparisons to make with the Kerr study.

A frequently used method to compare ranked data involves the calculation of the sum of ranks for each item rank. The sums are then put into rank order, and the differences between rank orders are shown diagrammatically (for examples see Beatty & Woolnough, 1982; Saglam & Millar, 2006; Thompson 1975; Whitfield, 1979). Figure 1 shows such a comparison between Key Stage 3 chemistry teachers in the Kerr study and the current study. The figure also presents the mean of the sum of ranks for each aim, on which the rank order is based, since the number of the chemistry teachers at Key Stage 3 was different in each study.

FIGURE 1 GOES HERE

An initial conclusion, from a preliminary analysis of Figure 1, might be that there had been no change in the importance Key Stage 3 chemistry teachers attached to Aim 5 between both studies as it was ranked 10th in both studies. Likewise the two-place difference between the ranks of Aim 8 suggests that there has been a change in the importance Key Stage 3 chemistry teachers ascribe to that aim having risen from

1
2
3 being ranked 5th to 3rd in the rank order of aims. However, if the analysis is based on
4
5 the means of the sum of ranks, instead of simply the rank orders, we find that the
6
7 preliminary conclusion obscured the fact that whilst there was a small difference (0.09
8
9 points) between the means of the sum of ranks of Aim 8 there was a much greater
10
11 difference (1.95 points) between the means of the sum of ranks of Aim 5.
12
13
14
15

16
17 In order to better examine the scope of any difference in teachers' views it was
18
19 decided to use the means of the sum of ranks, instead of the more basic rank orders, to
20
21 analyse any change in the importance teachers attached to the aims of practical work.
22
23 However, there remains one problem with using the means of the sum of ranks in any
24
25 such analysis. This is that although, irrespective of the sample size, the average of the
26
27 means of the sum of ranks remains 5.5 the standard deviation in both studies will
28
29 differ. For example in Figure 1 it can be seen that whilst the sum of ranks in both
30
31 studies is 5.5 the standard deviation is 2.15 for the Kerr study and 1.61 for the current
32
33 study. In order to compare the means of the sum of ranks they need first to be
34
35 expressed on the same scale and to achieve this it is necessary to convert each mean
36
37 into a z-score. Howitt and Cramer (2000) make clear that '*the number of standard*
38
39 *deviations is a universal scale of measurement*' and that '*the z-score is nothing other*
40
41 *than the number of standard deviations a particular score lies above or below the*
42
43 *mean of the set of scores*' (p. 46, italics in the original). For example, in order to
44
45 calculate the z-score of Aim 9 in the current study (Figure 1), we simply subtract 5.5
46
47 from 2.74, and then divide by the standard deviation of 1.61, which is – 1.714. The
48
49 magnitude of the z-score indicates that the mean of the sum of ranks of Aim 9 in the
50
51 current study is 1.714 standard deviations away from the mean of the set of scores,
52
53 and the minus sign indicates that it is below the mean of the set of scores. It is
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important to note that by converting the means of the sum of ranks into z-scores we
4
5 do not change their distribution but rather express them in standard deviations from
6
7 the average.
8
9

10
11
12 In the discussions above it was assumed that the sums of ranks were representing the
13
14 Key Stage 3 chemistry teachers' rank orders. Yet such an assumption requires there to
15
16 be sufficient agreement between the teachers' rank orders and to ascertain whether
17
18 this was the case a measure of the degree to which the teachers agree was needed.
19
20 Kendall (1955) developed the *coefficient of concordance* (W) as a means of
21
22 calculating the degree of agreement between various rank orders. The coefficient of
23
24 concordance ranges from zero, when there is no agreement between the various rank
25
26 orders, to +1 when there is full agreement. The statistical significance of the
27
28 coefficient of concordance can be calculated using a Chi Squared test provided there
29
30 are seven or more judges doing the ranking (Howell, 1997). For example the
31
32 coefficient of concordance for Key Stage 3 chemistry teachers in the current study
33
34 was 0.28. This is statistically significant at the 1% level, suggesting that there was
35
36 sufficient agreement between the Key Stage 3 chemistry teachers' rank orders to
37
38 enable the sums of ranks to be considered as representative of all of the Key Stage 3
39
40 chemistry teachers' rank orders.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Having discussed the degree of agreement between rank orders and the use of z-scores
52
53 in comparing the means of the sum of ranks we now illustrate the use of z-scores in
54
55 our analysis of the data using a set of z-scores from the study. [The full list of z-scores
56
57 can be obtained from the authors electronically]. Table 4 shows the z-scores for Key
58
59 Stage 5 chemistry teachers in the Kerr study and the current study, and the differences
60

1
2
3 between them. The magnitude of each difference provides a measure of the relative
4 change in the z-score of each specific aim. The negative signs in Table 4 indicate that
5 the z-scores of these aims have decreased *relative* to their value in the first study. For
6 the z-scores of these aims have decreased *relative* to their value in the first study. For
7 example, the change in z-score for Aim 2 was – 1.997, indicating that compared with
8 the Kerr study, the chemistry teachers in the current study gave less importance to
9 Aim 2. On the other hand, the change in z-score for Aim 10 was 1.869, indicates that
10 compared with the Kerr study, the chemistry teachers in the current study gave more
11 importance to Aim 10.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE 4 GOES HERE

29 We have categorised changes in z-score of between 0 and 0.333 as ‘small’; 0.333 and
30 0.666 as ‘limited’; 0.666 and 0.999 as ‘moderate’ and those of more than 0.999 as
31 ‘substantial’. Whilst recognising that the boundaries of such categories are, as with
32 the assessment of the data using diagrammatic methods, essentially arbitrary we feel
33 that they provide a useful method of comparing results from both studies.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Results

43 Results from the study will be presented in two sections. The first section will deal
44 with the overall results of the study whilst the second section will discuss the changes
45 in the importance teachers attached to the aims of practical work, by Key Stage, since
46 the Kerr (1963) study.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Overall Results

Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) was calculated to evaluate the agreement within the nine comparison groups. Of the nine coefficients of concordance all were found to be statistically significant at the 1% level. This suggests that the means of the sum of ranks of each group can be accepted as being representative of the importance that each group of science teachers attaches to the ten suggested aims of practical work. One notable finding was that the level of agreement in each Key Stage, and across all three science subjects, was very similar: although the level of agreement had its highest value amongst teachers at Key Stage 3. Therefore although there was agreement among science teachers about the aims of practical work, across the three Key Stages, it appears that those teaching at Key Stages 4 and 5 were less sure about those aims than teachers teaching at Key Stage 3. One possible line of future study might therefore be to investigate whether there is a similar pattern of the level of agreement in other countries, and the reason(s) for such a pattern.

Change in the aims of practical work

In this paper we will only discuss substantial changes in z-scores: where a change is said to be substantial if its magnitude is greater than or equal to 1. Table 5 shows all substantial changes in the z-score that were found.

TABLE 5 GOES HERE

Changes at Key Stage 3

As there were no substantial changes in the z-scores relating to teachers' views about the aims of practical work at Key Stage 3 since the original study by Kerr (1963) there are no results for Key Stage 3 in Table 5. Interestingly the most important purpose of practical work at Key Stage 3, across all science subjects, remains, as it was forty-five years ago, to arouse and maintain interest in the subject (Aim 9) whilst the least important purpose of practical work continues to be that of preparing pupils for assessed practical work (Aim 5) – which, in the current study, explicitly included Sc1 investigations.

Changes at Key Stage 4

The largest changes in z-scores observed in this study occurred at Key Stage 4 with regards Aim 5, which relates to preparing pupils for assessed practical work – including Sc1 investigations. Although Kerr (1963) acknowledges the possible role of practical work in preparing pupils for practical examinations there was also a recognition that it was too much to expect more than a few teachers to admit to using practical work to this end. Perhaps those teaching science in the early twenty-first century are more realistic and/or pragmatic about the influence of practical examinations on the aims and values of practical work.

As Kerr (1963) notes Aims 1 and 2 refer to 'the possible effects of practical work on one's subsequent thinking and behaviour' (p. 22). The substantial negative changes in z-scores relating to these aims at Key Stage 4 (and 5) suggests that science teachers today see these aims as being less important for older pupils – although the importance of these aims for pupils at Key Stage 3 remained unchanged - than did the

1
2
3 science teachers in the Kerr study. Comments written by some of the teachers on the
4
5 questionnaires suggested that it was not that these aims – which relate to basic
6
7 scientific skills - suddenly ceased to have any importance in Key Stages 4 and 5 but
8
9 rather that they saw the need to prioritise different aims at different Key Stages. A
10
11 frequent point made by teachers was that although the emphasis on encouraging
12
13 accurate observation and careful recording along with the promotion of simple,
14
15 common-sense, scientific methods of thought was seen as relatively important at Key
16
17 Stage 3 – to enable pupils to begin effectively engaging with practical work – these
18
19 were seen as being less important, *relatively* speaking, than other aims at Key Stages
20
21 4 and 5 whose importance had increased. The exception to this was that in terms of
22
23 Aim 1 there was no substantial change in the z-score associated with physics teachers’
24
25 views towards the importance of encouraging accurate observation and careful
26
27 recording. Interestingly, although only three physics teachers commented on this
28
29 point, all three emphasised the importance of accurate observation and the careful
30
31 recording of data if a high mark was to be achieved in the Sc1 assessed practical.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Evidently whilst teachers are aware that the National Curriculum considers
42
43 observation and scientific thinking as important practical skills to be taught at Key
44
45 Stage 4 – they clearly have an expectation that pupils would have developed sufficient
46
47 proficiency in these skills during Key Stage 3 to enable teachers to prioritise other
48
49 aims of practical work in Key Stages 4 and 5.
50
51
52
53
54

55 The most substantial increase in z-score at Key Stage 4 relates to the use of practical
56
57 work ‘to prepare pupils for assessed practical work – including Sc1 investigations’
58
59 although, as can be seen from Table 5, there is no substantial change at Key Stage 5.
60

1
2
3 Whilst few teachers made any comment on this specific aim those that did mentioned
4 the pressure of trying to ensure that their pupils did well in the Sc1 assessment, as this
5
6
7 contributed towards their total GCSE examination grade.
8
9

10
11
12 Aims 9 and 10 are concerned with the 'possible affects on one's general attitude to
13 science by increasing the desire to learn and the level of understanding' (Kerr, 1963 p.
14
15
16
17 22). Whilst there was a substantial rise in terms of the z-scores associated with
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Aims 9 and 10 are concerned with the 'possible affects on one's general attitude to science by increasing the desire to learn and the level of understanding' (Kerr, 1963 p. 22). Whilst there was a substantial rise in terms of the z-scores associated with physics teachers' views towards Aims 9 and 10, and a similar substantial rise amongst chemistry teachers for Aim 10, no substantial change in z-scores was found amongst biology teachers for either of these aims. However, that said, it must be emphasised that these two aims were, as at Key Stage 3, ranked 1st and 2nd by all teachers and the observed substantial increase in their z-score, amongst chemistry and physics teachers, simply indicates that those teachers saw them as being even more important than at Key Stage 3. The emphasis teachers place on the potential affective value of practical work both at Key Stage 3 and, more importantly at Key Stage 4, might help to explain the reported (Joint Council for Qualifications, 2008) rise in the number of pupils now opting to take one or more science subjects in the post-compulsory Key Stage 5. It is unclear why there was no substantial rise in z-scores amongst Key Stage 4 biology teachers regarding these two aims. One possible explanation might be that as the number of pupils taking biology at Key Stage 5 has been increasing year on year (Osborne, Simon & Collins, 2003) there was less pressure on biology teachers to change their views towards the use of practical work as they were evidently already effectively generating a sufficiently positive attitude towards biology amongst their pupils. Conversely the teachers of physics, which is seen as the least popular science, as measured by the number of pupils who go on to study the subject at Key Stage 5

1
2
3 (Osborne, Simon & Collins, 2003), have substantially increased the importance of
4 practical work as a means 'to arouse and maintain interest in the subject' and that this
5 is, and a number of physics teachers made this point, in the hope of motivating more
6 pupils – and this does appear to be having some degree of success (Joint Council for
7 Qualifications, 2008) - to continue with their subject post-compulsion.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 16 17 **Changes at Key Stage 5**

18
19 Similar to the changes that occurred at Key Stage 4 there were substantial falls in the
20 importance teachers assigned to Aims 1 and 2 and, unlike at Key Stage 4, there were
21 no exceptions. One of the physics teachers, one who had commented on the
22 importance of encouraging accurate observation and careful recording at Key Stage 3,
23 made the further point, about making accurate observations and careful recordings,
24 that "If they don't know how to do it by the time they're doing 'A' level [Key Stage
25 5] they shouldn't be doing 'A' level physics."
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 At Key stage 5 there was also a substantial fall amongst biology and physics teachers'
40 views about the use of practical work to develop manipulative skills although this was
41 not the case amongst chemistry teachers. Whilst only one chemistry teacher
42 commented on this aim, so it can only be seen as anecdotal, it was interesting in so far
43 as they claimed that "A level [Key Stage 5] chemistry requires higher order
44 manipulative skills and it's vital that we teach these". Clearly if this is the case, and
45 we have no evidence to support or refute this claim, it would offer a possible
46 explanation as to why chemistry teachers continued to see this particular aim as being
47 relatively important. Aims 9 and 10 saw the most pronounced rise in teachers' views
48 about their importance and, unlike at Key Stage 4, this was across all the science
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subjects. Those teachers that commented upon this, and again there were only a few,
4
5 spoke of a need to make science real and relevant in order to maintain an interest in
6
7 what was a much more conceptually demanding subject than it had been at Key Stage
8
9 4. Although there has been a substantial rise in the z-scores relating to these two aims
10
11 – they are now ranked 4th and 3rd respectively – it is unclear as to the extent to which
12
13 this reflects a desire, on the part of the science teachers, to encourage Key Stage 5
14
15 pupils towards studying a science degree at university as educational policy makers
16
17 and advisors (Department for Education and Employment 1996; Royal Society, 2006)
18
19 suggest is vital for the UK economy.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Conclusions and Implications for Teaching and Research**

28
29 The aim of this study was to see whether there had been any changes in the relative
30
31 importance of the aims science teachers assign to the use of practical work, across the
32
33 full secondary age range (11-18), since the last published national survey of teachers'
34
35 views about practical work undertaken by Kerr (1963). One important finding has
36
37 been the fact that despite the many changes in the educational system in England and
38
39 Wales during the last forty five years – including the introduction of a National
40
41 Curriculum – teachers' views about the aims of practical work for pupils in Key Stage
42
43 3 have remained virtually unchanged. Indeed, our findings replicate those of Beatty
44
45 and Woolnough (1982) who, twenty-six years ago, noted similarly, with regards KS3
46
47 (in fact only Years 7 and 8) that '[t]here is no evidence of a dramatic change in the
48
49 reasons that teachers give for doing practical work since 1962, despite all the
50
51 curriculum innovations in the succeeding period'. We believe that this stability, and
52
53 the high degree of concordance amongst teachers regarding the aims for the use of
54
55 practical work at this Key Stage in both this study and that of Kerr (1963), is a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reflection of the fact that there is less perceived competition between the aims.
4
5 Certainly the fact that these pupils do not have to undertake public examinations
6
7 involving practical work means that it is relatively unproblematic for teachers to rank
8
9 the aim of preparing pupils for assessed practical work – including Sc1 investigations
10
11 - very low whilst their desire to portray science as a fun and exciting ‘hands-on’
12
13 subject (Abrahams, 2007) means that many teachers will rank its potential affective
14
15 value i.e. to arouse and maintain interest in the subject highly.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In terms of the evolutionary model developed by Johnson, Monk and Swain (1998)
23
24 ‘[c]hanges to the working environment of teachers through curricula reform, in-
25
26 service provision and increased resources will lead to changes in pedagogy which in
27
28 turn will alter opinions’ (p. 1322). However, despite the introduction of the National
29
30 Curriculum – which has clearly changed the working environment – this study has
31
32 found no substantial change in current teachers’ aims regarding the use of practical
33
34 work at Key Stage 3 compared to those obtained by Kerr (1963) over forty years ago.
35
36 One possible way of understanding this is to propose that it is not, as Johnson, Monk
37
38 and Swain (1998) suggest, that changes in the working environment lead to changes
39
40 in pedagogy and subsequently teachers’ opinions – including those on the aims and/or
41
42 use of practical work – but that changes in the working environment have the
43
44 *potential* to lead to changes in pedagogy if those changes generate pressure on (or
45
46 removed it from) teachers. We would argue that the absence of any substantial change
47
48 to the z-scores associated with teachers’ views about the use of practical work at Key
49
50 Stage 3 suggests that the National Curriculum did not generate any pressure on
51
52 teachers to change their pedagogy and/or opinions, regarding practical work, in order
53
54 for them to continue to operate successfully within their new working environment.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The most substantial change in teachers' aims for practical work (Table 5) occurred at
4
5 Key Stage 4 and it would appear to reflect the introduction of the Sc1 investigations
6
7 and the associated pressure on biology, chemistry and physics teachers that this has
8
9 generated in terms of needing to prepare pupils for assessed practical work. Indeed
10
11 Donnelly, Buchan, Jenkins, Laws and Welford (1996), in a detailed study of the
12
13 'Scientific Enquiry' component of the English National Curriculum (Attainment
14
15 target Sc1), found that extended, and more open-ended, investigative practical tasks
16
17 were, in fact, rarely being used to teach pupils about specific aspects of scientific
18
19 enquiry might have been, but almost entirely to assess their ability to conduct an
20
21 empirical enquiry 'scientifically' - something that they would be required to do as part
22
23 of their public examinations. It would seem, therefore, that an unintended
24
25 consequence for educational policy makers of the introduction of Attainment Target
26
27 Sc1 may have been that teachers' views about the use of practical work were
28
29 influenced by government led changes to the assessment procedures (that generate
30
31 pressure on teachers) – and that this was particularly pronounced at KS4.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Following the recent decision by educational policy makers to remove Sc1 as a means
42
43 of assessment – and, as such, the pressure on teachers that was associated with it – we
44
45 would predict, and this would be an interesting area for further research, that the
46
47 importance of using practical work 'to prepare pupils for assessed practical work –
48
49 including Sc1 investigations' would return to a position at, or very close to, the
50
51 bottom of teachers' aims for using practical work at Key Stage 4.
52
53
54
55
56

57 Whilst many science teachers at Key Stages 4 and 5 substantially decreased the status
58
59 of the aims 'to encourage accurate observation and careful recording', 'to promote
60

1
2
3 simple, common-sense, scientific methods of thought' and 'to develop manipulative
4 skills', we do not believe that this necessarily means that they no longer see these as
5 important in an objective sense. Rather, we would claim, that such changes are more
6 likely to reflect the fact that teachers recognise, as a result of pressures in the
7 educational environment, that different aims are more important, *relative* to other
8 aims, at different stages within secondary education if their teaching is to be effective.
9 Indeed it might be expected that if these aims were effectively met, for example, in
10 Key Stage 3 – when their importance is ranked highly - then their *relative* importance
11 at Key Stages 4 and 5 might be expected to drop as has been found in this study.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 We suggest that helping those undertaking initial teacher training to recognise the way
28 in which practicing teachers' views about the relative importance of the different aims
29 for practical work change at different Key Stages could enable them to better reflect
30 on their own reasons for using practical work at a particular Key Stage.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 An interesting finding to emerge from our use of z-scores was the fact that some
40 seemingly identical changes in rank order, such as the change in the rank order of
41 Aim 9 by the biology and physics teachers at Key Stage 4, were in fact not identical in
42 magnitude when considered in terms of changes in their respective z-scores. Indeed,
43 in the above example, only in the case of physics teachers was the change in z-score
44 found to be substantial: a finding that would not have emerged had the analysis relied
45 solely upon the change in the rank order of a particular aim. For this reason we
46 suggest that in future studies z-scores should be used instead of rank orders as a
47 means of comparing sets of ranking data.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Note

The use of the term 'Key Stage' is peculiar to the UK. Key Stage 3 relates to the first three years of secondary school education (ages 11-14). Key Stage 4 corresponds to the fourth and fifth years of secondary school education (pupils aged 15-16): the completion of which marks the end of compulsory education in the UK. Key Stage 5 corresponds to the two years of post-compulsory secondary school education (pupils aged 17-18).

References

Abrahams, I.Z. (2007). Practical work: It's better than writing but does it motivate? *Education in Science* 224, 10-11.

Abrahams, I. & Millar, R. (2008). Does practical work really work? A study of the effectiveness of practical work as a teaching and learning method in school science. *International Journal of Science Education*. 30 (14), 1945-1969.

Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of social research*. New York: The Free Press.

Beatty, J.W. (1980). *School science, its organisation and practical work in the 11-13 age range*. Unpublished MSc dissertation. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Beatty, J. W. & Woolnough, B. E. (1982). Practical work in 11-13 science: The context, type and aims of current practice. *British Educational Research Journal*, 8 (1), 23-30.

Belson, W. A. (1986). *Validity in survey research*. Aldershot: Gower.

Cohen, L., Manion, L & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Department for Education and Employment (1996). *Labour market and skill trends*. London: Department for Education and Employment.

- 1
2
3 Donnelly, J., Buchan, A., Jenkins, E., Laws, P. & Welford, G. (1996). *Investigations*
4 *by order. Policy, curriculum and science teachers' work under the education reform*
5 *act*. Nafferton, UK: Studies in Education Ltd.
6
7
8
9
10 Gott, R. & Duggan, S. (1995). *Investigative work in the science curriculum*.
11
12 Buckingham: Open University Press.
13
14
15 Hoinville, G. & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (1978). *Survey research practice*. London:
16
17 Heineman Educational Books.
18
19
20 Howell, D.C. (1997). *Statistical methods for psychology*, 4th ed. London:
21
22 International Thomson Publishing Europe.
23
24
25 Howitt, D. and Cramer, D. (2000). *An introduction to statistics in psychology: A*
26 *complete guide for students*. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
27
28
29 Johnson, S., Monk, M. & Swain, J. (1998). *Teacher development and change in Asia*
30 *and Africa: An evolutionary perspective*. Paper presented at Teaching Effectiveness
31 and Teacher Development in the New Century. Hong Kong.
32
33
34
35
36 Johnstone, A.H. and Al-Shuaili, A. (2001). Learning in the laboratory; some thoughts
37 from the literature. *University Chemistry Education*, 5 (2), 42-51.
38
39
40
41 Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) (2008). *National provisional GCE A and AS*
42 *level results – June 2008*. [http://www.jcq.org.uk/attachments/published/984/JCQ%](http://www.jcq.org.uk/attachments/published/984/JCQ%20A-Level%20Results%202008.pdf)
43 [20A-Level%20Results%202008.pdf](http://www.jcq.org.uk/attachments/published/984/JCQ%20A-Level%20Results%202008.pdf). Accessed December 11, 2008.
44
45
46
47
48 Kendall, M. G. (1955). *Rank correlation methods*. London: Griffin.
49
50
51 Kerr, J. F. (1963). *Practical work in school science*. Leicester: Leicester University
52 Press.
53
54
55 Kind, P.M. (1999). TIMSS performance assessment – a cross national comparison of
56 practical work. In J. Leach & A.C. Paulsen (Eds.) *Practical work in science education*
57 *– recent research studies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic publishers.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lynch, P. & Ndyetabura, V.L. (1983). Practical work in schools: An examination of
4 teachers' stated aims and the influence of practical work according to students.
5
6
7
8 *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 20, 663-671.
9
- 10 Osborne, J., Simon, S. & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes towards science: A review of
11 the literature and its implications. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25 (9),
12 1049-1079.
13
14
- 15 Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research*. Oxford: Blackwell.
16
17
- 18 Royal Society (2006). *A degree of concern*. [http://royalsociety.org/document.asp](http://royalsociety.org/document.asp?id=5467)
19 [?id=5467](http://royalsociety.org/document.asp?id=5467). Accessed December 11, 2008.
20
21
22
23
- 24 Saglam, M. & Millar, R. (2006). Upper high school students' understanding of
25 electromagnetism. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28 (5), 543-566.
26
27
- 28 Screen, P.A. (1986). The Warwick process science project. *School Science Review*, 72
29 (260), 17-24.
30
31
32
- 33 Screen, P.A. (1998). A case for a process approach: The Warwick experience. *Physics*
34 *Education*, 23, 146-149.
35
36
37
- 38 Swain, J., Monk, M., & Johnson, S. (1999). A comparative study of attitudes to the
39 aims of practical work in science education in Egypt, Korea and the UK. *International*
40 *Journal of Science Education*, 21 (12), 1311-1324.
41
42
43
44
- 45 Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (1999). *International*
46 *Science Report*. isc.bc.edu/timss/1999.html. Accessed May 2007.
47
48
49
- 50 Thompson, J. J. (Ed.). (1975). *Practical work in sixthform science*. Oxford:
51 Department of Educational Studies, University of Oxford.
52
53
- 54 Verma, G. K. & Mallick, K. (1999). *Researching education: Perspectives and*
55 *techniques*. London: Falmer Press.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Whitefield, R. C. (1979). Educational research and science teaching. *School Science*
4
5 *Review*, 60 (212), 411-430.
6

7
8 Wilkinson, J. & Ward, M. (1997). A comparative study of students' and their
9
10 teachers' perceptions of laboratory work in secondary schools, *Research in Science*
11
12 *Education*, 27, 599-610.
13
14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Table 1 Teachers' ten suggested aims (purposes) for practical work in order of perceived importance (From Kerr 1963 p. 27)

Pooled Order of Importance of Aims of Practical Work				
		Physics teachers		
		Years 1-2 KS3	Years 3-5 KS4	6 th Form
1	To encourage accurate observation and careful recording	5	4	1
2	To promote simple, common-sense, scientific methods of thought	4	3	4
3	To develop manipulative skills	7	8	6
4	To give training in problem solving	9	9	8
5	To fit the requirements of practical examination regulations	10	10	10
6	To elucidate the theoretical work so as to aid comprehension	6	2	2
7	To verify facts and principle already taught	8	7	5
8	To be an integral part of the process of finding facts by investigation and arriving at principles	3	1	3
9	To arouse and maintain interest in the subject	1	5	9

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

10 To make physical phenomena more real 2 6 7
through actual experience

For Peer Review Only

Table 2. A comparison of the age ranges used in both studies

Year ranges of pupils	Youngest range	Middle range	Oldest range
Kerr	Years 1-2	Years 3-5	6 th Form
	Ages 11- 13	Ages 14 - 16	Ages 17 - 18
Abrahams and Saglam	Years 1-3 (KS3)	Years 4-5 (KS4)	6 th Form (KS5)
	Ages 11- 14	Ages 15 - 16	Ages 17 - 18

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

Table 3. Number of the questionnaires by school type

Teachers	Comprehensive	Grammar	Independent	Specialist
	school teachers	school teachers	school teachers	school teachers
Total sample (N = 912)	546	90	138	138
Analysed sample (N =363)	206	46	57	54

For Peer Review Only

Table 4. Change in the z-scores for Key Stage 5 chemistry teachers

Aim	The Kerr study	The current study	Change in z-score
1	-1.466	-0.105	-1.362
2	-0.455	1.542	-1.997
3	0.092	0.390	-0.297
4	0.357	0.993	-0.636
5	0.372	0.851	-0.479
6	-1.312	-1.717	0.405
7	0.147	-0.258	0.405
8	-0.565	-1.004	0.438
9	1.801	0.148	1.653
10	1.029	-0.840	1.869

Table 5. Substantial changes in z-scores

Aims of practical work			Science Subject		
			Biology	Chemistry	Physics
1	To encourage accurate observation and careful recording.	<i>KS4</i>	-1.613	-1.130	
		<i>KS5</i>	-1.743	-1.362	-1.704
2	To promote simple, common-sense, scientific methods of thought.	<i>KS4</i>	-1.571	-1.462	-1.299
		<i>KS5</i>	-1.506	-1.997	-1.389
3	To develop manipulative skills.	<i>KS5</i>	-1.712		-1.419
5	To prepare pupils for assessed practical work – including Sc1 investigations.	<i>KS4</i>	2.084	1.880	2.169
9	To arouse and maintain interest in the subject.	<i>KS4</i>			1.152
		<i>KS5</i>	1.492	1.653	1.839
10	To make biological, chemical and physical phenomena more real through actual experience.	<i>KS4</i>		1.230	1.021
		<i>KS5</i>	1.282	1.869	1.058

Note: KS is for Key Stage

Figure 1. A comparison between Key Stage 3 chemistry teachers in the Kerr study and the current study

Rank order of aims	The Kerr study		The current study	
	Aim	Mean of the sum of ranks	Aim	Mean of the sum of ranks
1	9	2.45	9	2.74
2	1	3.74	10	3.22
3	10	3.79	8	5.12
4	2	4.05	1	5.20
5	8	5.03	6	5.39
6	6	5.57	2	5.62
7	3	5.83	3	5.99
8	7	6.72	7	6.51
9	4	7.58	4	7.42
10	5	9.74	5	7.79