

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a doctoral thesis by

HSIA-PO VINCENT KUO

And have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by the final
examining committee have been made.

PATRICIA HELLER

Advisor

Signature

Date

GRADUATE SCHOOL

AN EXPLANATORY MODEL OF PHYSICS FACULTY CONCEPTIONS
ABOUT THE PROBLEM-SOLVING PROCESS

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY
HSIA-PO VINCENT KUO

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PATRICIA HELLER, ADVISOR

August, 2004

B

© HSIA-PO VINCENT KUO, 2004

DEDICATION

To my parents, Chin-Yi and Yueh-Hsi, for their unwavering love and support throughout this long journey.

To my brother and sister, Andy and Kaitlyn, for putting up with my sometimes eccentric personality during this process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many people whose time, effort, and support were greatly appreciated in the completion of this dissertation.

I thank my advisor, Dr. Patricia Heller, for her guidance and support during this project. She has taught me the meaning of conducting quality research.

I thank Dr. Kenneth Heller for his continual discussion, advice, and encouragement. He has taught me to think analytically about issues, as well as how to give a good presentation.

I thank Dr. Charles Henderson and Dr. Edit Yerushalmi for their insights during the first stage of this research program. I have learned much from working with them, and through our conversations about analysis techniques and qualifying interpretations.

I thank my various committee members, Dr. Charles Campbell, Dr. E. Dan Dahlberg, Dr. Fred Finley, and Dr. Frances Lawrenz, for many helpful conversations throughout this project.

I thank Dr. Thomas Thaden-Koch and Paul Knutson for their help. Conversations with them throughout this dissertation had made me clarify my own thoughts and made my writing more coherent.

Finally, I thank the 30 instructors who agreed to be interviewed as part of this research program, and for their willingness to talk about their views of problem solving.

ABSTRACT

One commonly stated instructor goal for an introductory calculus-based physics course is to improve students' problem solving skills. There is, however, a growing body of research evidence to suggest that this goal is not frequently accomplished in a typical college or university physics course. In response to this evidence, researchers and curriculum developers have developed a wide variety of curricular materials and instructional strategies that have been shown to be more effective in improving student problem solving performance. In spite of the availability of these curricular materials and instructional strategies, relatively few physics instructors have chosen to use them. One likely reason is that these curricular materials and instructional strategies do not align with, and perhaps are in conflict with, the ways that physics instructors think about the teaching and learning of problem solving. This has led the Physics Education Research and Development Group at the University of Minnesota to undertake a long-term, multi-stage research program to understand physics instructors' conceptions about the teaching and learning of problem solving.

In the first stage, semi-structured interviews with higher education physics instructors in Minnesota were conducted. The interview was designed around three types of concrete instructional artifacts (3 instructor solutions, 5 student solutions, 4 types of problems) that were all based on a single introductory physics problem. The interview included specific questions relating to a particular instructional artifact as well as more general questions. Based on an in-depth analysis of interview transcripts, concept maps were constructed to describe a model of the way that each instructor conceives of the teaching and learning of problem solving. These individual models were combined to form a composite model that describes the range and nature of conceptions for the instructors. The first stage analyzed the interview transcripts of six physics instructors from a research university, and an initial explanatory model was developed. Part of this initial model identified 3 different ways that these instructors conceive of the problem-solving process. Around the same time, interviews were also conducted with 24

additional instructors from community colleges, state universities, and private colleges in Minnesota.

The current study is the second stage of that research program. The goal of this current study is to modify, expand, and refine the part of the initial explanatory model dealing with instructor conceptions about the problem-solving process using interviews with the 24 additional physics instructors. The qualitative analysis procedure of this current study will be a variation of the Grounded Model Construction and Explicit Analysis methods suggested by Clement (2000). The first phases of this analysis will utilize the interviews with the 24 additional instructors. In the first phase, the initial explanatory model will be modified and expanded by adding and/or modifying the different conceptions about the problem-solving process. The second phase of this analysis will be the refinement of the details and descriptions of the modified and expanded conceptions. Concept maps were used both as an analysis tool and to schematically represent instructors' conceptions.

The refined explanatory model of instructor conceptions about the problem-solving process developed in this current study consisted of two qualitatively different conceptions. A third conception of the problem-solving process was also identified in this sample, but it was idiosyncratic, and did not consist of any descriptions of a process. As such, it did not provide very much information for further analysis and comparison. Of the two conceptions that included descriptions of a process, not one instructor expressed both conceptions. Although the instructors in these two conceptions used similar wording in describing various parts of the problem-solving process, they differed in the underlying nature of what problem solving entails. One group of instructors conceived of the problem-solving process in introductory calculus-based physics as linear decision-making. Another group of instructors conceived of the problem-solving process as cyclical decision-making. Furthermore, the instructors in these two conceptions of the problem-solving process also differed in their views of the thinking processes that underlie successful problem solving.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER 1: Introduction.....	1
Background.....	3
Problem Solving.....	3
Differences between Expert and Novice Problem Solvers.....	3
Summary of the Initial Explanatory Model.....	4
Model Generation and Testing.....	8
Research Questions.....	10
Methodology.....	10
Designing the Interview.....	10
Sample.....	11
Data Collection Procedure.....	12
Data Analysis.....	12
Addressing Sub-Question 1.....	13
Addressing Sub-Question 2.....	14
Addressing Sub-Question 3.....	15
Implications.....	16
Theoretical Implications.....	16
Practical Implications.....	16
Limitations.....	18
The Research Team.....	18
Important Terminology.....	19
Overview of This Dissertation.....	21

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review	22
Research on Teaching.....	22
Teachers' Cognitions	23
Teachers' Decision-Making.....	23
Preactive Thinking.....	24
Interactive Thinking.....	25
Summary of Research on Teaching.....	27
Research on Teacher's Conceptions	28
General Conceptions.....	31
Conceptions of Teaching and Learning	31
Conceptions of Subject Matter.....	34
Conceptions of the Teaching Context.....	36
The Teaching Cycle	37
Teachers' Context-Specific Conceptions.....	38
Expertise In Teaching	40
Reflection.....	42
Summary of Research on Teachers' Conceptions	43
Research on Problem Solving.....	44
Problem Solving.....	44
Metacognition	46
Differences Between Expert and Novice Problem Solvers	49
Differences in Knowledge	49
Differences in Approaches to Problem Solving.....	50

Strategies Designed to Improve Student Problem Solving.....	51
Problem-Solving Framework.....	51
“Real” Problems.....	54
Concept Maps	55
Guided Practice.....	56
Summary of Strategies Developed to Improve Student Problem Solving.....	56
CHAPTER 3: Methods.....	58
Goals of the Study.....	58
Overview of the Initial Explanatory Model of the Problem-Solving Process	59
Overview of Methodology.....	62
Phenomenography.....	62
Phenomenography versus Phenomenology	62
Convergent Studies	63
Development of the Interview Tool.....	64
Artifact Set I: Instructor Solutions.....	65
Artifact Set II: Student Solutions.....	65
Artifact Set III: Problem Types.....	66
Interview Protocol.....	66
Data Collection	67
Scheduling and Conducting the Interviews	67
Sample.....	68
Data Analysis	71
Transcription of the Interviews.....	71

Analysis of the Interview Data for the Exploratory Study	71
Selection of Parts of the Interview to Analyze	75
Units of Analysis.....	76
Breaking the Transcripts into Statements	77
Individual Concept Maps.....	81
Refining the Explanatory Model of the Problem-Solving Process.....	86
Generation of the Composite Map.....	86
Post Hoc Analysis: Metacognitive Processes	93
Viability of the Explanatory Model	98
Internal Consistency.....	98
External Consistency	101
Summary.....	103
CHAPTER 4: Results and Conclusions	105
Concept Map Symbols.....	105
Refining the Explanatory Model of the Problem-Solving Process.....	108
Sub-Question 1: Qualitatively Different Conceptions of the Problem-Solving Process	108
Overview of the Qualitatively Different Conceptions in the Initial Explanatory Model	108
Qualitatively Different Conceptions in the Refined Explanatory Model	110
Refined Explanatory Model: Answers to Sub-Question 1.....	115
Summary of Conception 1	115
Summary of Conception 2	115
Summary of Conception 3	116

Sub-Question 2: Details in the Refined Explanatory Model	117
Details of the Major Components in the Linear Conception	118
Metacognition in the Linear Conception	121
Details of the Major Components in the Cyclical Conception	124
Metacognition in the Cyclical Conception	126
Metacognition in the Problem-Solving Process.....	129
Different Types of Metacognition	129
Comparison of Metacognition between the Linear and Cyclical Conceptions.....	132
Percentage of statements.....	132
Different Phrasings of Metacognition.....	135
Refined Explanatory Model: Answers to Sub-Question 2.....	142
Summary of the Details in the Refined Explanatory Model.....	142
Summary of the Role of Metacognition.....	143
Sub-Question 3: Viability of the Explanatory Model.....	145
Internal Consistency.....	145
External Consistency	148
External Consistency Check 1	148
External Consistency Check 2	149
External Consistency Check 3	149
Refined Explanatory Model: Answers to Sub-Question 3.....	152
Summary.....	153
CHAPTER 5: Implications	155
Summary of the study.....	155

Limitations	156
Theoretical Implications	157
Methodological Implications	158
Relation to Prior Research	159
Practical Implications.....	161
Future Studies	165
REFERENCES.....	167
APPENDICES.....	182
Appendix A: Interview Artifacts	183
Set I: 3 Instructor Solutions	184
Set II: 5 Student Solutions	188
Set III: 4 Problem Types.....	194
Appendix B: Interview Protocol.....	199
Appendix C: Packet Mailed to Interviewee Prior to Interview.....	207
Cover Letter	208
Homework Problem.....	210
Background Questionnaire.....	212
Appendix D: Consent Form.....	217

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Initial Explanatory Model – Solve Physics Problems. The dashed box outlines the concepts that three instructors used to describe the details of the linear decision-making process	6
Figure 1-2: Cyclical process of generation and modification in the development of explanatory models (adopted from Clement, 2000, p. 554).....	8
Figure 2-1: Model of teachers’ interactive decision-making during interactive teaching.	26
Figure 2-2: Framework for understanding research on teaching	29
Figure 2-3: Taken from Fernandez et. al. (1973), this problem-solving framework emphasizes the dynamic and cyclical nature of the problem-solving activity. The framework starts at the upper left-hand corner, and proceeds clockwise. The dashed lines represent the “backtracking” between each step, and the oval in the middle represents the necessary regulatory metacognitive processes that are embedded throughout the whole problem-solving process	54
Figure 3-1: Initial Explanatory Model - Solving Physics Problems (6 instructors)	61
Figure 3-2: Problem upon which interview artifacts were based (Homework Problem) ..	64
Figure 3-3: A piece of the interview transcript from interview situation I, question #3 ...	73
Figure 3-4: Example of how concept mapping was used differently in this study as compared to its traditional form. The map on the left represents the application of concept mapping used in this study. Each box contains a whole statement, or conception. The map on the right represents what the same information would look like when applied in the traditional form. Each box usually contains only a single word to indicate a concept. The different shape boxes on the right represent active and passive concepts.	82
Figure 3-5: Procedure for Developing an Individual Concept Map	83
Figure 3-6: Individual concept map of the problem-solving process for Instructor 3	85
Figure 3-7: Individual concept map of the Problem-Solving Process for Instructor 16....	89
Figure 3-8: Individual concept map of the Problem-Solving Process for Instructor 17....	90
Figure 3-9: Individual concept map of the Problem-Solving Process for Instructor 27....	91
Figure 3-10: One branch of the Composite Map of the Problem-Solving Process	92
Figure 3-11: Procedure for analysis of metacognition.....	94
Figure 4-1: Concept Map Symbols	107
Figure 4-2: Refined Explanatory Model – Problem-Solving Process (30 Instructors)....	114
Figure 4-3: More detailed concept map for the Linear Decision-Making Process conception	120

Figure 4-4: Linear Decision-Making Process concept map with Metacognition	123
Figure 4-5: More detailed concept map for the Cyclical Decision-Making Process conception	125
Figure 4-6: Cyclical Decision-Making Process concept map with Metacognition	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: Summary of the qualitatively different conceptions of the problem-solving process in the Initial Explanatory Model	7
Table 3-1: Demographic information for 30 interview participants from various higher educational institutions in the state of Minnesota.....	70
Table 3-2: Statements made from a portion of the interview transcript with Instructor number 3	79
Table 3-3: Coding of metacognition with statements made from a portion of the interview transcript with Instructor 3.....	95
Table 3-4: Metacognitive phrasing for Instructor 3. Italic statement was idiosyncratic to this instructor	97
Table 3-5: Ranking scale for individual concept maps. Ranking consists of criteria based on quantity and quality of details about “Requirements”, “Reasons”, “Secondary Clarifications”, and “Interconnections”.....	100
Table 4-1: Summary of the qualitatively different conceptions of the problem-solving process.....	113
Table 4-2: Comparisons of the qualitatively different conceptions of the problem-solving process.....	116
Table 4-3: Summary of number and type of statements made by each of the 30 physics instructors.....	131
Table 4-4: Percentage of each type of statement with respect to the total number of problem solving statements for each instructor that expressed the Linear conception (N = 22).....	134
Table 4-5: Percentage of each type of statement with respect to the total number of problem solving statements for each instructor that expressed the Cyclical conception (N = 7)	134
Table 4-6: Metacognitive phrasings about <i>planning</i> and the percentages of instructors who expressed each respective phrasing within each qualitatively different conception of the problem-solving process. The dark lines separate metacognitive phrasings that are related to similar components of the problem-solving process. .	140
Table 4-7: Metacognitive phrasings about <i>monitoring</i> and the percentages of instructors who expressed each respective phrasing within each qualitatively different conception of the problem-solving process. The dark lines separate metacognitive phrasings that are related to similar components of the problem-solving process. .	141
Table 4-8: Metacognitive phrasings about <i>monitoring</i> and the percentages of instructors who expressed each respective phrasing within each qualitatively different conception of the problem-solving process.	141

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart 3-1: Count of statements relevant to the Problem-Solving Process sorted by Interview Question number for all six research university instructors	76
Chart 4-1: Comparison of the percentages for the three different types of metacognition between the Linear and Cyclical conceptions.....	133
Chart 4-2: Ranking of the concept maps in the Linear and Cyclical conceptions. The numbers represent the percentage of the concept maps within each conception that was ranked along the respective scale	146
Chart 4-3: Rating of importance for the goal of Quantitative Problem Solving. The numbers represent the percentage of the instructors within each conception that rated along the respective scale.....	150
Chart 4-4: Rating of importance for the goal of Qualitative Problem Solving. The numbers represent the percentage of the instructors within each conception that rated along the respective scale.....	150
Chart 4-5: Liking for example Instructor Solutions. The numbers represent the percentage of the instructors within each conception that expressed their liking for a particular Instructor Solution.	151