

## Design-based research: case of a teaching sequence on mechanics

Tiberghien, Andree; Vince, Jacques; Gaidioz, Pierre

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

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

[www.peerproject.eu](http://www.peerproject.eu)

### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Tiberghien, A., Vince, J., & Gaidioz, P. (2009). Design-based research: case of a teaching sequence on mechanics. *International Journal of Science Education*, 31(17), 2275-2314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690902874894>

### 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.

**gesis**  
Leibniz-Institut  
für Sozialwissenschaften

### 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.

Mitglied der  
  
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



**Design-based research: case of a teaching sequence on mechanics**

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Journal:         | <i>International Journal of Science Education</i>                              |
| Manuscript ID:   | TSed-2008-0158.R1  |
| Manuscript Type: | Research Paper   |
| Keywords:        | classroom, curriculum, design study, inquiry-based teaching, science education |
| Keywords (user): | modelling, theoretical approach, teaching sequence                             |
|                  |  |



## Design-based research: case of a teaching sequence on mechanics

### Abstract

Design-based research, and particularly its theoretical status, is a subject of debate in the science education community. In the first part of this paper, a theoretical framework drawn up to develop design-based research will be presented. This framework is mainly based on epistemological analysis of physics modelling, learning and teaching hypotheses. It includes grand theories, a specific theory that following Cobb & al. (2003) is a 'humble theory' in the sense that it does 'real work', and tools for design. In the second part, we will show how this specific theory and its tools led designers to develop teaching resources in the case of a teaching sequence on mechanics (grade 10). We will explain how the components of the specific theory and tools guide the design at different levels; the conceptual structure of the teaching sequence, the chronology of the activities, the various choices of the type of activity and their wording. This presentation makes the bases of designing teaching resources explicit and therefore allows for scientific debate.

## Introduction

Design-based research is an object of debate in the science education community. An issue of the International Journal of Science Education was devoted to this question (Méheut & Psillos, 2004, invited editors). In their editorial these authors underlined the emergence of this type of research with particular difficulty in making explicit the assumptions and decisions often implicit in the design of teaching sequences and, more widely, teaching materials. They think that:

*“it may be due to craft knowledge involved in the teaching and handling of specific content, or to a lack of widely accepted tools for representing teaching; a situation that warrants further study”* (p.516) [our italics].

This difficulty is also discussed in an issue of the Educational Researcher (January-February 2003), particularly the theoretical research status of such studies. The article introducing this issue signed by “the design-based research collective” suggests that proper design-based research enhances some characteristics as follows:

*“...Research on designs must lead to sharable theories that help communicate relevant implications to practitioners and other educational designers”* (p.1) [our italics].

And in the same issue, Cobb, Confrey, diSessa, Lehrer & Schoube (2003) characterized the status of the theoretical component of such studies by their role: “they are accountable to the activity of design. The theory *must do real work*” (p.10) [our italics] and consider that the general philosophical orientations like constructivism “often fail to provide detailed guidance in organising instruction” (p.10).

The distance between general orientation or grand theory and designed teaching materials is large; so it is not surprising that diSessa (2006) notes that different grand theories “often

1  
2  
3 advocate similar instructional strategies. [...] The use of instructional analogies, metaphors,  
4 and visual models is widespread and not theory-distinctive” (p. 276).  
5  
6

7  
8 It seems necessary to distinguish between general philosophical grand theories and the  
9 theories that do real work. The “real work” to design teaching sequences is diverse, there is a  
10 variety of decisions to be made relating to the specific teaching content, to the structure of its  
11 main aspects, to the order in which they are introduced, to the instructional strategies, and so  
12 on (Lopes, Silva, Cravino, Costa, Marques, & Campos, 2008). In particular, the type of  
13 classroom activity, the respective roles of the teacher and students, the teaching resources, the  
14 various possibilities of class organisation, the approximate duration of each activity, etc,  
15 should be decided according to the specific content to be introduced. Therefore the theoretical  
16 framework that does real work should include a variety of theoretical components.  
17  
18

19 In this paper, the status of the different components of a theoretical framework for design-  
20 based research in teaching sequences and their role in the design are discussed in relation to a  
21 specific case: the design of a teaching sequence in mechanics for the first year of upper  
22 secondary school (grade 10) in France. Then this paper aims to present a theoretical  
23 contribution to the field of science education design; it contributes more specifically to  
24 constructing a theoretical background for designing teaching resources. This theoretical  
25 contribution has emerged from considerable experience of designing teaching resources (more  
26 than ten years). This design activity *was initially based on teachers’ and researchers’*  
27 *experience*. This means that the research results and methods known by the researchers were  
28 proposed and used by them to contribute to the design. The design was therefore not carried  
29 out in the perspective of testing a theory but of ensuring that research serves the design of  
30 teaching resources and more generally contributes to improving science teaching. The  
31 theoretical proposal presented in this paper has emerged from this design experience in  
32 interaction with the evolution of research studies and new research trends on design.  
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

1  
2  
3 Following Bannan-Ritland & Baek (2008), this proposal can be called an “emergent theory”  
4  
5 (p. 301).  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **Theoretical framework leading to theories that do real work in designing** 11 **teaching sequences** 12 13

14  
15 As proposed by Cobb, the designers, who, as researchers, aim to make their choices and  
16 productions explicit and debatable, have to construct specific theoretical elements and, in  
17 some cases, specific tools that are directly operational. However, these specific constructions  
18 depend on grand theories that can come from several disciplinary fields. To present the way to  
19 go from the grand theories to teaching resources we start from the didactic triangle as  
20 presented in Figure 1a. Most of the grand theories involved in the design of teaching  
21 resources emphasize one of the three poles of the didactical (or pedagogical) triangle;  
22 knowledge, learning and teaching, without ignoring the others. We use ‘learning’ and  
23 ‘teaching’ instead of ‘student’ and ‘teacher’ to remain as close as possible to a theoretical  
24 approach. These grand theories cannot do real work; specific theories become necessary to  
25 design teaching resources. At present such theories are constructed by researchers in science  
26 education and are not currently shared by the community. This leads to our first research  
27 question dealing with the construction of *specific theories* from the grand theories to design  
28 teaching sequences (Figure 1a). What are the grand theories chosen? How do they contribute  
29 to a specific theory? Does a specific theory come from several grand theories? Our second  
30 question follows the first one in the design process; it deals with the way in which the specific  
31 theories “do real work” to design teaching sequences. More specifically, on what components  
32 of the teaching sequence do the specific theories do real work directly? Do they need specific  
33 tools to be operational?  
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 each pole, we will present in turn the grand theories and the specific theories and choices.

1  
2  
3 Due to the wider development of the knowledge pole, we will present it in two parts, (1)  
4 grand theories and (2) specific theories. This presentation by pole does not mean that the  
5 grand theories are exclusively related to one pole; in fact they can involve other poles.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Insert figures 1a and 1b about here  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **Knowledge: Grand theories**

20  
21  
22 The grand theories mainly related to the knowledge pole deal with two fields: sociology and  
23 epistemology of knowledge.  
24  
25  
26  
27

#### 28 *Sociology of knowledge: the grand theory of ecology of knowledge*

29  
30  
31 This grand theory deals with the relations between the educational system, the scientific  
32 community and everyday society. Its perspective involves a political level where the  
33 objectives of education are defined. But even at the design level where the official curriculum  
34 is defined, this sociological perspective plays a role in the designers' interpretation of the  
35 curriculum and then on the way they implement it.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 In this theory (Chevallard, 1991) there are social conditions for knowledge to exist;  
44 knowledge can only stay alive if it is studied and/or used, if not it dies<sup>1</sup>. Here knowledge takes  
45 a broad meaning, it is not only declarative knowledge but also the processes of its elaboration  
46 and it includes skills. Chevallard (1991) states that knowledge is alive in a group and that the  
47 *meaning of knowledge depends on the group*. For example, energy conservation does not have  
48 the same meaning in a high-energy research group as in an ecology group or in a physics  
49 classroom in an upper secondary school. He also makes a distinction between the types of  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

<sup>1</sup> This perspective is currently shared among people involved in sustainable archives: to be sustainable, an archive should live; that is, stay available and be used.

1  
2  
3 *relationships* to knowledge that a group of people has: production, use, etc. (a researcher and  
4  
5 an engineer do not have the same relationships to knowledge) and he analyses *the migration*  
6  
7 *of a part of knowledge from a group towards another. This migration is called transposition;*  
8  
9  
10 it implies necessarily that the meaning of the part of knowledge that migrates will change  
11  
12 since it is alive in different groups of people. *Didactical transposition* consists of the  
13  
14 migration of knowledge in the community of reference, called the reference knowledge,  
15  
16 towards the knowledge that is alive in the classroom and is called taught knowledge. In  
17  
18 physics teaching at upper secondary school, the reference knowledge is the physics  
19  
20 knowledge. However, in the case of scientific literacy, several communities of reference can  
21  
22 be involved; the scientific communities and the society at the level of a region or country.  
23  
24 This allows the designers to introduce social questions such as those raised by the  
25  
26 environment. This transposition includes two main steps (Figure 2): (1) from the reference  
27  
28 knowledge to the knowledge to be taught, and (2) from the knowledge to be taught to the  
29  
30 taught knowledge. The knowledge to be taught can be found in a community of policy  
31  
32 makers, teacher trainers and teachers; it mainly consists of official curricula, textbooks or  
33  
34 similar materials. This knowledge is usually written for people who are familiar with the  
35  
36 knowledge to be taught. The texts are meant for teachers who are specialists of the discipline  
37  
38 to be taught. Taught knowledge lives in a classroom and is necessarily associated with a  
39  
40 particular class. The class is considered as a system where taught knowledge is a joint  
41  
42 production of the teacher and the students and is therefore specific to a classroom (Mercier,  
43  
44 Schauber-Leoni & Sensevy, 2002). Let us note that this way of considering a classroom is  
45  
46 related to the teaching pole.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 [Insert figure 2 about here]  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 This grand theory of the ecology of knowledge (Figure 1b) is particularly important in our  
4 design because it states the difference between the disciplinary knowledge, the knowledge to  
5 be taught (official curriculum, textbooks) and the taught knowledge in a given classroom  
6 (Figure 2).  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 Within this perspective, the designed teaching sequences are a part of the knowledge to be  
13 taught (like a textbook). They are also close to the taught knowledge because the design  
14 includes written texts that are directly aimed at students together with comments for teachers  
15 on classroom management. These sequences contribute to narrowing the gap between the  
16 knowledge to be taught and taught knowledge.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 26 *Epistemology of knowledge: modelling* 27

28 Here the epistemology concerns not only disciplinary knowledge but also everyday  
29 knowledge. The reason for this comes from the grand theory of learning that we have chosen;  
30 socio-constructivism. From this grand theory, the students' initial knowledge plays a major  
31 role in learning; it is therefore important to better understand how everyday knowledge works.  
32 Thus our epistemological choice is also related to the learning pole (Figure 1b).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 All the teaching sequences designed in our group have the same epistemological grand theory  
42 (Figure 1b). We have chosen to favour the basic processing of physics: modelling. In the  
43 following we will introduce our epistemological view on modelling in physics and in  
44 everyday situations.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *View of modelling in physics* 52

53 Let us note that this analysis is carried out in order to be used as a reference in the  
54 transposition process from scientific knowledge to taught knowledge and not to study  
55 experimental science in itself. Our choice is based on the works of several epistemologists  
56 (Bunge, 1973; Bachelard, 1979; Giere, 1988) who have considered that modelling of the  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 material world is at the heart of physics. To characterize this process we will refer to Hacking  
4  
5 (1983/2005). We retain the following main points:  
6  
7

- 8  
9 - *Theories are not easy to define*; analysing the Faraday effect, Hacking shows that “at  
10  
11 least six different levels of theory” (ibid, p.212) are involved. For him “theories cover  
12  
13 lots of productions” (p.212). For example physicists can use different theories, more  
14  
15 or less mathematical, to interpret the same facts.  
16  
17 - *Observations are not necessarily driven by physics theory*. There have been important  
18  
19 observations in the history of science that have included no theoretical assumptions.  
20  
21

22 We share Hacking’s view in the following statement:  
23

24  
25 “Now of course Bartholin, Grimaldi, Hooke and Newton were not mindless  
26  
27 empiricists without an ‘idea’ in their heads. They saw what they saw because they  
28  
29 were curious, inquisitive, reflective people. They were attempting to form theories.  
30  
31 But in all these cases it is clear that the observations preceded any formulation of  
32  
33 theory.” (ibid, p.156)  
34  
35

36  
37 Let us notice that this position is neither the positivist one nor that of philosophers like  
38  
39 Lakatos, Feyerabend who, even though their opinions may differ, “were saying that  
40  
41 there are no purely observation statements because they are all infected by theory”  
42  
43 (ibid, p.171). Hacking insists on the idea that observation and experimentation *cannot*  
44  
45 be replaced by linguistic entities (observation sentences). For us, this aspect is  
46  
47 important for the transposition from this scientific community level to the secondary  
48  
49 teaching level.  
50  
51

- 52  
53 - *Theory and experiments cannot be directly articulated*. Hacking has proposed two  
54  
55 main reasons for this:  
56  
57

58  
59 “Most initial speculations [theories] hardly mesh with the world at all. This is for  
60  
two reasons. One is that one can seldom directly deduce from a speculation

1  
2  
3 consequences that are even in principle testable. The other is that even a  
4 proposition which is in principle testable is often not testable, simply because no  
5 one knows how to conduct the test. New experimental ideas and new kinds of  
6 technology are required.” Then there is “an enormously wide-ranging intermediary  
7 activity best called model-building.” (p.216)

- 8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 - The same idea of the difficulty of articulation is also reinforced by the analyses of  
17 Bachelard (1979) and Hacking (1983/2005), who consider that there are *two processes*  
18 *in model building*: a process from the theory, which makes the theory more concrete  
19 or visible and a process from the experiment, which makes the experiment more  
20 abstract. *In this epistemological analysis we will call a ‘model’ the result of this*  
21 *double process* (the word ‘model’ will be used with a different meaning in the design  
22 activity we present below) and ‘*modelling*’ *this double process* (with the same  
23 meaning in the design activity). The model is an intermediary between theory and  
24 experiment. It can be considered as having *two facets*, one from the theory and the  
25 other from the experiment. Let us note that this double modelling process, according  
26 to the scientists and/or the time period, is not unique; it can lead to different models.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

#### 42 *View of modelling in everyday situations*

43  
44  
45 Our grand theory on learning (socio-constructivist with Vygotski, figure 1b), as we discuss  
46 below, has led us to analyse the distance between physics modelling and the processes  
47 involved in everyday knowledge. To assess this distance we will also analyse everyday  
48 knowledge in terms of modelling.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 Epistemologists have studied physics cognition for several centuries but they have not studied  
56 everyday cognition. Various disciplines have approached this field, in particular  
57 anthropology, cognitive science, ethnology, linguistics, psychology and science education.  
58  
59  
60

We do not claim to review all the existing works; we will just provide some of the main

1  
2  
3 elements that have led us to draw up our theoretical framework. Let us first note that everyday  
4  
5 knowledge is not commonly recognized as knowledge that could be an object of study in  
6  
7 itself; there are no epistemologists of everyday knowledge, or very few. It is more often  
8  
9 aimed at understanding how people live and how they speak, think, etc. We will consider five  
10  
11 main aspects:  
12

- 13  
14  
15 - *Categorisation is a fundamental component* of interpretation of the material world.  
16  
17 Psychologists have studied this thinking process as well as anthropologists and  
18  
19 ethnologists such Levy-Strauss (1962).  
20  
21
- 22  
23 - *Causality is also a fundamental component* of explaining the material world. Piaget  
24  
25 and, more recently, researchers in cognitive science and science education have  
26  
27 studied causality (Piaget & Garcia, 1971; Tiberghien, 2004; Saxe & Carey, 2006).  
28  
29
- 30  
31 - From birth, individuals *construct their own knowledge of the material world* before  
32  
33 even language acquisition (Spelke, Phillips & Woodward, 1995). As in the case of  
34  
35 observation in physics, we will consider that perception plays a major role.  
36  
37 Communication and language also play a major part in the construction of knowledge  
38  
39 of the material world; the richness of everyday language, particularly with its  
40  
41 metaphors and the polysemy of words, helps this understanding. Then there is also a  
42  
43 cultural transmission of this knowledge.  
44  
45
- 46  
47 - *Our understanding of the material world includes some general approaches such as*  
48  
49 *categorisation and causality and more specific components* that form a kind of set of  
50  
51 theories (Vosniadou & Brewer, 1992). In this matter we do not share diSessa's  
52  
53 approach of "knowledge in pieces" (2006), even though we widely acknowledge the  
54  
55 interest excited by P-prime. This set of theories is individual and collective as part of a  
56  
57 shared culture, particularly when involved in a common language.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 - In everyday knowledge the *questions that are raised about the material world,*  
4 *including artefacts, are driven mainly by our uses* and do not aim at understanding the  
5 world as in physics. Everyday language is very rich, particularly with the polysemy of  
6 words.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 Our analysis leads us to consider that modelling processes are involved in everyday  
13 knowledge. They involve a set of knowledge elements that we call theories in the sense that  
14 they allow people to explain a large variety of behaviours of the material world (objects and  
15 events). This set includes general approaches like causality, categorisation and more specific  
16 elements of knowledge that can deal with local behaviours of the material world. We are well  
17 aware that using the word “theory” is a radical choice; it does not mean that these theories are  
18 similar to the theories in physics, they merely play a similar role in the explanation of a large  
19 part of the material world involved in everyday situations. Moreover *there is a wide*  
20 *difference in the modelling process,* whereas in physics the relations between theories and  
21 experiments are not at all direct as we have shown above. In everyday knowledge the  
22 “theoretical elements” can very often be related directly to the behaviour of the material  
23 world.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **Knowledge: Specific theory of the two worlds**

43 From our grand theories on modelling in physics and in everyday knowledge, we have  
44 worked out a theoretical framework in order to use it when designing teaching sequences. We  
45 will present this framework firstly for physics knowledge at school, then for everyday  
46 knowledge. To do this, we take into account the relationship between knowledge and the two  
47 poles learning and teaching (Figure 1b).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *The two worlds of physics knowledge to be taught*  
4  
5

6 In the transposition process we will *keep to the elementary physics* that is taught until the first  
7 year of university. In this case, there is macroscopic physics in which objects and events are  
8 almost directly observable because they are investigated with rather simple instrumentation.  
9 There is also microscopic physics in which particles associated with events are not directly  
10 observable; in this case the objects (particles) and events have to be constructed as belonging  
11 to the material world with the intermediary of simulation in some cases. The cases in which  
12 the experimental field is studied with complex instrumentation, for example studies of  
13 particles (high energies, etc) are not considered.  
14  
15

16 The main point for us is that, even in the case of elementary physics, the relation between  
17 theory and experimentation is not direct at all and includes several modelling processes. Then  
18 the question is raised of how to deal with the model, which is an intermediary between theory  
19 and experiment (Hacking, 1983/2005; Bachelard, 1979). In this intermediary role, let us  
20 consider how to transpose the process going from theory to experiments and the reverse (see  
21 the left part of Figure 3). When analysing the usual physics teaching content, the theory is not  
22 differentiated from the model, particularly from the components of the model that come from  
23 the theory.  
24  
25

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 [Insert figure 3 about here]  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 In the case of mechanics, for example, Figure 4 presents a short extract from a text given to  
51 the students with the status of theory in the case of the teaching sequence on mechanics. This  
52 text, associated with formal language (vector in this case), presents Newton's third law in  
53 natural language, and also introduces the rules to represent a force vector. The text presenting  
54 Newton's law is part of the theory (lines 1 and 8), but the second part of the text on the force  
55 is not strictly theory; this second part presents the modelling process that comes from the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 theory and helps to construct a model from measurements and observations of a material  
4  
5 situation. The two sentences: (1) line 6: “length is proportional to the value of force” or (2)  
6  
7 line 9: “The vectors which represent forces are on the same straight line; this straight line  
8  
9 depends on the situation being studied” introduce “slots” to be filled by the results of  
10  
11 measurement of the force or the observation of a straight line.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 [Insert figure 4 about here]  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 Regarding the material world, we have chosen to bring together observation and  
24  
25 experimentation. The main reason for this is that both provide information on the behaviour  
26  
27 of the material world depending on the conditions of experimentation or observation. This  
28  
29 statement is relevant because of the rather elementary physics level of secondary school as  
30  
31 discussed above. Concerning the modelling process starting from experimentation or  
32  
33 observation, our position is the following: event and measurement readings (thermometer,  
34  
35 ruler, voltmeter, etc.) belong to the material world in the sense that information is picked up  
36  
37 by perception (any modality). On the other hand, as soon as the values of the measurement are  
38  
39 involved in treatment, we consider that they are intermediaries and close to the theory/model  
40  
41 part; in fact they are on the facet of the model dealing with the experimentation/observation  
42  
43 side.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 We obtain five components of modelling, among them two (2 and 3) deal with actions of  
50  
51 modelling (left part of Figure 3):  
52

- 53 1) Theoretical physics statements / Relation between physics concepts
- 54
- 55 2) Selecting and processing the theoretical elements that fit the selected events and
- 56
- 57 measurements
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 3) Model built from the components 3 and 4
- 5
- 6 4) Selecting and treating events and measuring
- 7
- 8
- 9 5) Observation of and experimenting on objects and events
- 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

At secondary school level, we consider that modelling consists of going back and forth between these components: the order given does not mean that modelling implies all components or that only successive components can be related; all relations are possible. Based on different research studies, in particular those who studied the learning pathway (introduced by Scott, 1992) along a teaching sequence (Tiberghien, 1980; Niedderer & al., 2007; Clement et Rea-Ramirez, 2008), we considered that *to give a physics meaning to theoretical statements and to observation / experimentation, it is necessary to distinguish between them and to relate them*. In physics teaching, the relations are often between the observations of the selected events and/or the actions of measurements on one hand and their formal treatments on the other hand (Tiberghien & al. 2001). These two components are *not the aim of modelling*; they are *a way to relate theory and observation in order to understand physics*.

This analysis leads us to group the four components into two sets: one, the world of objects and events, including observations and measurements which, due to the physics teaching level, can be done directly; and two, the world of theories and models which involve theoretical statements and modelling components, including treatments of measurements and/or of selected events.

At the beginning of our work on transposition of modelling, we wanted as researchers to make a distinction between theory and model. However, the teachers working with us in the design thought that it would be too difficult for the students and even for the teachers who do not participate in the design; then we rapidly chose the two worlds (Figure 3).



1  
2  
3 The world “theories and models” includes theory and modelling elements, allowing us to  
4 relate theory to the observed and selected event or measurement readings as in the example  
5 presented in Figure 4. The world “objects and events” includes the material (inanimate) world  
6 and the observation and description of objects and events including measurement readings.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

### 12 13 14 *The two worlds of everyday knowledge*

15  
16 Our analysis of everyday knowledge allows us to structure this knowledge in two similar sets  
17 to match with physics modelling in order to better understand the distance between the  
18 physics to be taught and everyday knowledge. We consider that in everyday life, explanations  
19 or interpretations of material situations are guided by ideas with some general common  
20 approach like categorisation and causality and more local theories associated to specific sets  
21 of situations such as the well-known student conceptions in mechanics; for example,  
22 considering a force (like power) to be necessary to a motion (Viennot, 1996), a conception  
23 which is related to causality, whereas another conception that “the Earth is flat” is related to  
24 categorisation. We therefore lay down the hypothesis that, in everyday life, there is also a  
25 modelling activity of the material world. This means that when a person or group explains or  
26 interprets the material world or makes a prediction, a modelling activity is involved  
27 (Tiberghien, 2000). This hypothesis can be related to mental models in cognitive activity  
28 whatever the type of knowledge involved (Gentner & Stevens, 1983). Clement and his  
29 colleagues have widely developed this perspective in science teaching (see the recent  
30 publication: 2008). In our theoretical framework we emphasize that modelling activity  
31 involves explanatory ideas that we associate with a theoretical level on the one hand and with  
32 observation, perception and possible measurement (such as ambient temperature) of objects  
33 and events on the other hand. This leads us to a similar structure to that involved in physics  
34 knowledge at school. This similarity of structure should not hide the fact that in everyday  
35 knowledge the relations between explanatory ideas (equivalent to physics theory) and objects  
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

1  
2  
3 and events are almost *straightforward*. There is therefore a huge difference between everyday  
4  
5 and physics knowledge.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 In conclusion, we obtain a double categorization of knowledge: everyday and physics  
11 knowledge, and for each of these categories, theories/models and descriptions/observations in  
12 terms of objects and events of a material situation are distinguished (Figure 5); obviously an  
13 element of knowledge belongs to a given category depending on the context of use. In  
14 particular, a notion like “action” (used in the text of Figure 4) is firstly a concept of the  
15 teaching sequence because the students have to conceptualize the contact between two objects  
16 as the idea that an object acts upon another, called “action”. Then secondly, when the students  
17 are familiar with this “view” of material situations, the notion of action can be considered as  
18 describing a type of fact.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 We are well aware that the words ‘theory’ and ‘model’ are used in relation to everyday  
32 knowledge with a broader meaning than in physics.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 [Insert figure 5 about here]  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 In Figure 5, six bidirectional arrows show the multiple relations between the different types of  
46 knowledge that can be used for designing teaching sequences. Students can establish  
47 relationships between their everyday descriptions of objects/events and theoretical elements  
48 of physics knowledge that have been learnt. Students can also identify relationships between  
49 their everyday theories about the behaviour of the material world and some elements of the  
50 physics theory that are presented during teaching sessions. This specific theory of the ‘Two  
51 Worlds’ is further developed with our specific choices on learning (next paragraph).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In the cases of school-taught physics or everyday life, relying on modelling to analyse  
4  
5 different types of knowledge processing is a theoretical choice which entails methodological  
6  
7 consequences. It leads the researcher to separate knowledge into two main categories: theories  
8  
9 and models on the one hand and objects and events on the other hand.  
10  
11

### 12 13 **Learning: grand theory and specific choices**

14  
15 Socio-constructivism has been chosen as the grand theory (Vygotski 1934/1997) (Figure 1b).  
16  
17 Starting from socio-constructivism, we have emphasized the dynamics between the two inter-  
18  
19 and intra-psychological plans:  
20  
21

22  
23 “Any function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, or on two planes. First it  
24  
25 appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between  
26  
27 people as an inter-psychological category, and then within the child as an intra-psychological  
28  
29 category” (Vygotsky cited by Wertsch (1985) p. 60).  
30  
31

32  
33 For us the classroom allows students to construct meaning on a social plane where the cultural  
34  
35 development can take place. The students’ cultural development is favoured by the mediation  
36  
37 of language and other people, particularly the teacher and other students.  
38  
39

40  
41 The proximal development distance is another aspect of the Vygotskian theory that we have  
42  
43 emphasized. This aspect can also be related to Piagetian constructivism, on which many  
44  
45 studies of student conceptions have been based.  
46  
47

48  
49 Our position on learning has been reinforced with a series of research studies in science and  
50  
51 mathematics education. We have focused on studies relating to students’ learning in the  
52  
53 classroom during a teaching sequence. These studies deal with the individual student’s  
54  
55 learning pathway (Psillos & Kariotogou, 1999, Küçüközer, 2000, 2005; Givry, 2003; Givry  
56  
57 and Roth, 2006). From these results, we deduce that this pathway follows neither a rational  
58  
59 decomposition of disciplinary knowledge nor the order of introduction of taught knowledge in  
60

1  
2  
3 the classroom. The pathway towards understanding the relationships between concepts does  
4  
5 not necessarily start by understanding each concept; the learner's construction of his/her own  
6  
7 understanding may involve simultaneously this relationship *and* each one of its terms.  
8  
9 Moreover, most of the time students, at the end of the teaching sequence, construct  
10  
11 intermediary knowledge between initial and target knowledge.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 Insert figure 6 about here  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 The students' construction of knowledge during a teaching sequence can be well interpreted if  
24  
25 the analysis of the classroom and students' discourse is done at several granularities of  
26  
27 knowledge, including a micro level (Tiberghien and Malkoun, 2007). As illustrated in Figure  
28  
29 6, learning can consist of relating an element of knowledge involved in the taught knowledge  
30  
31 to a set of elements of knowledge already acquired, that *is not necessarily the set in which this*  
32  
33 *element has been inserted in the taught knowledge*. Therefore the meaning of an element of  
34  
35 knowledge constructed by a student can be different from that in the taught knowledge. We  
36  
37 set down the following position on learning: constructing the understanding of a concept or  
38  
39 notion requires establishing *new relations between elements of knowledge; these elements can*  
40  
41 *be "small". The relations constructed by students between small elements of knowledge can*  
42  
43 *be different from those involved in the taught knowledge and students can therefore acquire*  
44  
45 *elements of the taught knowledge without an overall conceptual understanding*.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 This position on knowledge is compatible with several grand theories and particularly with  
52  
53 our choice of socio-constructivism. It only supposes the *importance of prior knowledge*. It  
54  
55 also, but more implicitly, supposes the *importance of the situation* in which the knowledge is  
56  
57 introduced because the learner constructs relations between a new element of knowledge and  
58  
59 his/her prior elements of knowledge according to his/her overall understanding of the  
60

1  
2  
3 situation. Consequently, a teaching sequence should give students the opportunity to “tune”  
4  
5 their understanding of a new element of knowledge better, owing to the possibility of re-using  
6  
7 it in successive classroom activities. This position emphasizes the role of small elements of  
8  
9 knowledge, even if they are included in a general approach like when a teacher introduces  
10  
11 new laws or experiments. This position therefore has consequences because it becomes  
12  
13 necessary when designing teaching sequences to pay particular attention at the fine level of  
14  
15 knowledge granularity.  
16  
17  
18

### 20 21 **Teaching: theories of didactical situations and joint actions**

22  
23 The French theory of didactical situations (Brousseau, 1998) considers the classroom as a  
24  
25 system which is characterized by several concepts. This theory has been further developed by  
26  
27 Mercier, Schubauer-Leoni & Sensevy (2002) and Sensevy (2007). In this theory the  
28  
29 *classroom is viewed as a community of practice involving two simultaneous actions: teaching*  
30  
31 *and learning*. Therefore in a classroom the teacher and the students co-construct the taught  
32  
33 knowledge; they act together.  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 We will limit ourselves to the two main concepts of this theory that we have used in our  
39  
40 framework.  
41

42  
43 *Chronogenesis* accounts for the evolution of knowledge during teaching. In the classroom  
44  
45 perspective, this evolution takes place over an academic year. Let us note that chronogenesis  
46  
47 can also be used to study the evolution of the curriculum for a given discipline such as  
48  
49 physics along the whole schooling process. Chronogenesis is not limited to a particular time  
50  
51 scale.  
52  
53

54  
55 The *didactical contract* introduced by Brousseau (1998) meets with the reciprocal  
56  
57 expectations that the teacher and the students may have. It forms a system of norms, some of  
58  
59 which are generic and will be lasting, and others are specific to elements of knowledge and  
60

1  
2  
3 need to be redefined with the introduction of new elements. For example, after the teacher has  
4 introduced the concept of force, his/her expectations of the students' interpretations of  
5 material situations will be different from before.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 The concept of didactical contract is close to what Cobb et al. (in press) call normative  
11 identity:  
12

13  
14  
15 “The two central constructs of the analytic approach that we propose are *the*  
16 *normative identity as a doer of mathematics that is established in the classroom*, and  
17 the personal identities that individual students develop as they participate in classroom  
18 activities. [...]” (Cobb, in press) (*our italics*).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 As in the concept of didactical contract, normative identity refers to class phenomena,  
25 whereas personal identity refers to an individual in a community.  
26  
27  
28

29  
30  
31  
32 In this study we have not developed a specific theory for teaching itself but we have made a  
33 clear choice which we draw directly from the concept of didactical contract and which deals  
34 with classroom management and the role played by students' proposals. These proposals,  
35 whether or not they are right, are considered as potentially relevant and can be publicly  
36 presented and debated in classrooms. This means that the teacher expects answers and  
37 justifications for answers from the students and that the students expect to be understood. The  
38 teaching activities should therefore allow teachers to let students make their own proposals,  
39 write and debate them, and compare them with the physics proposals. Students will then be  
40 able to take responsibility for constructing new elements of knowledge. Later on, these  
41 elements will have to be institutionalized by the teacher.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 Other aspects of teaching design are still a kind of craft knowledge. In the case of our design,  
57 we consider the teacher's role as threefold: a mediator, a person in charge of maintaining the  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 scientific story and, thirdly, a guide for the development of classroom discussion (Dumas-  
4 Carré & Weil-Barais, 1998; Mortimer & Scott, 2000; Leach & Scott, 2002).  
5  
6

7  
8 In conclusion, our theoretical framework is particularly developed on the knowledge aspects;  
9 relations between learning knowledge and teaching knowledge. It is less developed in  
10 relations between learning and teaching, and in particular on aspects dealing with classroom  
11 management.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 We will now deal with the second question concerning how this theoretical framework may  
19 guide the design of a teaching sequence. As we have already mentioned, we will present this  
20 guidance in the case of a teaching sequence in mechanics (grade 10). This sequence has been  
21 designed using the specific theory of the Two Worlds; however, there has been a strong  
22 interaction between designing it and making this theory explicit. Before presenting how the  
23 specific theory guides the design, we introduce the social context of this design.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 33 **Context of the research development of the sequence in mechanics**

34  
35  
36 Our research team (ICAR, COAST group) has been working on research development  
37 projects for over ten years. These projects have been carried out by groups of one or two  
38 researchers with four to six teachers working together to construct teaching sequences based  
39 on the official curriculum. A series of sequences on different topics and at several levels  
40 (grades 10, 11, 12, and recently 7, 8) have been developed (Gaidioz & Tiberghien, 2003;  
41 Gaidioz, Vince & Tiberghien, 2004; Le Maréchal et al., 2004a; Le Maréchal, Perrey, Roux,  
42 Jean-Marie, 2004b). More specifically, each sequence is designed by a group of researchers  
43 and teachers who have met regularly over two or three academic years (weekly or twice a  
44 month). Each group participated in creating the sequence and in the first year, each of the  
45 designed activities was tested by some of the teachers in the group; then in the second year  
46 the teachers of the group used the whole sequence and discussed it during meetings in order to  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 modify either a given activity or the order of activities or even the structure of the sequence  
4  
5 itself. For some sequences, a PhD student contributed.  
6  
7

8 We recall that our design activity began with the aim of proposing teaching resources to  
9  
10 improve science teaching, particularly to improve students' physics understanding. Our aim  
11  
12 was not to test a theory; the theory has emerged from this design activity in interaction with  
13  
14 research activity. Therefore testing the teaching resources did not consist of testing a theory  
15  
16 and was carried out in complex ways including two main stages. The first stage, called the  
17  
18 'local impact evaluation phase' by Bannan-Ritland & Baeck (2008), is characterized by  
19  
20 iterative refinement processes. The second stage consists of evaluating the impact of a  
21  
22 teaching sequence on students' acquisitions. This last stage can only be carried out when the  
23  
24 sequence is finalised and used by teachers who did not participate in its design. We do not  
25  
26 develop this stage in the present paper; that would necessitate another study. In particular, this  
27  
28 evaluation implies a change of scale from a few classes to a larger number of classes. We just  
29  
30 mention that, for some of the sequences, questionnaires were given out before and after the  
31  
32 sequence in several classes that used the sequence and in a similar number of "ordinary"  
33  
34 classes (Tiberghien & Malkoun, 2007).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 The first stage involved two aspects related to teaching and learning, particularly *at the level*  
42  
43 *of an activity (or task)*. The first aspect was focused on the *usability and relevance of the*  
44  
45 *teaching resources for the teachers* in the classroom; it was central when a group of designers  
46  
47 was creating the initial design of the activities to be given to the students in the class. The  
48  
49 teachers participating in the group tested the activities in their classrooms, and their feedback  
50  
51 played a major role in the improvements. The second aspect concerned the validity of the  
52  
53 teaching resources for students' learning. It involved the research studies investigating  
54  
55 students' learning in the classroom when the teachers taught these designed activities; it also  
56  
57 played a major role in the refinement process. These studies used video data of the classroom.  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 For video recording of the classroom, the same two students were in the field of one camera  
4  
5 (most of the time two cameras were used in the class; one on a group of students and a part of  
6  
7 the class and the other on the teacher and a part of the class or on another group of students).  
8  
9 The focus of these research studies was not only the students' understanding of the activities  
10  
11 but also the way students were involved in them or, in other words, *how these activities allow*  
12  
13 *students to be autonomous and to take the responsibility of knowledge to carry them out.* The  
14  
15 overall research question of the studies was to better understand the students' learning  
16  
17 pathway in relation with teaching. With this orientation, the research results for each designed  
18  
19 activity were *at a fine granularity level.* Even if these studies used a case study methodology  
20  
21 and then observed a small number of students, they made in-depth analyses of the role of each  
22  
23 activity: the way the statement was formulated, the role of key words, the role of the chosen  
24  
25 experiments, etc. These analyses are particularly rich for the design of each activity that is  
26  
27 focused on the students' and teachers' possible actions during teaching. Let us note that the  
28  
29 relevance of the research studies is all the more important given that the teachers who  
30  
31 participated in the group and who tested the designed activities in their own classes cannot  
32  
33 analyse such data. Therefore *the teachers' experience in the classroom and the researchers'*  
34  
35 *analyses were complementary,* providing feedback on the implementation in class. Moreover,  
36  
37 the researchers, who were in the classrooms, also contributed by giving feedback on these  
38  
39 implementations. During the two or three years after this first phase of elaboration, when the  
40  
41 researchers analysed all the data during the whole teaching sequence, the feedback was  
42  
43 focused on the students' main difficulties of conceptual understanding, the *chronology* of the  
44  
45 new elements of knowledge introduced in the sequence in relation with the possible learning  
46  
47 pathways. The teachers who are more familiar with the sequence also give feedback on  
48  
49 difficulties in carrying out specific activities in terms of classroom organization, material  
50  
51 constraints or on how to take into account students' ideas in the classroom debates. This  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 improvement process can range over several years and is typical of design activity (Lijnse,  
4  
5 2000; Viennot & Raison, 1999). Let us note that this process is particularly in line with the  
6  
7 use of digital dissemination (website) allowing modifications.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 More specifically, the SESAMES sequence<sup>2</sup> on mechanics, grade 10, discussed in this paper  
13  
14 has been involved in different research studies. Küçüközer (2000) first studied students'  
15  
16 understanding during teaching as they were students working in small groups and the teacher  
17  
18 was a member of the design group. The other studies have dealt with diagnostic evaluation  
19  
20 (Coulaud, 2005), the evolution of taught knowledge in two classrooms, one using the  
21  
22 SESAMES mechanics teaching sequence and the other using a sequence created by the  
23  
24 teacher (both following the official curriculum) (Malkoun, 2007), an evaluation of the  
25  
26 mechanics teaching sequences by means of questionnaires before and after teaching in 20  
27  
28 classes (Malkoun, Vince & Tiberghien, 2007) and, lastly, a study of how a teacher who did  
29  
30 not take part in a research development group used the designed sequence for the first time  
31  
32 (Jeannin, 2006).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 These resources were made available on the official educational website of our area  
40  
41 (<http://www2.ac-lyon.fr/enseigne/physique/sesames/>). A website for teachers called PEGASE  
42  
43 (<http://pegase.inrp.fr>) was also created. These groups of secondary teachers and researchers  
44  
45 have been in charge of in-service teachers' professional development for several days every  
46  
47 year.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55  
56 <sup>2</sup> From the very beginning, the research development projects have had several names; the  
57  
58 current name SESAMES has been used for six years, so we will refer to the mechanics  
59  
60 teaching sequence as a SESAMES sequence.

## How do specific theories and choices guide the design of teaching content?

We have presented the structure and content of our theoretical framework; the grand theories, the Two-World specific theory, and the specific choices dealing with knowledge, learning and teaching. Now we will introduce the way in which the design has been carried out. To do this we have constructed two complementary tools. The *Knowledge Distance* tool guides the framing and sequencing of the teaching content, while the *Modelling Relations* tool guides the design of specific teaching activities with a finer grain size. Moreover, the need to describe each activity and to involve several representations led us to use research results in the field of multiple representations. Among others, a French researcher (Duval, 1995) has developed a theory on “semiotic registers and intellectual learning”. Our tool called “semiotic registers” derives from this theory and is also compatible with others. The tool deals with semiotics and has been called “semiotic registers”.

### *The design tool: knowledge distance*

The tool called “*knowledge distance*” makes explicit the difference between the knowledge to be taught and students’ knowledge as analysed in terms of modelling (Buty, Tiberghien, & Le Maréchal, 2004). It comes from the Two-World theory and from the grand theory on learning concerning the zone of proximal development.

[Insert table 1 about here]

This tool (Table 1) combines the analyses of students’ prior knowledge (everyday and school physics knowledge) and of the knowledge to be taught in terms of modelling. It is well adapted to a granularity of knowledge elements like a notion or concept. We present it in the case of action and force.

1  
2  
3 The first column refers to the two worlds and their relations; the second and third columns  
4  
5 lead the designers to make their hypotheses on the students' everyday knowledge as well as  
6  
7 the already acquired physics knowledge explicit. In the last column, the designers should  
8  
9 specify what the students have to learn. In all cases the theoretical components of knowledge  
10  
11 and the knowledge related to observation of the material world are differentiated. In the  
12  
13 teaching sequence in mechanics, the choice of introducing action and a model of interactions  
14  
15 with symbolic representations aims to help students dissociate the overall relationships,  
16  
17 particularly the idea that force (like power) is a necessary cause for a motion, called  
18  
19 "causality-force", and the idea that associates force and motion, called "force-motion".  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 26 *The design tool: Modelling relations*

27  
28 The second tool makes explicit the kinds of relationships that this teaching should lead  
29  
30 students to establish. Figure 7 summarises four different kinds of relations between the worlds  
31  
32 of theories and models, and objects and events:  
33  
34

- 35  
36 1. Relations between objects and events
- 37  
38 2. Relations from objects and events to theories and models
- 39  
40 3. Relations from theories and models to objects and events
- 41  
42 4. Relations between theories and models
- 43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 According to the specific Two Worlds theory, the designers conceive teaching activities for  
49  
50 which students have to construct relationships of types 1, 2 and 3 (in two directions between  
51  
52 theoretical elements and objects or events), and 4 (Figure 7).  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 [Insert about here figure 7]  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The necessity of differentiating theory/models and objects/events led the designers, for each  
4  
5 main part of a teaching sequence, to make explicit the theoretical elements and the associated  
6  
7 modelling actions with a text. In the case of the mechanics sequence, two examples are given  
8  
9 in Figures 4 and 8. This *text*, called a “*model*” in the teaching practice, is given to each  
10  
11 student and *constitutes a common reference for the class*. It allows the teacher to  
12  
13 depersonalize physics knowledge by using the text as a reference when evaluating students’  
14  
15 proposals. The text also helps the teacher to give responsibility to students to evaluate a  
16  
17 variety of proposals with reference to physics theory. The text is used by the students for  
18  
19 several activities or exercises; this allows students to construct a more relevant understanding  
20  
21 of the elements of knowledge involved in the text to the extent that they have more  
22  
23 opportunities to establish relations between them and with other elements of the situation.  
24  
25 This last consideration is related to the learning choices included in the specific Two Worlds  
26  
27 theory.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

[Insert about here figure 8]

51  
52 The model can be introduced either before the activity, at a specific point during the activity  
53  
54 or as a conclusion to the activity; in the latter case, it is involved in the following activity.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *The design tool: semiotic registers*

51 Another way of analysing knowledge is semiotics. The written description of the  
52  
53 experimental field and theory in physics and chemistry invariably involves a variety of what  
54  
55 Duval (1995) calls semiotic registers: natural language, vector register, algebraic register,  
56  
57 drawings and pictures. Duval (1995) stated that different semiotic registers associated with a  
58  
59 concept should be used and related to construct its meaning. Figure 8 gives an example of  
60

1  
2  
3 these registers: natural language, a diagram (two ellipses and the arrow) representing  
4 interaction, and the vectors representing forces in a specific case of interactions between two  
5 objects. The role of natural language is essential; it has to be used in the passage between  
6 different semiotic registers, such as from schemas to the vectors.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

### 12 13 14 **Designing the teaching sequence**

15  
16 A teaching sequence involves several components, in particular its structure, the didactical  
17 organisation, each activity, and the comments for teachers. In this section, we have presented  
18 the design process in the case of a teaching sequence on mechanics (grade 10) called a  
19 “SESAMES sequence” and we have introduced wider teaching resources for teachers based  
20 on our specific Two Worlds theory, choices and tools (Figure 1b).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 30 *Didactical organisation*

31  
32 As shown in Table 2, a major difference between this SESAMES sequence and usual physics  
33 teaching is that there is no lecturing to introduce and structure knowledge. New knowledge is  
34 introduced through activities that students have to carry out in small groups. For each activity,  
35 there is a statement (often a written sheet) and, for some of them, the students are given a  
36 model as presented above (examples in Figures 4 and 8). Then, after working in small groups,  
37 there is a crucial phase involving classroom discussion about the students’ procedures and  
38 solutions; during or at the end of this phase, the teacher states the relevant physics knowledge  
39 and institutionalises it. This design is related to our specific choice on the didactical contract.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 This comparison with the current practice is essential in the French context in that it is the  
53 practice used by the majority of teachers. Our practice must therefore be explained in  
54 comparison to the current one, to enable teachers to understand it. Let us note that our choice  
55 is related to the socio-constructivist grand theory.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

[Insert about here Table 2]

### *Structure of the teaching sequence*

The Two-World specific theory guides the design process of the sequence due to the necessity of differentiating between theoretical elements and objects or events. In the case of the mechanics teaching sequence, this guidance appears when compared with the structure of the official curriculum (Figure 9). The difference is shown in the first rectangles at the bottom (Part I, figure 9).

The official programme introduces force through its effect. It implies that, having a twofold status, force belongs to the world of objects and events since it has observable effects and at the same time it begins to be a physics concept. In the research-based design activity, the distinction between the two worlds has led the designers to introduce the notion of action as a description of what is happening between material objects at the level of objects and events.

[Insert about here Figure 9]

In the second part (II) of both cases, the concept of interaction was introduced and then the concept of force. However, in the SESAMES sequence, an intermediate model of interaction is explicitly introduced (part II) before introducing force. This intermediate model was added to avoid introducing the effects of force as proposed in the official curriculum. The main event related to the concept of force is the action between objects, even if they are motionless. When two objects A and B are in contact, there is an action of A on B and of B on A. Then, as previous research studies suggested (Guillaud, 1998), the event of action is introduced; this is the aim of the intermediary model. This model includes a symbolic representation (diagram in

1  
2  
3 Figure 8). Then two elements of knowledge: action between objects (event) and force exerted  
4 by a system on another system (model of this event) are clearly distinguished (see Table 1).  
5

6  
7 For the second part of dynamics concerning Newton's laws, the specificity of the SESAMES  
8 sequence is shown in the way laws are formulated, as they include four logical implications  
9 between compensation (or not) of forces and the type of motion. For example: "If there is  
10 motionless or constant velocity then forces compensate each other" and "If forces compensate  
11 each other then there is motionless constant velocity". The development in four logical  
12 implications is related to our learning choice that students' understanding can be made easier  
13 if elements of knowledge are small. There are two other statements related to change of  
14 motion and force. Let us note that according to the official curriculum, acceleration is not  
15 introduced and force is related to the velocity change.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Type of activities according to the Two-World specific theory**

31  
32  
33 As presented before, the case-based research studies give an in-depth analysis for each  
34 teaching activity of a group of two students and of the classroom work during correction. The  
35 group was analysed during the whole teaching sequence; each activity is not analysed in an  
36 isolated way. Furthermore, in the whole class, when the teacher asks the students to present  
37 their solution and leads a debate, the students' work and arguments of the observed students  
38 are compared to others. The analyses of the two students are therefore situated in the whole  
39 class. Moreover, these analyses are proposed to the teachers of the group who can compare  
40 them to what happens in their own classes. These results have allowed the researchers *to*  
41 *better understand the potential* of the activity on two main points: (1) to help students use the  
42 elements of knowledge and reasoning that the activity intended them to use, and (2) to allow  
43 the whole class to co-construct the new elements of knowledge that the activity is supposed to  
44 introduce. Such case studies have only allowed basic hypotheses, but they offer the advantage  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 of providing detailed information on the potential of *most of the activities* that have been  
4  
5 designed.  
6

7  
8 In the following, we will illustrate the relationships (Figure 7) by teaching activities.  
9  
10 Relationships 2 and 3 are often both involved in the activities. Most of the time an activity has  
11  
12 too large a granularity of knowledge to involve only one of them. This is why we present two  
13  
14 activities, one illustrating mainly type 2 relationships and the other illustrating mainly the  
15  
16 relationship between the theory/model and the objects/events (types 2 and 3).  
17  
18

### 19 20 21 *Activity about relationships at the objects and events level (type 1)* 22

23  
24 This type of activity is not common in ordinary teaching at upper secondary level. Most of the  
25  
26 time, teachers consider that such activities are too easy for the students.  
27  
28

### 29 30 *Designed teaching activity* 31

32  
33 This modelling approach has led the designers to consider that students have to learn how to  
34  
35 describe material situations in terms of objects and events in a way which is relevant to  
36  
37 physics, since this description is different from descriptions made spontaneously by the  
38  
39 students. Particularly in mechanics, motionless situations are described in different terms in  
40  
41 everyday life and in physics. Since there is no observable change, interpretation of the  
42  
43 motionless situation in everyday life is not interesting. In physics, motionless has to be  
44  
45 interpreted in the framework of laws in which motionless and rectilinear motion are similar  
46  
47 depending on the frame of reference. As we introduced before, the designers therefore  
48  
49 decided to teach how to describe motionless situations with the word 'action' and its  
50  
51 associated verb 'to act' (Guillaud, 1998, Küçüközer, 2000). In such a description, these words  
52  
53 have a different meaning from the one they have in everyday situations where they imply a  
54  
55 change. This activity given in Figure 10 is in part II of the SESAMES sequence (Figure 9).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In this activity the students are more or less guided to use the verb "to act". This should lead  
4 them to conceptualize the situation in terms of action. As we have already mentioned, at this  
5 stage, action is a conceptual construction for students, whereas later on, in the sequence and in  
6 physics, it will be at the level of objects and events.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Let us note that the choice of an ordinary object like a stone, and not of an object from a  
13 physics laboratory like a "weight" used in a Roberval scale, and the choice of the verb "to  
14 act" are at a fine level of granularity of knowledge.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 [Insert about here Figure 10]  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 *Example of students' work in class*

30  
31 As mentioned above, a research study was carried out in a classroom during the design of the  
32 sequence, the teacher being a member of the design group. This case study was aimed at  
33 studying how the students' understanding evolves during the teaching sequence (Küçüközer,  
34 2000).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Regarding the students' use and understanding of the verb 'to act', different analyses carried  
42 out in several classrooms have shown that students tried to use this verb and associate it with  
43 a thought experiment; for example, if we cut the elastic string, the stone will fall so the string  
44 supports the stone, or they might say sentences like "the earth pushes the stone downwards".  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 This type of activity helps students to associate 'to act' with potential changes and to use it to  
51 describe motionless situations even though nothing happens in the situation (which is an  
52 important step in learning). This language of description of the material world belongs to  
53 physics knowledge.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The extract presented below show how relevant such an activity closely related to observation  
4  
5 is for physics learning. It illustrates a basic problem in mechanics: all material objects,  
6  
7 whatever their size and mass, belong to the category “object”; it is the case of the Earth and of  
8  
9 the stone in this activity. This categorisation is not obvious for many students at this level of  
10  
11 schooling.  
12  
13

14  
15 We will present a translation of an extract of student discussions by small groups working on  
16  
17 this activity (Figure 10). The extract begins when students S1 and S2 are trying to write their  
18  
19 answers down, and the teacher (T) intervenes for a short period. The line numbers are those of  
20  
21 the original transcription.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

- 27  
28 366 S2: what are the objects(?) [...]  
29  
30 ....  
31  
32 369 S2: hmmm attraction isn't an object [*they laugh*]  
33  
34 370 S1: well, the thread [...]  
35  
36 371 S2 elastic  
37  
38 372 S1 yeah  
39  
40 373 S2 ah but there are several objects  
41  
42 374 S1: hmmm first there's this [*holds the stone*], then there's that, the elastic string, then hmmm since  
43  
44 there's an 's' [in the activity statement] there are at least two  
45  
46 [...]  
47  
48 385 S2: you could say attraction but it's not an object  
49  
50 ....  
51  
52 388 T: ...the attraction of what(?)  
53  
54 389 S1: of the ground [in French S1 says “terrestre”<sup>3</sup>]  
55  
56 390 S3 yes  
57  
58 391 T: why is there this attraction? I'll leave you to think about it  
59  
60 392 S1: because of the stone, the heaviness of the stone

<sup>3</sup> In French “attraction terrestre” is an rather current expression; let us note that gravity is also used.

- 1  
2  
3 393 T: what object (?) What do you call it (?) What does it cause (?) [*T leaves*]  
4  
5 394 S1: the nucleus the Earth is not an object [*laughs*]  
6  
7 395 S2: what's the nucleus, do you think it's an object?  
8  
9 396 S1: well gravity, it's the same [*laughs*]  
10  
11 397 S2: the attraction of the ground [in French l'attraction terrestre], what's that (?)  
12  
13 ....  
14  
15 400 S1: well the Earth ... yes the Earth is an object  
16  
17 401 S2: Yeah I don't know it's a strange object  
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

This extract shows the students' difficulties in considering that the Earth is an object just like the stone; finally S1 (400) concludes that it is an object and that attraction and gravity are not (385) which is implicitly confirmed by the teacher, and S2 accepts S1's proposal adding "strange" (401).

In fact this activity requires a specific physics way of "seeing" the material world i.e. putting a small stone and the Earth or any material object in the same category: "object". This has to be learnt by the students. This phase of description, which is often neglected in physics teaching, is necessary to students' understanding of physics (Sensevy & al., 2008).

Several data on this activity have shown that the students are usually involved in the task and discuss it using elements of knowledge considered as relevant (by the designers). This does not mean that students propose the correct knowledge from the physics point of view. In this sense, the activity allows students to take responsibility for constructing (or starting to construct) new elements of knowledge, particularly a new meaning for "to act" and "action" and a new categorisation of Earth as an object, which for us is confirmation of this activity's potential to improve students' understanding.

1  
2  
3 *Activities involving relationships from objects and events to theory/model and*  
4  
5  
6 *the reverse (types 2 and 3)*  
7  
8

9 We first present an activity whose the first question mainly illustrates a type 2 relationship,  
10  
11 then another activity which requires using both relationships (2 and 3) and but mainly type 3.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 *Activity about relationships from objects and events to theory/model*  
18

19  
20 This type of activity is most common in physics teaching (Tiberghien, Veillard, Le Maréchal,  
21  
22 Buty, & Millar, 2001)  
23  
24

25  
26 Designed teaching activity  
27

28 We give an example Figure 11. This activity shows a specificity of SESAMES sequence  
29  
30 which asks students to use the text of a model (for example, Figure 8). As we have written  
31  
32 before, an activity like this aims to help students understand the physics model of interaction  
33  
34 and force.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 [Insert about here Figure 11]  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Let us note that we deliberately chose the ping-pong ball, as the action of the hand that holds  
47  
48 it under the water is clearly perceived, and the ball rises as soon as the hand releases it. We  
49  
50 also chose to ask students to draw a ball-interactions diagram before asking them to draw the  
51  
52 force vectors on the ball; this decision to ask for formal representations comes from the  
53  
54 “semiotic registers” tool. Here again, these choices are at a fine granularity level of  
55  
56 knowledge.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Example of student work in class  
4  
5

6 In this activity (Figure 11) the students have to construct a rather large set of new theoretical  
7  
8 elements of knowledge about the compensation of forces associated with a vector  
9  
10 representation. This activity requires establishing relationships between theoretical statements  
11  
12 and an easily observable situation in which the students' perception is involved: they have to  
13  
14 hold a ping-ball motionless under water. This is the first time that a principle (Inertia  
15  
16 principle) has been introduced in the physics teaching for these students (grade 10).  
17

18  
19 First, let us note that the situation of a ball held under water presents an initial difficulty; that  
20  
21 of acknowledging that the Earth is still acting on the ball, even when the ball is under water.  
22  
23 This difficulty has been observed in several classrooms with different teachers and some  
24  
25 students are difficult to convince.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 To illustrate the complex relations between the world of objects-events and the theory-model  
33  
34 world, we will give three short extracts from the same study as in the activity presented above  
35  
36 (Küçüközer, 2000). In the first extract, the students are working on the second part of question  
37  
38 1 (Figure 11) about the forces acting on the ball, after having correctly answered the first part.  
39  
40 They have a difficult discussion on the orientations of the different forces, one of them (F)  
41  
42 suggesting that the “force of the hand” is oriented upwards because if the hand releases the  
43  
44 ball (a comment made prior to those in the extract), the ball rises and therefore the force has  
45  
46 this upwards direction.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 519 L [...] the Earth attracts it [the ball] downwards and the water makes it go back up  
55

56 .....  
57

58  
59 523 L the hand... no er I don't know why I said that [in 519] so the water oh yeah, yeah wait – the  
60  
water upwards

1  
2  
3 524 A no  
4  
5

6 This discussion continues and deals with the importance of the respective forces. After two  
7 minutes, L seems rather sure of his proposal and they have already agreed that the hand acts  
8 on the ball downwards.  
9

10  
11  
12 557 L ... 'it's upwards it's the water yeah'.....  
13

14 566 F the water acts, and the Earth - is it downwards? Is it like that? No, the Earth is upwards...  
15

16 567 L no, the Earth is downwards, not upwards - the Earth doesn't push the ball upwards  
17  
18

19 Then the two students work on question 2.  
20

21  
22 570 A Look at the next question - they ask how you explain why the ball stays motionless, it's that  
23 normally...  
24

25 571 L yeah it's because it pulls downwards  
26  
27

28 572 A no look, wait, listen, look, why does it stays motionless, I think it's because there are two  
29 forces that are smaller there [shows his sheet with the force vectors exerted by the hand and by  
30 the Earth on the ball] that make the same force as the biggest [force vector exerted by the water  
31 on the ball]  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 This short extract shows two typical ways of "viewing" and interpreting the situation. L  
37 interprets it from the *noticeable event of the situation*; the hand that pulls the ball downwards  
38 and A starts from a *noticeable point of the activity statement*: motionless and relates it to their  
39 modelling of the situations in terms of forces. A, as in other situations, is deeply influenced by  
40 the teacher's requirements. We interpret this in terms of didactical contract; A tries to do what  
41 the teacher expects of him. At the same time, this contract could help him to use a theoretical  
42 approach.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53  
54  
55  
56 The last extract takes place during the correction with the whole class. It shows how the  
57 teacher goes from the objects-events level to determine the forces (second part of question 1,  
58 Figure 11) to reasoning that comes from theory-model; the principle of inertia in this case.  
59  
60

This extract is in fact an example of type 3 relationships from theories-models to objects-events, illustrated in the next case. This shows that the two relationships between the two worlds cannot be really involved in an isolated way.

- 719 P well, they say that the principle of inertia allows you to...
- 720 St ...
- 721 T what allows you to say what you are saying, that the forces compensate each other (?)
- 722 St1 well, the forces compensate each other
- 723 St2 they compensate each other
- 724 T can you read what it is in the model? [text given to the students before starting the activity stating the Inertial principle and the laws of mechanics]
- .....
- 729 F if the velocity of a system does not vary then all the forces that exert on the system compensate each other
- 730 T That's it, the velocity does not vary because the system is motionless. So, since the velocity does not vary, the forces compensate each other; this justifies our diagram, in fact before drawing the diagram you have to look at the principle and then you work out the diagram ...

This type of reasoning involves recognising the status of a principle and, in fact, illustrates the next type of teaching activity, which aims to help students understand the relationships between theory-model and objects-events. This is a crucial aspect of understanding Newton's mechanics.

*Activity involving the relationship between theory/model and objects and events (types 3 and 4)*

The modelling choice has provided guidance to the designers for proposing such activities.

The chosen activity given in Figure 12 is based on the model of interactions (Figures 8 and 4) introduced in part II, and the activity is at the beginning of part III (Figure 9).



[Insert about here Figure 12]

This activity aims to help students use the basic components of the concept of force; contact force and distance force: if two objects are not in contact (in this case, hand and ball) then there is no force between these objects; on the contrary, the air is in contact and acts on the ball while the Earth acts at a distance. This type of reasoning is not spontaneous; it is very likely that students will use the overall causality-force and force-motion relations (Table 1), and students have to learn it.

The activity was introduced several years after the first design of the entire sequence. A teacher who had not participated in the group that designed the sequence made the proposal after using the sequence in his class. The teacher was particularly interested in the history of science and attached importance to modelling; because of this, he suggested explaining two historical models to the students. The group accepted his proposal, although some members were reluctant because of the length of the sequence. In fact, one of the teachers who was reluctant at the time has now been using this activity in his class for two years, and recognizes that it “works very well with the students; the historical aspect removes their worries about their mistakes, and the activity allows students to review what they have learnt previously, particularly the modelling process.”

#### *Activity to relate elements of the model (type 4)*

Such activities require that students have acquired at least a partial understanding of the model. This design is not easy because it often requires in-depth knowledge of the theory/model. It is therefore not surprising that, in the SESAMES sequence, these activities are at the end of a part and at the beginning of the next part. The activity illustrating the type 4 relationship was also designed several years after the first design; we do not have a specific

1  
2  
3 analysis of it. The activity presented in Figure 13 is situated at the beginning of Part IV of the  
4  
5 sequence and to work on it, the students have to use the laws of mechanics introduced in Part  
6  
7  
8 III.

9  
10  
11  
12  
13 [Insert about here Figure 13]  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 This activity leads the students to take into account the vector aspect of velocity and  
19  
20 recognize that velocity has a constant magnitude but a varied direction (at grade 10,  
21  
22 acceleration is not introduced). The activity should help students to develop their  
23  
24 understanding of the relationship between force and velocity change by establishing links  
25  
26 between the vector aspects and the natural language of the laws of mechanics. At this level, it  
27  
28 is just an introduction to this basic relation. The sequence does aim to introduce a formal  
29  
30 relation between force and change of velocity vectors. This acquisition was studied at grade  
31  
32 11 with a sequence designed by our group; it appeared that vector construction plays a major  
33  
34 role in students' understanding of this fundamental relation (Küçüközer, 2005).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 *Remarks on the levels of granularity of the design*

41

42  
43 The Two-World theory and the specific choices guided the design of a teaching sequence on  
44  
45 several levels. The structure of the sequence is influenced by the modelling approach; as has  
46  
47 been discussed before, the SESAMES sequence starts with introducing action and then force,  
48  
49 instead of the effects of force as is suggested by the official curriculum. The necessity of  
50  
51 *coherence* between the theory/models proposed in the sequence and the set of material  
52  
53 situations to be studied also affects the main structure of the sequence. This coherence is not  
54  
55 easy to observe. In fact, in the first years after the initial design of the mechanics sequence,  
56  
57  
58 because of the official curriculum, friction forces were not included in the model of laws of  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mechanics. However, over the following years it clearly appeared that, for many exercises, the  
4  
5 teachers had to introduce these forces as a particular case, but no general case for friction  
6  
7 forces was introduced. The modelling guidance of coherence between the theory/model and  
8  
9 the experimental field has led the designers to introduce friction forces in the model even  
10  
11 though they were taking the risk of not observing the official curriculum.  
12  
13

### 14 15 16 **Design of the comments for teachers** 17

18  
19 These comments are addressed to all teachers, to enable them to use the teaching sequences  
20  
21 without having taken part in the design process. The teachers have direct access to the website  
22  
23 PEGASE; usually they visit it after discussions with colleagues or after in-service  
24  
25 professional development sessions. The comments have two main aims: (1) explaining our  
26  
27 choices and the reasons for them and (2) helping teachers to “stage” the activity in their  
28  
29 classrooms so that the types of knowledge (including skills, process of science) involved in  
30  
31 the activity (from the designer’s perspective) “live” in the classroom.  
32  
33

34  
35 Two different types of comments have been designed; a series of comments are associated  
36  
37 with specific components of a teaching sequence, and broader comments in the sense that  
38  
39 they are relevant to all the teaching sequences based on the modelling approach of the  
40  
41 SESAMES group.  
42  
43

### 44 45 46 *Comments associated with the mechanics teaching sequence* 47

48  
49 On the PEGASE website (<http://pegase.inrp.fr>) each activity is presented in a window (for  
50  
51 example Fig. 14) with five buttons giving access to comments for teachers: (1) Aim (“But”),  
52  
53 (2) Preparation, (3) Knowledge; that is, comments on the knowledge to be taught and  
54  
55 information on the physics content (“Savoir”), (4) Students’ behaviour; that is, information on  
56  
57 the students’ behaviour and the way of taking their difficulties into account (“comportements  
58  
59 des élèves”); (5) Providing answers (“Corrigé”).  
60

[Insert about here Figure 14]

The five headings (on each button) provide structure to the comments; a structure based on the teachers' experience, as distinguishing between aims, session preparation, knowledge, and providing answers are current practices in teachers' documents. However, the "students' behaviour" button has been introduced, together with a hypothesis on teachers' knowledge, because usually a teacher is unaware of the students' behaviour when they are working in small groups; this work is private and the students' comments are not made public (at least a part of them) at the class level. A teacher cannot follow a group's work during the whole activity. Our approach was therefore to show relevant examples of students' activity in order to improve the teacher's understanding of students' approaches, not just overall but also on specific aspects of knowledge. In fact, some teachers do not easily understand students' approaches during these "private" discussions (Saint Georges & Richoux, 2005).

We will just give an example of the 'Knowledge' button ("savoir"). For the activity given in Figure 12 (relation from theory/model to objects/events), the comment is:

"[...] We have given up finding a situation which could convince students that this force (in the direction of the movement) was not necessary for the movement. We could only convince them with an argument such as: 'there was no force in the direction of the movement because there is no system that exerted it'. In this way, we use an argument from the taught *model (a theoretical argument)* to help students overcome their intuitive knowledge."

This type of comment illustrates the role of the modelling approach. In this case many studies show the students' difficulties in acquiring these elements of knowledge, so the designers considered that they should provide arguments to the students. However, experimental argument is difficult if not impossible (Koyre, 1990), so it was decided to provide an

1  
2  
3 argument at the level of theory/model, and to help students develop the coherence of their  
4  
5 understanding of theoretical knowledge. The situation is similar for the students' difficulties  
6  
7 in the activity given in Figure 11 concerning the action of the Earth on a ping-pong ball held  
8  
9 in water; theoretical arguments seem unavoidable.  
10  
11

12  
13 The button "*comportement des élèves*" ('students' behaviour') has given teachers access to  
14  
15 short video extracts with comments, showing specific students' difficulties such as in  
16  
17 categorizing the Earth as an object.  
18  
19

### 20 21 *Broad comments based on modelling*

22  
23

24 The aim of these broad comments is to propose elements that deal directly with the teacher's  
25  
26 professional activity. These texts are structured with "markers". A marker works like a  
27  
28 conspicuous signal for a teacher. These markers can be relevant to different categories of  
29  
30 classroom situations and can help a teacher during different phases of his/her activity; during  
31  
32 a preparation, in a laboratory, in a classroom, and also when s/he is correcting or writing a  
33  
34 problem statement ([http://pegase.inrp.fr/theme.php?Rubrique=2&id\\_theme=30](http://pegase.inrp.fr/theme.php?Rubrique=2&id_theme=30)). These markers have a  
35  
36 similar function to the "teachers' concerns" of the PEEL project (<http://peelweb.org>). The  
37  
38 PEEL project (Erickson, Minnes Brandes, Mitchell & Mitchell, 2005) has similar  
39  
40 characteristics as the SESAMES project in the sense that both have had a long history of  
41  
42 producing teaching resources and a common aim born from teachers' concerns about students  
43  
44 who rarely contribute ideas of their own. A major difference is that SESAMES is explicitly  
45  
46 focused on science and we try *to make our theoretical choices explicit*. In any case, even with  
47  
48 these differences, we face a similar problem concerning how to structure the resources that are  
49  
50 not ours, is not discipline-dependent. At this stage of our research, our structuring has been  
51  
52 influenced by the Two-Worlds theory but has also been adapted so as to be understood by  
53  
54 teachers who do not know about the theory. Let us note that, for each activity, in the PEGASE  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 window there is a list of links to the relevant markers (Figure 14 under the heading  
4  
5 ‘ressources liées’ (linked resources).  
6  
7

8 Each marker has two parts: advantages and risks. Examples of markers are given to illustrate  
9  
10 the necessity of introducing other criteria than those given by the modelling process to stage  
11  
12 the activities in the classroom.  
13  
14

15 “Maker A” is directly associated with a type of activity presented above, activity type 1;  
16  
17 relationships at the “objects and events” level. Its title is “students are not explicitly invited to  
18  
19 refer to a model”, which implies that students’ activities deal mainly with description or  
20  
21 interpretation without involving physics concepts. The proposed advantages are based on  
22  
23 learning hypotheses: students do not know how to describe an experiment in a relevant  
24  
25 physics way; they need to learn how. The risks are from the teachers’ points of view: the  
26  
27 teacher should not discredit this type of activity, thinking that it is too easy for students.  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 The three other markers correspond to activities in which the students use a model that they  
33  
34 already know and discover a new model or are invited to construct a new element of a model,  
35  
36 dealing with relationships 2, 3 and 4 (figure 7).  
37  
38

39  
40 Marker B: “Activities in which students are invited to use some elements of a model that has  
41  
42 already been introduced”. These activities aim at developing links between theory/models and  
43  
44 experimental fields in both directions.  
45  
46

47  
48 Marker C: “In this type of activity, students discover a new element of a model at the end of  
49  
50 the activity”. These activities mainly aim at developing type-4 relationships, internal to  
51  
52 theory/model, and relationships 2 and 3 between the experimental field in both directions.  
53  
54

55  
56 Marker D: “Activities in which students are invited to use a new model from the beginning of  
57  
58 the activity”. Here, relationship 3 is mainly developed.  
59

60  
We do not give the complete text of each marker, we just comment that the markers deal with  
a difficult component of physics teaching; that is, the risk of arbitrariness when presenting an

1  
2  
3 experiment and its interpretation without specifying the approximation and/or the basic  
4 choices. For example, teachers are told to be careful when they generalize a model to its  
5 whole field of validity because generalizations can appear arbitrary to students and unsettle  
6 them.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 The structure of the broad comments with “markers” is experience-based teaching. The idea is  
13 that a teacher should be aware of the potential difficulties of some types of situations. This  
14 idea entails that the teacher can recognize the type of situation and is aware of its specific  
15 characteristics, taking them into account in his/her behaviour. Up to now, these statements  
16 have been hypothetical and because they merely explain the problem, future research is  
17 necessary.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Discussion**

29  
30 To discuss our theoretical approach to designing of teaching sequences, we have compared it  
31 to another approach, recently published in “Model based learning and instruction in science”  
32 by Clement and Rea-Ramirez (2008). In both cases, the design activity was initiated several  
33 years ago and has been carried out in collaboration with teachers.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In their introductory chapter, Rea-Ramirez, Clement & Nuñez-Oviedo (2008) present the  
41 same point of view as us regarding the role of grand theories on design: “Even though these  
42 theories [the grand theory of conceptual change] are extremely valuable, they are still quite  
43 general and do not provide a sufficient understanding of underlying mechanisms to give much  
44 guidance for curriculum development” (p.27).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 In reference to the three poles of the didactical triangle, the knowledge pole in relation to  
53 students is essential in the theoretical framework of design in both cases.  
54  
55

56 The difference appears in the epistemological references. Clement et al (2008) refer to a  
57 “cognitive historical” approach, and Nersessian’s work is a major reference (1992 among  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 others). Instead, we use two types of references in the epistemology of science and in the  
4  
5 epistemology of everyday knowledge that emphasize the social aspect of knowledge. When  
6  
7 referring to the analysis of the cognitive processes of scientists as individuals in a community  
8  
9 (for example Nersessian analysed Faraday's work and reconstructed the cognitive process),  
10  
11 Clement et al. have transposed both the scientific knowledge process and the individual  
12  
13 cognitive process to develop their curriculum. Clement and his colleagues have emphasized  
14  
15 the role of analogy in their curriculum development, due to its importance in the scientist's  
16  
17 work.  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 It is interesting to underline that Rea-Ramirez, Clement & Nuñez-Oviedo (2008) introduced  
23  
24 the idea of types of knowledge (Table 3) and introduced two main distinctions between  
25  
26 theories and observation and four types of knowledge, as we have done (Figure 7).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 [Insert about here Table 3]  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Clement et al.'s modelling process with four types of knowledge is, on the whole, similar to  
38  
39 ours, as we have two main types of categories: theories and observations. The two types of  
40  
41 theories are also in the theory model world. However, Rea-Ramirez et al. include qualitative  
42  
43 or mathematical descriptions including empirical laws in observation, like the behaviour of  
44  
45 the relation  $pV=kt$ . In our study, we would have included these in the theory model, as the  
46  
47 activities involve the recognising the behaviour of concepts like pressure, temperature and  
48  
49 their relations, and this does not fit the level of description in terms of objects and events of  
50  
51 the material world. From our point of view, this is an interpretation in terms of concepts.  
52  
53 However, for physicists, the relation between pressure and the the state of a gas is obvious,  
54  
55 and to them, variation of pressure is equivalent to gas behaviour, but for the students who are  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 learning the concept of pressure, for example, it is a concept which does not describe the  
4  
5 behaviour of gas (Givry, 2003).  
6  
7

8 Both groups have emphasized the idea of learning pathways with intermediary steps between  
9  
10 students' initial knowledge and target knowledge. For Clement et al., the reference to  
11  
12 conceptual change and the mental model (Gentner and Stevens, 1982 for example) plays a  
13  
14 major role, and 'model' means either the scientist's or the learner's cognitive representation at  
15  
16 a given time of teaching. This reference has led them to specify the episodes of students'  
17  
18 dissatisfaction and revisions of their mental models. Their learning pathways are carefully  
19  
20 defined at a fine grain size. They studied learning pathways in terms of evolution within the  
21  
22 teaching time of explanatory models. Most importantly, they have taken *analogy as a main*  
23  
24 *factor for physics learning.*  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 As for us, we have studied the learning pathway in terms of evolution of the elements of  
31  
32 knowledge used by the learners in their oral/gesture/written production as related to teaching  
33  
34 situations during the teaching sequence. Our main *factor for physics learning is the distinction*  
35  
36 *between theory and observation-perception of objects and events in order to make the links*  
37  
38 *unavoidable in physics teaching.*  
39  
40

41 These two approaches have led to different design tools and teaching sequences. The two  
42  
43 explicit epistemological references on cognitive models, with the role of analogy and the  
44  
45 process of conceptual change on the one hand, and the relations between theory-models and  
46  
47 objects-events on the other hand, have influenced design on several levels. Clement & al.  
48  
49 proposed a cycle for each step in model evolution; the GEM cycle: Generate model, Evaluate  
50  
51 Model, Modify Model (student contribution), Modify Model (teacher contribution). They also  
52  
53 proposed making explicit goals and strategies at different time-scale levels for curriculum  
54  
55 design and teaching (levels of several months, days, minutes, one hundred seconds and  
56  
57 seconds). This shows that their design has been carried out on different scales and has  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 included a fine grain size. In our design, our two-worlds modelling tool plays a similar role to  
4 the GEM cycle. It structures our designed teaching sequences and guides the design of  
5 teaching activities at a fine grain size. Clement & al. considered learning pathways as an  
6 evolution of mental models. We have considered them as an evolution of students'  
7 understanding of the relation between theoretical elements and experimental facts or  
8 observable events, and this has led us to attach importance to the language in the design,  
9 particularly on wording the teaching activities, the model and comments for teachers as well  
10 as, of course, in the classroom. Both approaches take into account a fine grain size. These two  
11 approaches contribute to design-based research in two main ways. Firstly, they show that  
12 different epistemological choices, which are really related to the design, lead to different  
13 teaching resources. These teaching resources can be efficient and therefore offer the teachers  
14 different possibilities according to their own preferences. Secondly, they allow debate on how  
15 the theoretical aspects that we call "specific theory" differ, which opens up scientific debate.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Conclusion**

36  
37 Regarding the role of theories in design activity, we have considered with Cobb & al. (2003)  
38 that our theoretical framework is "*accountable to the activity of design*". The *two-worlds*  
39 framework is mainly constructed from grand theories on knowledge and learning. Moreover,  
40 we have made specific choices regarding teaching and learning and have devised three  
41 different new tools; 'knowledge distance', 'modelling relations' and 'semiotic registers',  
42 which can be used directly in designing teaching resources. These specific theories, specific  
43 choices and tools have guided the design process of the teaching sequences and the associated  
44 comments for teachers, as well as specific and broad teaching comments. However,  
45 professional experience is still involved in designing. Therefore this work of making the bases  
46 explicit for designing is only one step in a long process to obtain sharable specific theories  
47 such as those proposed by the design-based research collective (2003). It is clear that if the  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 specific theory of Two Worlds is available, we do not have an elaborated specific theory for  
4  
5 the teaching pole in relation with the knowledge and learning poles. However, this specific  
6  
7 theory and the tools allow scientific debates on the following precise aspects: the specific  
8  
9 theory itself, the way the tools are used, the craft knowledge involved in design and their roles  
10  
11 in the refinement process. More research is necessary to investigate these aspects further.  
12  
13  
14

## 15 16 **References**

- 17  
18  
19 Bachelard, S. (1979). Quelques aspects historiques des notions de modèle et de justification  
20  
21 des modèles. In P. Delattre & M. Thellier (Eds.), *Elaboration et justification des modèles*  
22  
23 (Vol. 1, pp. 3-19). Paris: Maloine S.A.  
24  
25  
26 Bannan-Ritland, B., & Baek, J. Y. (2008). Investigating the act of design in design research:  
27  
28 the road taken. In A. E. Kelly & R. A. Lesh & J. Y. Baek (Eds.), *Handbook of design*  
29  
30 *research methods in education. Innovations in science, technology, engineering, and*  
31  
32 *mathematics learning and teaching*. New York: Routledge.  
33  
34  
35  
36 Brousseau, G. (1998). *Théorie des situations didactiques*. Grenoble: La pensée sauvage.  
37  
38  
39 Bunge, M. (1973). *Method and matter*. Dordrecht-Holland.: Reidel publishing company.  
40  
41  
42 Buty, C., Tiberghien, A., & Le Maréchal, J. F. (2004). Learning hypotheses and associated  
43  
44 tools to design and to analyse teaching-learning sequences. *International Journal of*  
45  
46 *Science Education*, 26(5), 579-604.  
47  
48  
49 Chevallard, Y. (1991). *La transposition didactique* (2ème ed.). Grenoble: La Pensée Sauvage.  
50  
51  
52 Clement, J., & Rea-Ramirez, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Model based learning and instruction in*  
53  
54 *science*. Dordrecht: Springer.  
55  
56  
57 Cobb, P., Confrey, J., diSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schoube, L. (2003). Design experiments in  
58  
59 educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 9-13.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Cobb, P., Gresalfi, M., & Hodge, L. L. (in press). An interpretive scheme for analyzing the  
4 identities that students develop in mathematics classrooms. *Journal for Research in*  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 Coulaud, M. (2005). *Evaluer la compréhension des concepts de mécanique chez des élèves de*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 diSessa, A. (2006). A history of conceptual change research: threads and fault lines. In K.  
20  
21 Sawyer (Ed.), *Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 265-282).  
22  
23 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.  
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
- Dumas-Carré, A., & Weil-Barais, A. (Eds.). (1998). *Tutelle et médiation dans l'enseignement scientifique*. Paris/Berne: Peter Lang.
- Duval, R. (1995). *Sémiosis et pensée humaine, registres sémiotiques et apprentissage intellectuels [Semiosis and human thought, semiotic registers and intellectual learning]*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Erickson, G., Minnes Brandes, G., Mitchell, I., & Mitchell, J. (2005). Collaborative teacher learning: Findings from two professional development projects. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(7), 787–798
- Gaidioz, P., & Tiberghien, A. (2003). Un outil d'enseignement privilégiant la modélisation. *Bulletin de l'union des physiciens, 850*, 71-83.
- Gaidioz, P., Vince, J., & Tiberghien, A. (2004). Aider l'élève à comprendre le fonctionnement de la physique et son articulation avec la vie quotidienne. *Bulletin de l'union des physiciens, 866*, 1029-1042.
- Gentner, D., & Stevens, A. L. (Eds.). (1983). *Mental models*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- 1  
2  
3 Giere, R. N. (1988). *Explaining science. A cognitive approach*. Chicago: The University of  
4  
5 Chicago Press.  
6  
7  
8 Givry, D. (2003). *Étude de l'évolution des idées des élèves de seconde durant une séquence*  
9  
10 *d'enseignement sur les gaz*. Thèse, Université Lumière Lyon 2, Lyon.  
11  
12  
13 Givry, D., & Roth, W.-M. (2006). Toward a new conception of conceptions: Interplay of talk,  
14  
15 gestures, and structures in the setting. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*,  
16  
17 43(10), 1086-1109.  
18  
19  
20 Guillaud, J.-C. (1998). *Enseignement et apprentissage du concept de force en classe de*  
21  
22 *troisième*. Thèse, Université Joseph Fourier Grenoble 1, Grenoble.  
23  
24  
25 Hacking, I. (1983/2005). *Representing an Intervening*. Cambridge: University Press  
26  
27 Cambridge.  
28  
29  
30 Jeannin, L. (2006). *Appropriation par un enseignant de physique d'une nouvelle séquence*  
31  
32 *d'enseignement : cas de la mécanique en seconde*. Université Lyon 2, Lyon.  
33  
34  
35 Koyré, A. (1990). Cohérence de la physique aristotélicienne. In *Leçons de physique. Aristote*  
36  
37 (pp. 375-380). Paris: Presses pocket.  
38  
39  
40 Küçüközer, A. (2000). *Une compréhension de la notion d'interaction dans le cadre d'un*  
41  
42 *enseignement de mécanique*. Mémoire du DEA Didactiques et Interactions, Université  
43  
44 Lumière - Lyon 2.  
45  
46  
47 Küçüközer, A. (2005). L'étude de l'évolution de la compréhension conceptuelle des élèves  
48  
49 avec un enseignement. Cas de la mécanique en 1ère S. Thèse, Université Lumière  
50  
51 Lyon 2, Lyon.  
52  
53  
54 Le Maréchal, J.-F., Barbe, E., Roux, M., Jean-Marie, O., Roue, B., & Vincent, D. (2004a).  
55  
56 Difficultés des élèves sur l'utilisation des ions dans le cadre des nouveaux  
57  
58 programmes. *Bulletin de l'Union des Professeurs de Physique et de Chimie*, 98(867),  
59  
60 1399-1410.

- 1  
2  
3 Le Maréchal, J.-F., Perrey, S., Roux, M., & Jean-Marie, O. (2004b). Tableau d'avancement :  
4  
5 avantages et difficultés au long de la scolarité. *Bulletin de l'Union des Professeurs de*  
6  
7 *Physique et de Chimie*, 98(860), 93-100.  
8  
9
- 10 Leach, J., & Scott, P. (2002). Designing and evaluating science teaching sequences: an  
11  
12 approach drawing upon the concept of learning demand and a social constructivist  
13  
14 perspective on learning. *Studies in science education*, 38, 115-142.  
15  
16
- 17 Levy-Strauss, C. (1962). *La Pensée Sauvage*. Paris: Plon Collection Agora.  
18
- 19 Lijnse, P. (2000). Didactics of science: the forgotten dimension in science education research?  
20  
21 In R. Millar, J. Leach & J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education* (pp. 308-326).  
22  
23 Buckingham: Open University Press.  
24  
25
- 26 Lopes, J. B., Silva, A. A., Cravino, J. P., Costa, N., Marques, L., & Campos, C. (2008).  
27  
28 Transversal Traits in Science Education Research Relevant for Teaching and  
29  
30 Research: A Meta-interpretative Study *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*,  
31  
32 47(5), 574-599.  
33  
34
- 35 Malkoun, L. (2007). De la caractérisation des pratiques de classes de physique à leur relation  
36  
37 aux performances des élèves: étude de cas en France et au Liban. Thèse de Doctorat,  
38  
39 Université Lyon 2 / Université libanaise, Lyon/Beyrouth.  
40  
41
- 42 Malkoun, L., Vince, J., & Tiberghien, A. (2007, 17, 18, 19 octobre 2007). *Relations entre*  
43  
44 *pratiques d'enseignement de la physique au lycée et performances des élèves : cas de*  
45  
46 *l'enseignement de la mécanique*. Paper presented at the Cinquièmes Rencontres  
47  
48 scientifiques de l'ARDIST La Grande Motte.  
49  
50
- 51 Méheut, M., & Psillos, D. (2004). Editorial - Teaching-learning sequences: aims and tools for  
52  
53 science education research. *International Journal of Science Education*, 26(5), 515-535.  
54  
55
- 56 Mercier, A., Schauber-Leoni, M. L., & Sensevy, G. (2002). Vers une didactique comparée.  
57  
58 *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 141, 5-16.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (2000). Analysing discourse in the science classroom. In R. Millar,  
4  
5 J. Leach & J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education: the contribution of research*  
6  
7 (pp. 126-142). Buckingham UK: Open University Press.  
8  
9

10 Nersessian, N. (1992). How do scientists think? Capturing the dynamics of conceptual change  
11  
12 in science. In R. N. Giere (Ed.), *Cognitive models of science* (Vol. 15, pp. 3-44).  
13  
14 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.  
15  
16

17 Niedderer, H., Budde, M., Givry, D., Psillos, D., & Tiberghien, A. (2007). Learning process  
18  
19 studies. In R. Pintó & D. Couso (Eds.), *ESERA Selected Contributions book*. (pp. 159-  
20  
21 171). Berlin: Springer.  
22  
23

24 Pegase: [pegase.inrp.fr](http://pegase.inrp.fr) last consultation: March 2007.  
25  
26

27 Piaget, J., & Garcia, R. (1971). *Les explications causales*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de  
28  
29 France.  
30  
31

32 Psillos, D., & Kariotoglou, P. (1999). Teaching fluids: Intended knowledge and students?  
33  
34 Actual conceptual evolution. *International Journal of Science Education*, 21(1), 17-  
35  
36 38.  
37  
38

39 Rea-Ramirez, M. A., Clement, J., & Nùñez-Oviedo, M. C. (2008). An instructional model  
40  
41 derived from model construction and criticism theory. In J. Clement & M. A. Rea-  
42  
43 Ramirez (Eds.), *Model based learning and instruction in science* (pp. 23-43).  
44  
45 Dordrecht: Springer.  
46  
47

48 Saint-Georges M., Richoux H. (2005). *Utiliser en formation des vidéos d'élèves ; Quels*  
49  
50 *apports pour les enseignants ?* Communication aux 4<sup>ème</sup> rencontres de l'ARDIST, Lyon.  
51  
52 Retrieved June 17, 2007, from <http://www.inrp.fr/ardist2005/recherche.php>  
53  
54  
55

56 Saxe, R., & Carey, S. (2006). The perception of causality in infancy. *Acta psychologica*, 123  
57  
58 (1-2), 144-165.  
59  
60

60 Scott, P. (1992). Pathways in learning science: a case study of the development of one



- 1  
2  
3 student's ideas relating to the structure of matter. In R. Duit & F. Goldberg & H.  
4  
5 Niedderer (Eds.), *Research in Physics Learning: theoretical issues and empirical*  
6  
7 *studies* (pp. 203-224). Kiel: I.P.N.
- 8  
9  
10 Sensevy, G. (2007). Des catégories pour décrire et comprendre l'action didactique. In G.  
11  
12 Sensevy & A. Mercier (Eds.), *Agir ensemble : Eléments de théorisation de l'action*  
13  
14 *conjointe du professeur et des élèves* (pp. 13-49). Rennes: Presses Universitaires de  
15  
16 Rennes (PUR).
- 17  
18  
19 Sensevy, G., Tiberghien, A., Santini, J., Laube, S., & Griggs, P. (2008). An epistemological  
20  
21 approach to modeling: Cases studies and implications for science teaching. *Science*  
22  
23 *Education*, 92(3), 424-446.
- 24  
25  
26 Spelke, E. S., Phillips, A., & Woodward, A. L. (1995). Infants' knowledge of object motion  
27  
28 and human action. In D. Sperber & D. Premack & A. Premack (Eds.), *Causal*  
29  
30 *Cognition: A multidisciplinary debate* (pp. 44-78). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 31  
32  
33 The Design-Based Research Collective. (2003). Design-Based Research: An emerging  
34  
35 paradigm for educational inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 5-8.
- 36  
37  
38 Tiberghien, A. (1980). Modes and conditions of learning: An example: Learning of some  
39  
40 aspects of the concept of heat. In W. F. Archenhold & R. Driver & A. Orton & C.  
41  
42 Wood-Robinson (Eds.), *Cognitive development research in science and mathematics,*  
43  
44 *Proceedings of an international seminar* (pp. 288-309). Leeds: University of Leeds.
- 45  
46  
47 Tiberghien, A. (2000). Designing teaching situations in the secondary school. In R. Millar, J.  
48  
49 Leach & J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education: The contribution of research* (pp.  
50  
51 27-47). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- 52  
53  
54  
55 Tiberghien, A., Veillard, L., Le Maréchal, J.-F., Buty, C., & Millar, R. H. (2001). An analysis  
56  
57 of labwork tasks used in science teaching at upper secondary school and university  
58  
59 levels in several European countries. *Science Education*, 85(5), 483-508.
- 60



1  
2  
3 Tiberghien, A. (2004). Causalité dans l'apprentissage des sciences. *Intellectica*, 38(1), 69-  
4  
5 102.

6  
7  
8 Viennot, L. (1996). *Raisonnement en physique. La part du sens commun*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

9  
10 Viennot, L., & Rainson, S. (1999). Design and evaluation of a research-based teaching  
11  
12 sequence: The superposition of electric field. *International Journal of Science*  
13  
14 *Education*, 21(1), 1-16.

15  
16  
17 Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1992). Mental models of the earth: A study of conceptual  
18  
19 change in childhood. *Cognitive Psychology*, 24, 535-585.

20  
21  
22 Vygotski, L. S. (1934/1997). *Pensée et langage* (3ème ed.). Paris: La Dispute.

23  
24  
25 Wertsch, J. V. (1985). La médiation sémiotique et la vie mentale : L.S. Vygotsky et M.M.  
26  
27 Bakhtine. In B. Schneuwly & J. P. Bronckart (Eds.), *Vygotski aujourd'hui* (pp. 139-168).  
28  
29 Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé.  
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

Figure 1a




Figure 1b




Figure 1: Global structure of the theoretical framework going from grand theories to specific theories and tools to design resources. Figure 1a: general case; figure 1b: our choices and construction. The double line corresponds to the development and use of specific theories and tools





Figure 2: Place of a teaching sequence produced in a design-based research activity in the transposition process



36 Figure 3: Transposition from our epistemological analysis of physics in terms of modelling, to the  
37 framework of the Two-Worlds specific theory for designing teaching sequences at secondary  
38 school level  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Interactions

1. When a system X is in interaction with a system A, the action from A on X is called force exerted by A on X
2. To represent a force on a system, the system on which the force is exerted is represented by its centre of gravity to which the mass of the system is attributed.
3. The force exerted by A on X is represented by a vector with a symbol (see Figure). Its characteristics are as follows:
  4. its origin is the point representing the system;
  5. it goes in the direction of the force;
  6. its length is proportional to the value of the force (called magnitude)
  7. the value of the force is expressed in Newton (symbol: N).
8. When two systems A and X are in interaction, the force exerted by A on X and the force exerted by X on A have the same magnitude and are opposite in direction.
9. An interaction is modelled by two forces which, for all situations and in all cases, have same magnitude and opposite directions. The vectors which represent forces are on the same straight line; this straight line depends on the situation being studied.




Figure 4: Extract of a text given to students in the mechanics teaching sequence. The lines are numbered for reference in the comments




Figure 5: Representation of the specific theory of the 'Two Worlds' with the double categorization of knowledge: (1) modelling between the objects/events and the theories/models and (2) everyday/physics knowledge





Figure 6: Image illustrating our learning choices in the specific theory of the “Two Worlds”. The thick curved lines illustrate some of the new relations constructed by the learner, and the rest of the figure represents the taught knowledge



20 Figure 7: Modelling relations tool from the specific theory of the Two Worlds

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



### First part of the model of interactions


A system is a (material) object, part of an object, or a set of objects (this way of dividing reality is a choice made by the person who studies the situation).

**Interactions:** when system A acts on system B, simultaneously B acts on A; we say that A and B are in interaction. The action of A on B is written as  $A/B$  and the action of B on A is written as  $B/A$ .


This statement is applicable in **all** situations, both when the systems are motionless and when they move.

### Representation


Representation of a system



Representation of a contact interaction



Representation of a distance interaction



As soon as the system is chosen, only its interactions with the other systems have to be taken into account (outside systems), the interactions inside the system are not relevant.

These interactions are represented with the systems on the same schema. This schema is called a *system-interaction* diagram. To clearly distinguish the chosen system from the other systems, its name is underlined in the diagram.

### Second part of the model of interactions

(see Figure 4)


Figure 8: First part of the model of interaction introducing force



**Part II Interactions and forces Activity 1: Introducing the notion of action**

You have at your disposal: a support, an elastic string, a stone.

The stone is hanging from an elastic string. It is motionless.

*Questions*

- a) What are the objects which act on the stone?
- b) On what objects does the stone act?

Figure 10: Activity statement aiming to help students describe a situation in terms of objects and events in a way which is relevant to interpretation in physics

**Part III, the Inertia Principle and other laws of mechanics    Activity 2: Introduction to the laws of mechanics**

A ping-pong ball held by hand under water is motionless.

1) With the help of the model of interactions (parts I and II, [see Figure 4]) and of the laws of mechanics, draw:

- a ball - interactions diagram

- a diagram of all the forces acting on the system ball


2) Again using the model, how do you explain why the ball remains motionless?

Figure 11: Activity statement aiming to help students to relate objects-events to theory-model


**Part III, Inertia Principle and other laws of mechanics    Activity 1: “Aristotle or Galileo”**

We want to analyse different students' answers to the question: “represent the forces which are exerted on the medicine-ball (when it is moving upwards) represented by a dot and labelled as M-B)”. Two types of answers have been distinguished:

Students Group A



Students Group B



....

- 2 Using the information given at the beginning [a medicine-ball is thrown vertically upwards, the study focuses on the ball's upward motion], identify which Group (A or B) has analysed the situation intuitively.

- 3 a- Identify the systems 1 and 2 (present in the two representations) which act on the system MB. In your opinion, what does the force represent for Group A? Why did they need to represent this force?

b- With the help of the interaction model, justify the fact that this force does not model an action exerted by the medicine-ball when it moves upwards

Figure 12: Part of an activity statement (questions 2 and 3) aiming to help students relate elements of model to a material situation

**Part IV. Universal gravitation    Activity 1: Motion of the Moon**

To study the motion of the Moon around the Earth, we choose to represent it by its centre and we consider that this point has a circular motion.

When the gravity centre of an object has a uniform circular motion, we state that this object has a uniform circular motion. We study systems which, like the Moon, have a uniform circular motion.

1. Using the model of the laws of mechanics, say whether the forces exerted on a system like this (i.e. with a uniform circular motion) balance each other.

Figure 13: Activity statement aiming to help students relate elements of the model

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

The screenshot shows the PEGASE website interface. At the top, there are logos for Pegase, Enseigner, and icar, along with the date 'lundi 26 mai 2008'. Below this is a navigation menu with tabs for 'Cinquième', 'Quatrième', 'Troisième', 'Seconde', 'Première', 'Terminale', and 'Autres pays'. A theme selection box is open, showing 'THEME: L'Univers en mouvement et le temps France - Niveau 10 (Seconde) - Physique' with sub-options for 'Approche microscopique en chimie' and 'Mécanique'. On the left, a sidebar lists 'Partie n°1' through 'Partie n°5', 'Activité 1' through 'Activité 7', 'Exercice 1' through 'Exercice 9', 'DS 2', and 'Modèle 1'. The main content area displays 'Activité 1: Introduction de la notion d'action.' with a diagram of a stone suspended from a support by an elastic string. The text describes the materials and asks questions about the forces acting on the stone. Below the text are five buttons: 'But', 'Préparation', 'Corrigé', 'Savoir', and 'Comportement des élèves', along with a 'Version intégrale imprimable' button. A 'Ressources liées' section at the bottom lists three balises (M1, M3, E1) with their respective descriptions.

Figure 14. Window of the PEGASE website, giving the text of an activity (see translation in Figure 10) with five buttons of comments for teachers and links to relevant transversal 'markers' (balises in French)

165x116mm (300 x 300 DPI)

|   | <i>Students' knowledge</i>   |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Modelling</i>  | <i>Students' existing physics knowledge</i>  | <i>Already known everyday knowledge</i>          | <i>To be learnt in physics</i>  |
| <i>Theory/Model</i>   | Velocity<br>Uniform and non uniform motion<br><i>These concepts are taught just before the introduction of force (grade 10); assessments suggest that they are at least partially understood by students.</i>  | "Causality – Force"                              | Interactions<br>Force exerted by Sys A on Sys B<br>Laws of mechanics  |
| <i>Relationship between the 2 worlds (Theory/model, objects/events)</i> | An object is represented by a point, its trajectory by a line; and its mean velocity by the ratio of the distance between two positions of the point to the time taken to travel between them<br><i>Again, assessments suggest that students readily grasp the notion of mean velocity</i> | Force - motion                                   | Action – Force (without and with motion)  |
| <i>Objects/events</i>   | Situations with different motions<br><i>In physics, motionless situations are not treated as special cases; rather, they are particular situations where <math>v=0</math> on a continuum</i>   | Situations: great variety of motions, motionless | Action of one object on the other (without and with motion) and the reverse if contact between objects or at distance (Earth) |

Table 1: Design tool: "knowledge distance" in the case of action and force



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

**Progression in time of a task**      Time

→

|   |   |                   |     |  |
|---|---|-------------------|-----|--|
| <i>Sesames sequence</i>                         | Teacher's introduction                    | Small group work  | ← → | Classroom discussion, correction, Institutionalisation |
| <i>Usual physics teaching</i><br><i>Lecture</i> | Teacher's lecture<br>Institutionalisation | →                 | ←   | Teacher's lecture<br>Institutionalisation              |
| <i>Laboratory activity</i>                      | Teacher's introduction                    | Small groups work | ← → | Possible Classroom discussion                          |

19 Table 2: Didactical organisation in “usual physics teaching” and in a SESAMES sequence

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

|              | Types of knowledge   | Example: study of gases                                    |
|--------------|--|--|
| Theories     | 4. Formal theoretical principles   | Principles of thermodynamics                               |
|              | 3. Explanatory models  | Colliding elastic particle model                           |
| Observations | 2. Qualitative or mathematical descriptions of patterns in observations including empirical laws | $pV=kt$<br>(refers to observations of measuring apparatus) |
|              | 1. Primary-level data: observations  | Measurement of a single pressure change in a heated gas    |

Table 3: Four types of knowledge used in science (Rea-Ramirez et al. 2008, p.29)