

Participatory Educational Research (PER) Vol. 2(2), pp. 84-92, August, 2015 Available online at <u>http://www.partedres.com</u> ISSN: 2148-6123 http://dx.doi.org/10.17275/per.15.20.2.2

# Effectiveness of the Nature of Science Activities Developed for 5<sup>th</sup> Grades

## Menşure A.Küçükaydın<sup>\*</sup>, Çiğdem Akkanat, Büşra Bakioğlu Amasya University Institute of Social Sciences, Amasya, TURKEY

Şafak Uluçınar Sağır, Murat Gökdere, Orhan Karamustafaoğlu Amasya University Faculty of Education Primary Education Department

	ersity Faculty of Education Frimary Education Department
Article history	Within the context of new findings about nature of science,
<b>Received:</b> 27.06.2015	literature has been reviewed and it was seen that the activities to develop nature of science understanding were not adequate. For
<b>Received in revised form:</b> 21.07.2015	this reason, new activities were developed as a part of 5th grade 'Matter and Change' unit and their effectiveness was tested. The
Accepted: 21.07.2015	research was conducted with 5th grade students from two classrooms, who were attending to a middle school in a village of
Key words: Nature of Science, 'Matter and Change' unit, 5th grade activities, VNOS-E Questionnaire.	city of Tokat. Activities developed about the unit; 'Thermoscope to - Thermometer', 'Bingo Game' and 'Science Wheel' activity from the literature were applied to experimental group with textbook content, as for control group the nature of science concepts were integrated with textbook content. VNOS-E questionnaire was conducted both for pretest and posttest to experimental and control group, the questionnaires were coded by three researchers and the coefficient of consistency was calculated as 0,78. Results indicated that, experimental group's view of nature of science in all dimensions was changed in a positive way, a significant difference was found between the posttests of two groups in experimental group's favor. The activities were effective in developing students' views about the nature of science. The regular curriculum was not effective in nurturing nature of science views as a consequence because the theoretical basis regarding the nature of science in the renewed science curriculum is not supported with appropriate activities, methods and classroom resources. As a result, essential and applicable suggestions were made for those who concerned.

## Introduction

Today those scientific developments happened intensely, in most countries, the ultimate purpose of science education is stated as developing individuals' scientific literacy. Scientific literacy is defined as individual's decision making in such cases as required for science and technology which he shows responsibility and having necessary skill and information to activate him cognitively (Laugsksch, 2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup> Correspondence: mensurealkis@hotmail.com

Global climate change, energy resources, stem cell researches and socio-scientific problems that related to most developments in modern medicine are matters interest not only scientist and specialists who works in those fields but also every individual in society. Individuals have high scientific literacy may attend processes by stating their opinions about these topics. Therefore, it is important that scientific literacy to be developed and for this Nature of Science to be understood (Fowler, Zeidler & Sadler, 2009). In renewed science curriculum it was given wide publicity to ability of questioning about socio-scientific matters in the fields of understanding science-technology-society and environment to understand the Nature of Science (MEB, 2013). Without an common portrayal of researchers, the Nature of Science was defined by McComas, Clough and Almazroa (2002) on explaining matters such as what the science is, how it works, how scientists work as a social group and how society steers scientific efforts and reacts to explanations of matters; as a mixture of various social sciences which includes philosophy of science that was integrated by research with cognitive sciences like psychology, history of science and sociology of science. As for science educators, they indicated that NOS determines the intersection of issues addressed by philosophy of science, history of science, sociology of science, psychology of science as they apply to and potentially affect science education and science learning; and were fundamental domains for science education.

According to researchers studying on science and Nature of Science, features that have to be mentioned are specified as: 1)The Tentative Nature of Scientific Knowledge, 2)Th e Empirical Nature of Scientific Knowledge, 3) Subjectivity, 4) Creative nature of scientific knowledge, 5)The Social and Cultural Embeddedness of Scientific Knowledge, 6) Observations, inferences and theoretical entities in science, 7) Scientific theories and laws, 8) The theory-laden nature of scientific knowledge, 9) Myth of scientific method (Lederman, Abd-El-Khalick, Bell & Schwartz, 2002). The Nature of Science involves understanding what science is, which roles it includes, who scientifics were and which roles they played, scientific facts, observations, events, rules, scientific method and how they do science (Taşar, 2003).

There are three approaches to develop understanding on the Nature of Science in general. These are historical, implicit and explicit-reflective approaches. Studies have shown that explicit-reflective approach is the most effective method among these approaches. Explicitreflective approach is a kind of successful approach which was found effective on teaching the Nature of Science to a lot of groups (Abd-El-Khalick, Lederman 2000). Developing students' understanding about the Nature of Science in early classes may help them to comprehend both the Nature of Science and course content of science better (Akerson, Buck, Donnelly, Nargund-Joshi & Weiland, 2011). Akerson and Donnelly (2010) indicated that explicit-reflective approach was a successful approach even for the pre-school period children. Akerson, Nargund-Joshi, Weiland, Pongsenon and Avsar (2013) carried out explicitreflective approach to 3<sup>rd</sup> grades (8 year old groups according to American education system) for a school year and found out that it was effective. It was seen that among three students chosen situational at the end of teaching period of the Nature of Science rest upon explicitreflective approach, low-successful student was able to discuss the Nature of Science, middlesuccessful student was able to discuss and write about it and high-successful student was able to discuss, write and put forward some questions about the Nature of Science. It was clearly seen that students were able to learn concrete extents of the Nature of Science (like difference between experimental data and observation and inference) easier in comparison with abstract ideas (like being subjective, creative and tentative) about it. Hence, Akerson et al. (2013) indicated that at first more concrete ideas has to be emphasized then more abstract ones while teaching young students the Nature of Science.



It was observed in literature and most studies about the Nature of Science that it was given independently of the content of science. Besides, studies done with primary school,  $5^{th}$  grade and pre-school period students are in a limited number. In this study,  $5^{th}$  grade students were chosen as working group and explicit-reflective method integrated with the 'Matter and Change' unit was interiorized then students' ideas about the Nature of Science were analyzed . It was thought that this research would shed light to studies about teaching the Nature of Science in early ages on account of choosing  $5^{th}$  grade students as sample and involving new the Nature of Science activities aimed at 'Matter and Change' unit.

## Method

## **Research Model**

In the study, quasi-experimental method with pretest posttest control grouped was used. One of the 5<sup>th</sup> grades from the school that intervention was performed was experimental group, the other one was chosen as control group; before and at the end of study a the Nature of Science questionnaire was conducted to both groups for the purpose of defining their opinions about the Nature of Science.

## Sample of Study

Study; was carried out with 30 5<sup>th</sup> grade students studying in a primary school in a village of city of Tokat. There are two 5<sup>th</sup> grade classes in the school that the questionnaire was conducted in. socio-economic status, success average and family profiles of students are equal. Also, same teachers lectured those students. Within the scope of the study, fifteen students were chosen randomly from classes for each experimental and control groups. During 'Matter and Change' unit; activities were used from 5<sup>th</sup> grade Science course book in control group, any different activities related with nature of science aspects were not conducted. While in experimental group the Nature of Science activities developed by researchers were combined with teaching of 'Matter and Change' unit and performed with explicit-reflective method. Neither of groups was taught about the aspects of the Nature of Science.

## **Data Collecting Tools**

In study, VNOS-E Questionnaire, developed by Lederman and Ko (2004) and brought in our literature by Erenoğlu (2010), is used. Aspects about questions that the questionnaire includes are ranked below.

Nature of Science Aspect	VNOS-E Items									
Scientific knowledge is reliable and valid	1 X	2	3 X	<b>4</b> X	5	6 X	7			
Scientific knowledge involves logical, mathematical and experimental inferences	Х	Х								
Scientific knowledge is subjective	Х				Х					
Imagination and creativity has a great role in acquiring	Х			Х			Х			

**Table1.** Aspect of VNOS-E questionnaire



scientific knowledge				
Observation and inference are different concepts	Х	Х	Х	
Reference: Seçkin, 2013; 34.				

## **Practices**

Research was conducted with 5<sup>th</sup> grade students during "Matter and Change" unit in Science lesson for 5 weeks total of 20 course hours. In experimental group the Nature of Science was taught via explicit-reflective method, while in control group activities were in line with regular curriculum in Science lesson, nothing different had been done about the Nature of Science apart from content of course book.

## Activities Used for Experimental Group

In study; a new drama activity called 'Thermoscope to Thermometer', proper to explicit-reflective approach which was created by researchers and 'Bingo Game' and 'Science Wheel' which takes part in literature were customized to the subject and carried out. Expert opinions were received for activities that developed by researchers and activities were used integrated with curriculum. In *Table 2* activities and aspects of the Nature of Science that those activities reflected are given. Besides, explanations belong to relevant activities are presented.

Nature of Science Aspects	Activities						
	Science Wheel	Thermoscope to Thermometer	Bingo Game				
Scientific Knowledge is reliable and valid	Х	Х					
Scientific Knowledge involves logical, mathematical and experimental inferences	Х	Х	Х				
Scientific Knowledge is subjective		Х					
Imagination and creativity has a great role in acquiring scientific knowledge	Х						
Observation and inference are different concepts	Х		Х				

*Science Wheel:* It is an activity aims to reveal students' ideas about science, scientists and scientific knowledge (Doğan, Çakıroğlu, Bilican & Çavuş, 2010). It was expected from students to observe and make inferences from experiments on the subject of states of matter. In activity a wheel of concept was generated on the board.

*Bingo Game:* Teacher picks up three children that he stated before and arranges a seating order as students able to see each other. Then gives Bingo cards to chosen students. After picking another student, he gives a bag full of colorful cartons. There are pictures in the bag represents Expansion, Contraction, Boiling, Condensation and Sublimation. Each of the students representing those concepts takes the picture from bag and acts like it. Meanwhile, the teacher wants students to observe their friends and find out which student represents which concept. He wants them to explain their observations and inferences.

Thermoscope to Thermometer: This drama is an activity consisting of part reading and



discussions. In activity, students are primarily given drama activities to work at home, are asked to research the creation of thermometer. The materials used in the experiments to be made are previously obtained. Then, the experiment of the inflation of hot water containing balloon which was put at the end of the bottle is done. Students are expected to reach the conclusion that when the air expands the volume increases. "Thermoscope to Thermometer" reading part is read and drama part begins. Drama is based on an imaginary conversation between Galileo and his friends Santorio Santorio and Gian Francesco Sagredo who were living with him in Vienna. After the speeches, the lack of the invention made at the time is introduced and the need for a transition to a modern thermometer is emphasized.

## Data Analysis

The Nature of Science questionnaire was tested out to experimental and control groups as pretest and posttest. Those tests are evaluated by three researchers, wrong answer was coded as inadequate, partly adequate as convenient and desired leveled answers were coded as modern opinion and they were scored in order of 0,1 and 2. In study interceder reliability was calculated as 0,78. The descriptive analysis of students' answers was done and change in dimensions of the Nature of Science was tried to be set via comparing pretest and posttest results.

#### Findings

The descriptive analysis of pretest and posttest points of the Nature of Science questionnaire tested out to experimental and control groups is given in Table 3.

				1			-		$\overline{\mathcal{O}}$	1			<u> </u>	,	1								
	6				1		2			3			4			5			6			7	
	Group		0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
		n	12	2	1	13	2	0	7	8	0	8	6	1	11	4	0	10	4	1	5	10	0
st	Experiment	%	80	13	7	87	13	0	47	53	0	53	40	7	73	27	0	67	27	7	33	67	0
Pretest	~ .	n	12	2	1	14	1	0	8	6	1	4	10	1	12	3	0	15	0	0	5	10	0
Ц	Control	%	80	13	7	93	7	0	53	40	7	27	67	7	80	20	0	100	0	0	33	67	0
		n	6	7	2	3	12	0	3	8	4	7	4	4	7	5	3	7	4	4	2	10	3
sst	Experiment	%	40	47	13	20	80	0	20	53	27	47	27	27	47	33	20	47	27	27	13	67	20
Posttest	~ .	n	12	3	0	5	10	0	4	9	2	12	2	1	11	4	0	11	4	0	6	8	1
Ą	Control	%	80	20	0	33	67	0	27	60	13	80	13	7	73	27	0	73	27	0	40	53	7

**Table 3.** The descriptive analysis of groups according to aspects of the nature of science

0: Inadequate 1: Convenient 2: Modern Opinion

When groups' answers were analyzed in the basis of categories, it was seen that both groups got almost same points. It was observed that change among inadequate questions percentage decreased in every questions of experimental group but increased in  $4^{th}$  and  $7^{th}$  questions of control group. The rate of convenient ideas increased in  $1^{St}$  - $2^{nd}$  and  $5^{th}$  questions, never changed in  $3^{th}$ - $6^{th}$  and  $7^{th}$  questions but decreased in  $4^{th}$  question of experimental group. As for control group there was a decrease in  $4^{th}$  and  $7^{th}$  questions but an increase in others. For modern opinions; in experimental group there was an increase but a decrease in  $2^{nd}$  question; in control group there was a decrease in first question, a decrease in  $3^{rd}$  and  $7^{th}$  questions but no change in others.

When questions' posttest test points according to the aspects of the Nature of Science were analyzed for "Scientific Knowledge is reliable but can change" dimension pretest 1, 3, 4, 6; after teaching, convenient and modern ideas were increased 40% (from 20% to 60%), in  $3^{rd}$ question 27% (from 53 to 80), in  $4^{th}$  question 7% (from 47 to 54) and in  $6^{th}$  question 20%. In control group rates of change are in order of 0, 26, -44 and 7. It was found that answers



given to 1st and 2nd questions related to the dimension of "Scientific Knowledge involves logical, mathematical and experimental inferences" changed widely to convenient from inadequate (idea of convenient in 2<sup>nd</sup> question from %13 to %80, in control group from 7% to 67%), and rates of change in control group were 67 and60. Total change of convenient and modern ideas for the 5<sup>th</sup> question from 1<sup>st</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> which are related to the "Scientific Knowledge is subjective" dimension is 26% in experimental group and 7% in control group. When questions 1, 4 and 7 which are in the "Imagination and creativity has a great role in acquiring scientific knowledge" dimension were analyzed in the change in 7<sup>th</sup> question was observed as 20% in experimental and 3% in control groups. The last dimension "Observation and inference are different concepts" involves questions 1, 4 and 6 and an increase was observed an increase in countenance to experimental group on a par with first sub-dimension and in order of 40, 7 and 20 percentages. It is seen that increase of point of experimental group in all dimensions related to the Nature of Science is surplus. Change is surplus in the dimensions as "Scientific Knowledge is reliable but can change", "Imagination and creativity has a great role in acquiring scientific knowledge", "Scientific Knowledge is subjective", "Observation and inference are different concepts."

It was controlled whether data distribute normally via Kolmogorov – Smirnov test in order to define which statistical analysis will be used to compare pretest and posttest point of experimental and control groups. The pretest value for control group was found as K –S z=0,599 p=0,866 and posttest z=0,527 p=0,944. For control group it was found as K-S z=0,778 p=0,580 and for posttest z=0,672 p=0,757 which shows normal distribution. Parametric tests can be carried out (Pallant, 2005).

	Table 4. t test results for pretest and posttest										
	Groups	Ν	$\overline{X}$	S	sd	t	р				
Pre-test	Control	15	2,53	1,73	28	-0,344	0,733				
	Experiment	15	2,80	2,45							
Doct toot	Control	15	3,20	2,21	28	-2,365	0,025*				
Post-test	Experiment	15	6,00	4,02							

Pretest and posttest total scores were compared between groups with independent sample ttest. Results of independent samples t test are given in Table 4.

As it is seen in Table 4 there is not any significant difference between students' pretest results (t= 0,344, p>0,05). Accordingly, it can be said that both groups are similar to each other before activities was done in terms of ideas about the Nature of Science. A significant difference between pretest results was found after activities about the Nature of Science practiced in experimental group at the end of unit (t= -2,365, p<0,05). It shows that those activities done oriented to the Nature of Science are effective to develop students' ideas about the Nature of Science. Calculated effect size (n<sup>2</sup>=0,2) is quite extensive (Büyüköztürk, 2012). Accordingly, it can be said that 20% of variance seen in the Nature of Science originated from carried out activities.

In control group, activities only in curriculum were done. Although there is an emphasis on teaching the Nature of Science in new Science curriculum, it is obvious that this was not reinforced with appropriate activities and methods. In that case, it can be alleged that usage of activities for the Nature of Science is significantly more effective in accordance with the lesson that activities in not used.



#### Discussion

In this study, changes in 5<sup>th</sup> grade students' ideas about the Nature of Science after activities that performed to develop their understanding on the topic of the Nature of Science were analyzed. In control group some other activities were carried out beside ones in course book while in control group any activities were carried out except for activities in 5<sup>th</sup> grade Science course book that are used convenient for Science lesson curriculum. As a result of activities; a significant difference in points of experimental group from the Nature of Science questionnaire was seen but not in the points of control group (Table 4). There are some studies supporting indications about idea intended to the Nature of Science intellects can be developed via applying variable activities in early ages (Akerson et al., 2011; Can & Şahin Pekmez, 2010; Erenoğlu,2010).

When points of students in control group analyzed, an increase was seen for inadequate questions in  $3^{rd}$  (Scientific knowledge can change) and  $7^{th}$  (Role of imagination and creativity) questions. This, conjures up that teaching based upon course book resulted in that situation. It is observed that students' ideas on the tentative nature of scientific knowledge changed to inadequate idea at the rate of 50%. This is can be because; they were not given feedback about their answers to questions in questionnaire after practice, students' exchanging opinions about their answers on questionnaire and changing their ideas by reason of being unsure about the answers they gave. It can be indicated as another reason to affect each other's idea that expressions in course book were written in such a manner that they were largely indicating certainty of scientific knowledge. However, it is quite apparent that teaching merely depended on course book activities and approach as in control group is not sufficient to develop ideas about the Nature of Science which was envisioned in renewed science program.

When experimental group students' the Nature of Science perceptions were handled in terms of different dimensions it was seen obviously that there was a point rise in all dimensions and inadequate ideas changed to convenient or modern opinion. This reveals that carried out activities were effective in expected level. It was found out that the least point rise was in the dimension of "Scientific Knowledge involves logical, mathematical and experimental inferences." The reason of shortage in observed development, despite giving place to this dimension in activities, can be that deducing may become majorly abstract for students. In addition to activities in this study allowing activities involving mathematical operations and statements without ignoring educational attainments can be very effective on developing ideas in that dimension. In survey questions about this dimension, students were presented the definition of science and feature that make it different from other fields. Due to associating science only with situations faced in science lessons, they might have thought on the basis of lesson and have difficulty in making distinction. Another reason is the relatively quiet shortage of questions about this dimension. Asking questions about all dimensions for revealing students' ideas can increase validity. When analyzed on the basis of questions, it is in 6<sup>th</sup> question that inadequate opinions changed into convenient and modern opinions in the least numbers. In this question, students were expected to comment on certainty of information that meteorologists gave about weather conditions. The question is about observation and aspect of deducing and changeability of scientific knowledge. Even though these dimensions were given place in activities students had difficulty in commenting in this question. The reason of this can be the information about climate and weather they were given during former educations. Also, 5<sup>th</sup> grade students are generally in tendency to confuse climate with weather and they have misconceptions about these subjects (Henriques, 2000; Doğar & Başıbüyük, 2005). This may prevent those making right inferences in this question.



Especially if ideas in this dimension at the level of  $5^{th}$  grade are about a subject that students do not have difficulty in understanding, it will be able to get convenient and modern opinions in high rate

## **Conclusion and Suggestions**

Within the context of progress about the dimension of the Nature of Science; considering that activities aimed at understanding the Nature of Science were not in expected level within the 5<sup>th</sup> grade "Matter and Change" unit, new activities were developed and productivity of activities was tested. It was defined with research findings that experimental students got higher points in comparison with control group from VNOS-E scale. Accordingly, it was ascertained that under the favor of generated activities experimental group students made more progress in comparison with control group students in understanding the Nature of Science. Moreover, when pretest and posttest points were analyzed in themselves it can be said that comprehension ability of both group about the Nature of Science was increased, thus both teachings (the Nature of Science activities and teaching in curriculum) made a contribution to students about understanding the Nature of Science. In the considerations of this study it can be said as:

- In order to make students understand the Nature of Science some activities like these and similar to these must be added to course books and these activities must be integrated to the unit.
- Teacher of Science of Technology/Physical Sciences can take advantage of these activities while teaching different units and in different classes.
- Field researchers, can do research in different levels with these activities.
- Prospective teachers can be lectured about how to organize the Nature of Science activities.
- In service trainings can be organized for Teacher of Science of Technology/Physical Sciences aimed at how to organize the Nature of Science activities.
- By putting emphasis on the studies of nature of science on the level of primary school, we can raise awareness of class masters.

## Acknowledgement

The initial version of this article was presented as an abstract in 2014 ICEMST in Konya

## References

- Abd-El-Khalick, F. & Lederman, N. (2000).Improving science teachers' conceptions of nature of science: A critical review of the literature. International Journal of Science Education, 22(7), 665-701.
- Akerson, V.L.& Donnelly, L.A. (2010). Teaching nature of science to K-2 students: What understandings can they attain? International Journal of Science Education, 32, 97– 124.
- Akerson, V.L., Weiland, I.S., Pongsanon, K., & Nargund-Joshi, V. (2011). Evidence based strategies for teaching nature of science to young children. Journal of Kırşehir Education, 11(4),61–78.
- Akerson, V., Nargund-Joshi, V., Weiland, I., Pongsanon, K. & Avsar, B. (2013). What thirdgrade students of differing ability levels learn about nature of science after a year of instruction. International Journal of Science Education, 1-33.



- Altındağ, C., Tunç Şahin, C. & Saka, Y. (2012). A sample activity for teaching the nature of science. Journal of Inquiry Based Activities (JIBA), 2(1), 1-9.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012) .Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabi: İstatistik, araştırma deseni, SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum (16. Baskı). Pegem Akademi, Ankara. [Handbook of data analysis for social sciences: Statistics, research design, SPSS practice and interpretation (16. Edition). Pegem Academy, Ankara]
- Can, B. & Şahin- Pekmez, E. (2010). The effects of the nature of science activities on the development of seventh grade students' science process skills. Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 27, 113-123.
- Doğan, N., Çakıroğlu, J. ,Bilican, K. & Çavuş, S. (2012). Bilimin doğasi ve öğretimi. Pegem Akademi, Ankara [Nature of science and teaching: Pegem Academy, Ankara].
- Doğar, Ç. & Başıbüyük, A. (2005). The understanding levels on weather and climate concepts for primary and secondary students. Kastamonu Education Journal, 13(2), 347-358.
- Erenoğlu, C.(2010). The effects of teaching science in nature on 5th grade students understanding of the nature of science. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ege University Institute of Social Sciences, İzmir.
- Fowler, S.R., Zeidler, D.L. & Sadler, T.D. (2009). Moral sensitivity in the contex socio scientific issues in high school science students. International Journal of Science Education, 279-29.
- Henriques, L. (2000). Children's misconceptions about weather: a review of the literature. The Annual Meeting of the National Association of Research in Science Teaching, http://www.csulb.edu/~lhenriqu/NARST2000.htm.
- Laugksch, R. (2000). Scientific literacy: A conceptual overview. Science Education, 84 (1), 71–94.
- Lederman, J. S. & Ko, E. K. (2004). Views of nature of science, form e. Unpublished Paper, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago.
- Lederman, N. G., Abd-El-Khalick, F., Bell, R. L., and Schwartz, R. S. (2002). Views of nature of science questionnaire: Toward valid and meaningful assessment of learners' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6), 497-521.
- McComas, W.F.,Clough, M.P., &Almazroa, H. (2002). The role and character of the nature of science in science education. In W.F. McComas (Ed.), The Nature of Science in Science Education: Rationale Sand Strategies (pp.3-39). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers
- Pallant, J. (2005). SPSS survival manual (second edition).Sydney: Allen& Unwin.
- Seçkin, M.(2013). Finding out the views of 8th grade students about the nature of science. Journal of Education and Humanities: Theory and Practice, 4(7), 27-52.
- Taşar, M. F. (2003). Teaching history and the nature of science in science teacher education programs. Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 13(1), 30-42.

