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Abstract. Based on a previous work, we present here a scheme for continuing in-school training of primary and secondary school Science teachers which is currently being developed. When completed, this system, using extensively the Internet and based on distance education methods, will exhibit significant advantages compared with other forms of training. In this work, we present first results from the trainees’ evaluation of the test cases we used during the development of the training modules.
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1. Introduction

In all modern, technologically advanced societies, special measures are taken for an effective Science teaching [1] with the necessity for a generalized Science and Technology Literacy an explicit objective [2]. In order to be useful, this literacy must be focused on principles and methodology rather and not being limited to factual knowledge on specific data, techniques or themes. This implies that in order to be understandable and assimilated by the students, the scientific knowledge that the Science and Technology teachers possess has to be transformed appropriately to teaching activities but it seems that teachers lack, in general, this skill. As a consequence, Science and Technology are considered as difficult subjects [3] although they are rather simpler [4] and possess inherent advantages [5]. This constitutes a significant problem in most of the advanced countries. Another relevant matter is the existing outline of the Science and Technology syllabus and the way of teaching. In the majority of the cases the subject matter does not include advances like relativity or quantum physics that are known for more than 5 generations and require a (qualitatively) different approach than the Aristotelian one of classical physics [6]. The teaching is in general narrative [7] with the teaching book as the only resource [8]. This practice implies that scientific inquiry skills, an explicit common objective of the Science curriculum, are not developed. As a further consequence, a difficulty seems to exist to discriminate between data from observations and their interpretation.

Within the observations made above, it is evident that there is a need for an affordable, sustainable and efficient in-service training scheme for the Science teachers. Such a scheme has been described in [9]. This scheme has two main axes: a. face-to-face training courses, and b. online training courses. The face-to-face courses focus on the learning of the recent theoretical paradigms on the Science teaching and the relevant supporting pedagogical principles. The e-learning system to be developed will be used by Science teachers and specialized scientists in the area of Science Teaching and is based to the configuration of Figure 1 (for more details see [9]).

The focus of this scheme is on the promotion of the collaboration and cooperation between teachers, schools and institutions involved in the Science teaching and in Science Teaching education. The fundamental philosophy is that learning can be developed and enhanced through the sharing of knowledge and best field practice...
experience of different groups involved in such activities. A further objective is the establishment of a network of people including scientists, school-teachers and researchers to promote Science and Technology education. In this aspect membership consortium is intended to be open to any colleague wishing to participate.

This scheme presents a direct inherent advantage to the Science Teachers of primary and secondary schools, especially those in rural areas where modern equipment and counselling are sparse. Indirectly, through the improvement of their teachers, the pupils of the corresponding schools and the various groups involved in the activity will benefit. Groups that may be involved in this activity are Universities, schools, Institutions for Science Teaching, Science teachers and specialized Science trainers. It is expected that the different groups will collaborate in order to have a better achievement according to their aims and objectives with every group being able to benefit from the exchange of experience and knowledge in the field. This ‘individualised benefit’ is another advantage of the scheme.

Based on the context described an application was approved by the European Commission under the SOCRATES – Comenius 2.1 (Training of School Education Staff) [10].

The activities of this project are organized in three phases
1. The first one consists of the development of training modules.
2. The second phase consists of a traditional test delivery of (some) training modules developed and (a rather extensive) evaluation. Phase 2 is necessary in order to obtain comparative evaluation results between the traditional face to face and the e-learning deliveries.
3. The 3rd phase will consist of the transformation of (some of) the training modules developed to distance education training material with a test delivery and its evaluation. It is expected to last 10-12 months.

The project has begun its implementation and we present here results from the test evaluation phase from The University of Crete partner. Similar work is ongoing with the other partners of the project.

2. Implementation

1. One traditional face-to-face seminar was delivered four times during the period from March to May 2006 in the form of an intensive training course. The 1st was delivered in Nicosia Cyprus, to (secondary education) Science teachers as part of their pre-service training (3 training hours). The 2nd was in Heraklio Crete, to secondary education Science teachers (6 training hours in two consecutive days). The 3rd was also to secondary education Science teachers in Rethimno Crete (6 training hours in two consecutive days). The 4th was to primary school teachers in Rethimno Crete (6 training hours in a whole afternoon). In all 4 seminars the same two persons (P. G. Michaelides and M. Tsigris) were used as trainers. In the 4th seminar (to the primary school teachers) another person (N. Tsagiotis) presented also the basics of the reformed primary school Science books. In all seminars there was also an observer (A. Margetousaki of the authors).

2. The contents of the seminar were a selection of topics from different areas of the school curriculum, mainly from Physics and (to a lesser extent) from Chemistry. The seminar was mostly focused on the didactics adopting a teaching approach within a Hands on Science Teaching context [12]. More specifically, examples of relating Science to everyday life observations [13], [14] and experimentation with self made equipment.

![Figure 1: The e-learning system](image-url)
were discussed. The seminar was organized as follows:

- One (short) part where the theoretical basis of the teaching approach adopted was presented in an interactive with the trainees way.
- One part where examples of relating observations from everyday life were located and a study approach indicated.
- One part where examples of self made experimental devices and instruments were presented. The construction of self made equipment and instruments was made with simple, easy to find materials and is appropriate for a better understanding of the basic Science concepts. Teachers had the opportunity to watch all the process of the construction, the use and the ‘debugging’ that in some cases is necessary when constructing these devices. During this stage the trainees had an opportunity (limited because of time constraints) to get involved in these constructions and carry out the corresponding experiments or measurements. A short discussion on errors and of possible construction pitfalls was also made.
- Then a rather extensive discussion took place on the usefulness of the material presented to the school curricula, on possible problems, constrains or difficulties that teachers could face in the classroom or during the preparation of the lesson of the day and how to deal with them ….

3. It must be noted that:

- Science in primary school is a common course. In the first 4 classes it is within a ‘Study of the Environment’ school subject with topics from the natural and the human environment. In the 5th and 6th classes there is the school subject ‘Science’ with topics from Physics, Chemistry and Biology. There is also the school subject ‘Geography’. In this, topics from natural Geography, especially of the Greek and the European area, form most of the syllabus but there are also topics from anthropography and from the solar system and its neighbourhood.
- Teachers in primary school do not have a specialist education or initial training in Science. They teach all school subjects one teacher to one class or, sometimes in small villages, to two or more classes...

This is true for schools with less than 6 teachers who have to teach the 6 classes (grades) of the primary school. In primary schools with a large number of students and 6 or more teachers an informal allocation (sharing of teaching responsibilities) is usually made with two teachers teaching the upper two (5th and 6th) classes (grades) one responsible for Mathematics, Science, and Technology (usually a male teacher) and one responsible for Humanities [11].

- Secondary education schools in Greece include the middle school (Gymnasium, grades 7th to 10th) and the upper school, Lyceum or Technical Vocational Lyceum (or, previously, Technical Vocational school, a middle school). Science in secondary education schools is taught as separate subjects (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, etc).
- Science Teachers in secondary school have a (University) degree in a Science subject (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Geology, etc) and they are entitled to teach any of the Science subjects in secondary education schools, as needs arise. In practice they are assigned to teach Science subjects according to their own Science specialty. There is also an informal tendency [11] for male teachers to be assigned the responsibility of the higher grades and of Physics and Chemistry.
- Students’ attitude to Science subjects (along with every other school subject) in the upper secondary school (general Lyceum) is oriented towards the written entrance to higher education general examinations. This means that learning activities like experimentation are not within the students’ priorities or within the tasks undertaken by the teachers (in these conditions, it seems to be loss of time).

4. Upon the completion of each seminar the (teachers) trainees were asked to fill anonymously a written questionnaire. The aim was to check on the trainees’ impression to the teaching approaches adopted and to trace (possibly) their training needs.

3. Analysis of the questionnaire.
An analysis of the questionnaires is on going and some results already obtained are presented in this section.

There were 107 trainees participants in total from which 93 were Secondary school teachers and 14, the Rethimno (p) row, were Primary school teachers as is depicted in ‘Table1. Participants’.

As shown in Table 2. Sex, 48 (45%) of the participants were females and 59 (55%) were males. For the primary school teachers the participation was 9 (64%) females and 5 (36%) males.

Table 1. Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heraklio</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rethymno (s)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rethymno (p)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A (significantly) lower response rate is observed for the female participants, likely even more for the female primary school teacher participants. On this observation, it is evident that a detailed analysis should rather differentiate between male - female participants and between primary – secondary school teachers participants. Because of the as yet small sample we examine the rest of the questionnaire as a whole restricting the results to the general trends only.

The participants were asked:

5. If the topics presented were useful with choices to answer; extremely useful, useful, just a little, not at all. The answers are presented in Table 6. Usefulness.

Table 6. Usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least useful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If the topics discussed were related to the school curricula with possible choices to answer; much related, a little relate, not at all related. The answers are presented in Table 7. Relation with the Curriculum.

Table 7. Relation with the Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>50,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40,3</td>
<td>46,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If the seminar presented another teaching perspective with possible choices to answer; Yes, No. The answers are presented in Table 8. Different teaching perspective.

Table 8. Different teaching perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>11,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86,1</td>
<td>88,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. If they would attend again a similar seminar with possible choices to answer; Yes, No. The answers are presented in Table 9. Attain again.

Table 9. Attain again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If they think that this seminar would be interesting to their fellow teachers with possible choices to answer; Yes, No. The answers are presented in Table 10. Are other teachers interesting?

Table 10. Are other teachers interesting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the two (open) questions about the positive and about the negative aspects of the seminar the responses are presented in ‘Table 11. Positive points of the seminar’ and in ‘Table 12. Negative points of the seminar’ respectively. Of the participants (refer to ‘Table 11. Positive points of the seminar’):

- 31% found the simplicity of the constructions very positive,
- 18% mentioned that they found very prototypical the experiments,
- 43% mentioned as very positive the teaching method proposed during the seminar,
- 8% think that the seminar was a chance for further speculation on the teaching of Science.
- There was a percentage 29% who did not answer this question.

Table 11. Positive points of the seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple constructions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching approach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speculation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondingly as negative points of the seminar were mentioned:

- The time spent was not enough to cover the subjects by 44% other participants.
- The organization was not appropriate (24%). This category covers a wide variety of statements including: ‘the subjects should be related to the curriculum’, ‘teachers (i.e. the trainees) should participate at the procedure’ or ‘I would prefer to participate myself at the experiments’.
- Almost 20% of the respondents mentioned as a negative point that there was too much theory in the seminar.
- 12% of the respondents mentioned as a negative point that the topics discussed were mainly from Physics.
- A significant 43% did not answer this question.

Table 12. Negative points of the seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Time</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the question if they would participate in a similar seminar organized with Distant Education methods the results are depicted in Table 13. Distance learning seminar.

Table 13. Distance learning seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interesting is the respondents’ answer to the question ‘Can you apply the topics discussed/ the knowledge acquired to your classroom?’ which is depicted in Table 14. Application. The vast majority (more than 84%) answer ‘yes’. However a (small) number of these positive
answers continue that this may be done on the
prerequisite that they would have the time and
the infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Commentary

The data presented earlier show that the
seminars were accepted by the teachers –
trainees in a very positive way. However, a
detailed analysis, especially on the criticism
performed is appropriate and on going. However
we would like to add a few comments based on
the (informal) discussions the authors had with
the trainees.
1. Many of the participants believe that the
theoretical framework was extremely
extended and in many cases was
characterized as useless (see also Table 12).
2. There was a vivid interest on the experiments
and the constructions (see also Table 11).
3. Straightforward or indirectly many of the
participants admitted that they have not
experience at all with this kind of application
or teaching approaches in the classroom.
Comments made are ‘There are no books’ ‘It
is not anticipated by the ministry’.
4. Schools in secondary education are equipped
with labs and the necessary tools for the
experiments. Although there is equipment in
schools, the main negative point mentioned
was that there is no need for this kind of
experiments because they are not useful for
the entrance examinations to higher
education.
5. Many of the participants mentioned the
simplicity and the prototypic nature of the
constructions (see also Table 11).
6. It was understood that through this kind of
applications it is possible for the teacher to
be a collaborator or partner of the children
through the learning process in the
laboratory.
7. In the end of the seminar many expressed the
desire to be capable of performing these
experiments presented during the seminar,
and bypassed the point that these
experiments were part of a broader context
applying in a certain teaching methodology.
They seemed to focus on the certain cases,
instead of the teaching method proposed
with those cases as starting points.
8. Another thing that came out from the
discussions is the need expressed from the
teachers to work on the constructions and try
to perform the experiments themselves, a
point mentioned also in the questionnaires
too.

5. Epilogue

The results show that there is great interest
for the teaching model of Science proposed
during the seminars. Teachers seem to be
interested in the idea of quantification of the
experiments and the involvement of the pupils to
the experimental process. Teachers are willing to
have further training in this field and are also
ready to use the online training method of
Science teaching. It is also obvious that there is
an extended training gap concerning the science
teaching as shown from the fact that teachers are
willing to participate in a training seminar of this
kind again and from the fact that they think that
other teachers would also be eager to participate
too. The main negative point of the seminar
mentioned from the participants was the lack of
time, which seemed to be very short in
comparison with the subjects inquired. Maybe
there is a need for a more extensive seminar
where there will be provision for teachers’ active
participation to the construction of the equipment
- instruments and the development of the
experiments. This way they will have a direct
experience and they will be able to work on the
idea of self-made apparatus.
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Private own data within the context of an on going project on school practice.

Learning Science requires the involvement of the student in activities of observing, experimenting, making hypotheses to explain the data observed, planning and realizing experiments to discriminate between different hypotheses, making generalizations in the form of models and communicating the results of their study. Hands on Science includes all these activities but places an emphasis on the (usually neglected) phases of observation, experimentation and the (subsequent) collection of relevant data.

