

EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF A LARGE-  
SCALE DIAGNOSTIC SCIENCE TEST AND  
FORMATIVE PRACTICES. A mixed-  
methods study.

James Scott MEd

Doctor of Philosophy C02041

University of Technology Sydney

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

©James Scott 2018

### **Certificate of original authorship**

I, James Scott declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy by Thesis in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

Production Note:  
Signature removed prior to publication.

29 August 2018

## **Acknowledgments**

This thesis would not have happened without insights, support and encouragement from a number of people.

My thanks to Dagmar McCloughan, ESSA Team Leader, for the opportunity to be involved with the ESSA program in the early years of its development and implementation. Also, my thanks to Professor John Pegg (University of New England) and Associate Professor Debra Panizzon (then from the University of New England) for the opportunity to be a part of the research team investigating the potential of SOLO as a tool for improving assessment for learning. After that initial involvement, both provided me with their advice, encouragement and support which I sought at different times whilst I worked on this thesis.

I would like to acknowledge Doctor Geoff Barnes who encouraged me to run with the idea that the residual from a regression procedure was a measure of a real effect of teaching. My thanks also to the NSW Department of Education for providing me with access to ESSA and NAPLAN data in a form that I could use for the purposes of this thesis. Particular thanks in this regard are due to Doctor Nadine Smith and former colleague and dear friend Gerry McCloughan.

Associate Professors Nick Hopwood and Tapan Rai from the University of Technology Sydney have my gratitude for the time and advice they provided as I developed the approach I wanted to take with the research model and analysis of data.

I am extremely grateful to the science teachers who responded to the survey about their practice and particularly so to the teachers who made themselves available to participate in the case studies. I have undertaken to provide them with the results of my work in a form that I hope will be useful to them.

I had the support and advice of two excellent supervisors, both at the University of Technology Sydney, for this thesis. Professor Peter Aubusson who encouraged me to undertake this project in the first instance and Associate Professor Matthew

Kearney who took over in the later stages to assist me bring it to a conclusion. My gratitude and thanks to both for their patience, advice and support.

This thesis also had the benefit of the considerable editing skills of Doctor Terry Fitzgerald who is also at the University of Technology Sydney.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the forbearance of Daune my wife who, in the end, waited patiently and supportively for me to complete this project so that we could resume our lives together.

### **Thesis format**

This is a conventional thesis comprised of title, front matter, glossaries (acronyms and terms used), table of contents, list of figures, list of tables, abstract, six chapters, appendices and references consulted in the preparation of this thesis.

## List of Acronyms

AAS	Australian Academy of Science
ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ACARA	Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority
ACCI	Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry
ACER	Australian Council for Educational Research
AE	At Expectation (see also WAE and WBE)
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
AQF	Australian Qualifications Framework
ARG	Assessment Reform Group
BCA	Business Council of Australia
BOS	Board of Studies
BOSTES	Board of Studies, Teaching and Educational Standards
CC	Curriculum Corporation
CCII	Centre for Continuous Instructional Improvement
DEC	NSW Department of Education and Communities
DET	NSW Department of Education and Training
D of E	Department of Education
ESA	Education Services Australia
ESSA	Essential Secondary Science Assessment
EV	Acronym for the acronyms ESSA and VALID.
F	The Foundation or entry level for schooling (see K).
HSC	Higher School Certificate
ICSEA	Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage
K	Kindergarten or entry level for schooling (see F).
NAP-SL	National Assessment Plan-Scientific Literacy
NAPLAN	National Assessment Plan Literacy And Numeracy
NESA	New South Wales Education Standards Authority
NGSS	Next Generation Science Standards (US)

NSES	National Science Education Standards (US)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCK	Pedagogical Content Knowledge
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
SEA	Socio-Educational Advantage
SEAR	Science Education Assessment Resource
SET	Science, Engineering and Technology
SLPM	Scientific Literacy Progress Map
SMART	Schools Measurement Assessment and Reporting Toolkit
SME	Science, Mathematics and Engineering
SOLO	Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
TIMSS	Trends In Mathematics and Science Study
US	United States of America
VALID	Validation of Assessment for Learning and Individual Development
VET	Vocational Education and Training
WAE	Well Above Expectation (see also AE and WBE)
WBE	Well Below Expectation (see also AE and WAE)

## **Glossary of terms as used in this thesis**

artifact	Something made by human effort, in this context related to educational assessment.
assessment as learning	Assessment as learning occurs when students are their own assessors. Students monitor their own learning, ask questions and use a range of strategies to decide what they know and can do, and how to use assessment for new learning. (NESA, 2018)
assessment for learning	Assessment for learning involves teachers using evidence about students' knowledge, understanding and skills to inform their teaching. Sometimes referred to as 'formative assessment', it usually occurs throughout the teaching and learning process to clarify student learning and understanding. (NESA, 2018)
assessment of learning	The use of evidence of learning to make a summative judgment of achievement against outcomes and standards. Sometimes referred to as 'summative assessment'. It usually occurs after a period of instruction. The judgment is often expressed as a mark, percentage or grade. The usefulness of the grade or mark depends on validity and reliability of the processes used to gather and assign value to the evidence gathered. (NESA, 2018)
assessment-related work	Is the purposeful collecting of evidence of learning, creating the means by which that evidence was obtained (if not by direct observation of behaviour), the assumptions used to interpret that evidence, the choice of text forms used to represent and communicate results of assessment, and subsequent uses for those results.

capabilities	A measure of the ability, capacity, power or potential to do something. The <i>Australian Curriculum, Science</i> includes seven general capabilities all students are expected to acquire as they progress through schooling.
Curriculum Corporation	A national educational support entity created by the Federal, state and territory governments in Australia to produce educational resources for Australian Schools. It was replaced by Education Services Australia (ESA) from 2010.
competencies	See capabilities.
curriculum	The documents teachers use to inform the learning activities they plan and deliver to students.
diagnostic assessment	Gathering evidence of learning to identify gaps, strengths and weaknesses in student learning.
education jurisdiction	States and territories in Australia manage the delivery of educational services to students in Australia. They provide for registration and regulation of public and private schools in their geographic areas of jurisdiction.
educational standards	Are the learning goals students are expected to achieve, usually after set periods of instruction typically associated with Year or Grade levels.
feedback	Information provided by an agent regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding.
formative assessment	See assessment for learning.
formative practices	Instruction informed by formative feedback.
high stakes assessment	Any assessment where the results have consequences for the recipient of those results.
key competencies	A set of competencies related to equipping students for work.



low stakes assessment	The use of evidence of learning in ways that reduces to a minimum unintended, usually negative, consequences for the learner.
outcomes	Measurable or observable behaviours intended as a result of instruction.
Primary Connections	A set of curriculum materials produced by the Australian Academy of Science designed to assist K-6 teachers to teach science.
proficiency areas	Areas of skill or expertise.
proficiency levels	Descriptions of response features that differentiate between levels of skill or expertise.
regression	Regression is a statistical process for estimating the relationships between variables.
Science by Doing	A curriculum support resource produced for secondary science teachers by the Australian Academy of Science.
scientific literacy	Scientific literacy is the ability to engage with science-related issues, and with the ideas of science, as a reflective citizen (OECD). It is also the specialized literacies that distinguish science literacy from general literacy and numeracy.
SEA quarters	Socio-Educational Advantage (SEA) proportions, relative to Australia, in school populations. (ACARA <i>MySchool</i> website)
SEA score	Socio-Educational Advantage (SEA) score is a composite measure of socio-educational advantage generated for the purposes of this project.
selective entry schools	A category of school in NSW, entry to which is determined by student results in tests of reading, mathematics, general ability and writing.

self-regulated learners	Students who can plan their own learning, monitor their performance and then reflect on the outcome of that learning.
Skills, cognitive	Include remembering, thinking logically and reasoning, explaining and describing.
Skills, employability	Skills related to communicating, working in teams, problem solving, initiative and enterprise, planning and organising and self-management.
Skills, generic	Groups of skills variously described as basic/fundamental, people-related, conceptual/thinking, personal skills and attributes, skills related to the business world and skills related to the community.
SOLO model	Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) theory that involves two learning cycles within a mode of thinking
SOLO taxonomy	Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) theory that describes a single learning cycle within a mode of thinking
standards framework	Descriptions of levels of performance in a number of categories relating to curriculum, teaching or other profession.
statistically significant	Is the probability of finding a given deviation from a null hypothesis, or a more extreme one, in a sample. (SPSS definition)
STEM system	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics institutions in a country or larger group that prepares people for work in, and including, the institutions that produce STEM outputs in society and related economies.
summative assessment	See assessment of learning.

syllabus	A detailed curriculum that in NSW may be used to define the scope of an external test.
The Board	A generic term for the statutory authority in NSW with responsibility for determining the curriculum and related assessment requirements schools need to comply with so that students satisfy requirements for receipt of credentials. In the course of this project that authority began as the NSW Board of Studies (BOS), became the NSW Board of Studies Teaching and Educational Standards (BOSTES) before becoming the NSW Education Standards Authority (NESA) in 2017.
The Department	A generic term covering the NSW government authority responsible for delivering public education services to students in NSW. It went from being at the beginning of this project (2012) the NSW Department of Education and Training (DET) to the Department of Education and Communities (DEC) to the NSW Department of Education (D of E).
Year 8	The year of schooling in Australia (Grade in other places); in this case the ninth year of schooling.

## Table of contents

List of Acronyms.....	v
Glossary of terms as used in this thesis.....	vii
Table of contents.....	xii
List of Figures .....	xviii
List of Tables.....	xix
Abstract.....	xxi
<b>CHAPTER ONE: OUTLINE OF MY PROJECT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 The two initiatives.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3 Research questions and methodology.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.4 Overview of findings.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.5 Importance of the research.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>1.6 The researcher .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1.7 Structure of this thesis.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.2 A curriculum, teaching and assessment for the twenty-first century... </b>	<b>21</b>
<b>2.3 Assessment and assessment systems .....</b>	<b>28</b>

<b>2.4 The purposes for assessment .....</b>	<b>37</b>
2.4.1 Three purposes for assessment? .....	39
2.4.2 Theories of learning, cognition and assessment.....	43
2.4.3 Criteria for evaluating the credibility of assessments.....	49
<b>2.5 Measurement and summative and evaluative assessment .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>2.6 Formative assessment and formative practices.....</b>	<b>65</b>
2.6.1 Support for formative assessment.....	67
2.6.2 Teachers make the difference.....	71
2.6.3 Weight of evidence supporting formative practices .....	72
2.6.4 Formative Practice.....	74
2.6.5 Formative practice and self-regulated learning.....	76
<b>2.7 SOLO and the ESSA-VALID (EV) program in NSW.....</b>	<b>80</b>
2.7.1 The SOLO Taxonomy.....	80
2.7.2 The SOLO model.....	86
2.7.3 The ESSA-VALID (EV) assessment framework.....	88
2.7.4 The EV test: “fit for purpose”?.....	91
2.7.5 SOLO and assessment in Australasia .....	94
<b>2.8 Themes from the literature review and their relevance to this thesis.</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODOLOGY, METHODS.....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>3.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>102</b>

<b>3.2 Mixed method research, case studies and research design .....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>3.3 Phase One: selecting the sample of schools to work with.....</b>	<b>107</b>
3.3.1 Selecting the sample of schools to work with.....	108
3.3.2 Regression residual as both measure of collective scientific literacy and ‘effect size’ of science teaching. ....	110
<b>3.4 Phase two: online survey for science teachers .....</b>	<b>113</b>
3.4.1 Survey design.....	113
3.4.2 Analysis of survey responses .....	116
<b>3.5 Phase three: case studies and science department assessment related narratives .....</b>	<b>118</b>
3.5.1 Audio-recorded semi-structured interviews: purpose and development .....	118
3.5.2 Artifacts of assessment practice: purpose.....	123
3.5.3 Case study school data: purpose.....	124
3.5.4 Defining later achievement in science.....	126
3.5.5 Defining engagement with science .....	127
<b>3.6 Comparable schools and three predictions .....</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>3.7 Limitations .....</b>	<b>133</b>
3.7.1 Trustworthiness of qualitative research.....	133
3.7.2 Validity and reliability of quantitative data .....	136
3.7.3 Summary of limitations affecting this study’s findings.....	137

3.8 Research approvals.....	141
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS FROM PHASE TWO.....</b>	<b>142</b>
<b>4.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>4.2 Findings from analysis of the science teacher survey returns.....</b>	<b>146</b>
4.2.1 Set one results: Teacher engagement with EV resources (survey questions 1 to 5) .....	147
4.2.2 Set two results: SOLO and extent of teacher engagement with it (survey questions 6 to 8) .....	158
4.2.3 Set three results: Formative practices (Questions 9 to 15) .....	165
4.2.4 Set four results: Respondent Data.....	189
<b>4.3 Other findings .....</b>	<b>191</b>
4.3.1 Teacher experience and student achievement.....	191
4.3.2 Teacher use of EV student survey feedback .....	191
<b>4.4 Key findings from the survey analysis.....</b>	<b>193</b>
<b>4.5 Summary of findings in relation to science teacher use of formative practices.....</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: PHASE THREE-COMPARING CASE STUDY SCHOOLS.....</b>	<b>198</b>
<b>5.1 The case study schools.....</b>	<b>201</b>
<b>5.2 Three predictions and the case study schools.....</b>	<b>207</b>
5.2.1 Prediction one: Year 8 achievement and engagement.....	207
5.2.2 Prediction two: Year 10 achievement .....	209

5.2.3 Prediction three: Year 12 engagement .....	210
<b>5.3 Compared case study schools .....</b>	<b>211</b>
5.3.1 Pair ONE: PCWAE1 and MCWAE1 .....	212
5.3.2 Pair TWO: MCAE2 and MCWBE3 .....	217
5.3.3 Pair THREE: PCWAE2 and MCWBE5 .....	220
5.3.4 Pair FOUR: MGFSAE2 and MGFSWBE1 .....	226
5.3.5 Pair FIVE: PCWAE2 and PCWAE3 .....	232
<b>5.4 Correlation and strength of associations between school variables ..</b>	<b>241</b>
5.4.1 Correlations: fully selective entry case study schools (n = 3) .....	243
5.5.2 Correlations: non-selective entry case study schools (n = 11) .....	244
5.5.3 Correlations: provincial case study schools (n = 3) .....	246
<b>5.5 Summary .....</b>	<b>248</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS .....</b>	<b>253</b>
<b>6.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>253</b>
<b>6.2 Discussion of findings addressing research question one .....</b>	<b>255</b>
6.2.1 Teachers and the EV program .....	256
6.2.2 Teachers and SOLO .....	265
<b>6.3 Discussion of findings addressing research question two .....</b>	<b>267</b>
6.3.1 Science department assessment practices .....	267
6.3.2 Formative classroom practices .....	270



6.4 Discussion of findings addressing research question three .....	279
6.5 Suggestions for further research.....	282
6.6 Recommendations.....	286
6.7 Conclusion.....	292
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>296</b>
<b>Appendix A: Competencies, Basic Skills, Generic Skills and Key     Competencies .....</b>	<b>296</b>
<b>Appendix B: Goals for Schooling (1989 – 2008) .....</b>	<b>298</b>
<b>Appendix C: A teaching sequence exemplifying different views of learning     .....</b>	<b>300</b>
<b>Appendix D: Five examples involving aspects of the SOLO model .....</b>	<b>302</b>
<b>Appendix E: Proforma for case study schools to complete.....</b>	<b>320</b>
<b>Appendix F: Science teacher survey questions.....</b>	<b>322</b>
<b>Appendix G: Interview questions for case study school participants (final)     .....</b>	<b>328</b>
<b>Appendix H. Assessment related narratives for case study schools used to     make pair wise comparisons. ....</b>	<b>330</b>
<b>Appendix I: Data tables for paired school comparisons.....</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Appendix J: Survey descriptive statistics.....</b>	<b>390</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>429</b>

## List of Figures

Figure		Page
2.1	Components of an evaluation and assessment framework...	33
2.2	Selected school data for a government, metropolitan, Years 7-12 school.....	61
2.3	Effect-sizes of differences between Expert and Experienced Teachers.....	72
2.4	The three interacting domains of pedagogy (instruction)....	77
2.5	Representation of the Biggs & Collis (1991) SOLO Taxonomy.....	82
2.6	Representation of the two cycles within a mode SOLO model.....	87
3.1	Regression of 2014 EV results over a NAPLAN-based predictor.....	109
4.1	Means plots for Q1 & Q 2 combined.....	149
4.2	EV category means shown to be statistically significantly different.....	152
4.3	Teacher self-rating for their understanding of the EV program (n = 85).....	155
4.4	Means plots for Q6.....	159
4.5	Frequency V level of engagement (zero to ten).....	161
4.6	Means plots for Q7 self-reported understanding of SOLO....	162
4.7	S7 Frequency (n = 85) verses level of understanding (one to five).....	163
4.8	NKUA graphical representation of means.....	166
4.9	Means plots for Q9 – Q15.....	167
4.10	Survey questions sorted to show teacher or student as the lead actor.....	169
4.11	Formative practice means for all items, teacher items and student items (n = 84).....	171
4.12	LISC means plots.....	175
4.13	CDEL combined, TCDEL, SCDEL means plots.....	177
4.14	FTAL combined, TFTAL, SFTAL means plots.....	181
4.15	ASIR means plots.....	184
4.16	ASTL combined, TASTL & SASTL means.....	186
4.17	Frequency verses item sets for student survey (none to three).....	192
5.1	Graphical representation of descriptive statistics for identified (ID) and case study (CS) schools combined and case study (CS) schools separately.....	205

## List of Tables

Table	Page
2.1	Summary of needed changes to teaching and assessment..... 25
2.2	Issues to resolve when planning and constructing assessments and how to use them..... 49
2.3	Messick's aspects of construct validity..... 51
2.4	Influences on learning and effect sizes..... 74
2.5	The concept of evaporation through modes and levels (SOLO Taxonomy)..... 83
2.6	Selected outcomes and related SOLO levels in the 2011 EV assessment framework..... 90
3.1	Structure of online survey for science teachers..... 115
4.1	Defining populations from which to invite research participants..... 143
4.2	Descriptive statistics for Q1 & 2 (n = 85)..... 149
4.3	Results of parametric ANOVA for eight EV categories..... 151
4.4	Descriptive statistics for Q3 (n = 85)..... 154
4.5	Summary of EV purposes..... 156
4.6	Descriptive statistics for Q6 (n = 85)..... 158
4.7	Parametric ANOVA (n = 85) for SOLO questions (Q6 & 7)..... 160
4.8	Q6 SOLO category counts (n =85)..... 160
4.9	Descriptive statistics for Q7 (n = 84)..... 162
4.10	Q8 summary of sources for learning about SOLO..... 164
4.11	Means for NKUA option (n = 85)..... 166
4.12	Descriptive stats for Q9 -15 (n = 84)..... 167
4.13	Test for normality and homogeneity of variance for all items Qs 9-15 (n = 84)..... 168
4.14	Sample items from the online survey with a teacher or student focus..... 170
4.15	Descriptive statistics for TAFL & SFAL (n = 84)..... 171
4.16	Tests for normality and homogeneity of variance on assessment for learning (AFL) responses data sets (n = 84)..... 172
4.17	Nonparametric ANOVA on AFL ALL, AFL teachers and AFL student means (n = 84)..... 173
4.18	Welch statistics for robust equality of means..... 174
4.19	LISC combined means (n = 84)..... 175
4.20	CDEL combined, TCDEL & SCDEL means..... 177
4.21	Tests for normality and homogeneity of variance on CDEL responses data sets (n = 84)..... 178

4.22	Parametric ANOVA: ALLCDEL, CDEL teacher and CDEL student means (n = 84).....	178
4.23	TCDEL & SCDEL Games-Howell multiple comparisons tests.....	179
4.24	FTAL combined, TFTAL & SFTAL means.....	180
4.25	Tests for normality and homogeneity of variance FTAL responses data sets (n = 84).....	181
4.26	Nonparametric ANOVA on FTAL ALL, FTAL teacher and FTAL student means (n = 84).....	182
4.27	TFTAL & SFTAL Games-Howell multiple comparisons test (n = 84).....	182
4.28	ASIR combined, TASIR & SASIR means.....	184
4.29	ASTL combined, TASTL & SASTL means.....	186
4.30	Tests for normality and homogeneity of variance on ASTL data sets (n = 83).....	187
4.31	Nonparametric ANOVA on ASTL ALL, ASTL teacher and ASTL student means (n = 84).....	188
4.32	TASTL & SASTL Games-Howell multiple comparisons tests (n = 83).....	188
4.33	Data about respondents and their schools.....	190
4.34	YES counts for student survey items.....	192
5.1	Schools that identified themselves including case study schools (shaded).....	202
5.2	Mean standardised residuals and SEA scores.....	204
5.3	Pair ONE selected statistics.....	213
5.4	Year 12 science course completions (2013-2015 averages).....	215
5.5	Pair TWO selected statistics.....	218
5.6	Year 12 science course completions (2013-2015 averages).....	220
5.7	Pair THREE selected statistics.....	222
5.8	Year 12 science course completions (2013-2015 averages).....	224
5.9	Pair FOUR selected statistics.....	228
5.10	Year 12 science course completions (2013-2015 averages).....	230
5.11	Pair FIVE selected statistics.....	234
5.12	PCWAE2 and PCWAE3 Year 8 EV results.....	235
5.13	Case study school ranks based on student scores for the six items from the student survey.....	236
5.14	Year 12 science course completions (2013-2015 averages).....	238

## **Abstract**

Researchers working with schools in the UK and elsewhere are finding that explicitly teaching students the “five strategies of formative assessment” (Black and Wiliam, 2009, p. 8) is helping to re-engage students with science. This thesis presents findings about the impact of two major interventions on the assessment-related work of junior secondary science teachers in the New South Wales government school system (the largest in Australia) and on student science results. The first intervention took the form of advice to teachers about formative assessment in the official science curriculum (introduced in 2003), where it is called assessment for learning. The second took the form of a mandatory low-stakes, large-scale, test-based diagnostic assessment program involving Year 8 students. This program was fully implemented across NSW from 2007. The assessment framework used to inform the development of test items and tasks and that informs the comprehensive feedback provided to students, parents and teachers is underpinned by Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) theory. Three research questions guided data collection. The research design employed mixed methods, including both quantitative and qualitative methods as well as case studies involving sixteen purposively chosen school sites. Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to the analysis of both state-wide and school-specific, teacher-provided survey data about their practices and school-level test results. An interpretive approach was used to generate assessment-related work narratives from audio-recorded interviews and artefacts of assessment practice provided to the researcher by volunteering science teachers in the case study schools. The findings show that teacher use of three of five dimensions of formative practice and an explicit focus on teaching students the skills of writing to learn science produced science test results that were above expectation. Less certain was the hoped-for finding that students were also acquiring the skills of learning how to learn. An unexpected finding was that students in regional schools where science results were well above expectation were less positive about their school science experience than their metropolitan counterparts.