# THE EFFECT OF A STRUCTURED PROBLEM SOLVING STRATEGY ON PERFORMANCE AND CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING IN PHYSICS:

#### A STUDY IN DISADVANTAGED SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS

by

**Estelle Gaigher** 

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

PhD (Science Education)

in the Faculty of Natural & Agricultural Science

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

December 2004

#### **SUMMARY**

Title: The effect of a structured problem solving strategy on performance and

conceptual understanding in physics: A study in disadvantaged South African

schools

Student: Estelle Gaigher

Supervisor: Professor J.M. Rogan

Co-Supervisor: Professor M.W.H. Braun

Department: Physics

Degree: PhD (Science Education)

This study extended existing research on structured problem solving into disadvantaged South African classrooms. Sixteen disadvantaged urban South African high schools participated in a quasi-experimental study to investigate the effect of a structured problem solving strategy in physics on performance and conceptual understanding. The schools were disadvantaged with regard to standards set by the apartheid education system as well as by instruction in English, the second language of the students and most of the teachers. The problem solving strategy incorporated the use of different representations, group work, verbal arguments, written explanations, planning and interpretation of solutions. The strategy was implemented by a cascading model, where the researcher interacted with the teachers, while the teachers interacted with students. The treatment was non-disruptive of the normal school routine. The problem solving strategy was applied throughout the year while learning new content; there were no extra classes or additional work for learners. Normal classroom tests and examinations were utilized as sources of quantitative data.

The treatment group outperformed the control group by 8 % in the midyear examination; this increased average score was statistically significant at the .001 level, indicating enhanced problem solving skills. Evidence of enhanced conceptual understanding was found by analyzing solutions presented in the midyear examination, videotaped problem solving and responses to questionnaires. Two new techniques were developed to assess conceptual understanding. Firstly, "solutions maps" were constructed for specific examination problems. These maps were visual

representations of concepts, formulae, assumptions, substitutions and numerical answers presented by students. The popularity of various routes on the maps was compared for the two groups as a measure of differences in conceptual understanding. Secondly, a "conceptual index" was defined to quantify the extent to which a group of students used a conceptual approach in their solutions, as opposed to an algebraic approach. Learners and teachers regarded the structured problem solving strategy as a viable practice, they believed the students' problem-solving skills were improved and they commented on the value of the strategy as a facilitator of understanding the language and concepts of physics. Teachers also believed that their own problem solving skills improved.

Greeno's model for scientific problem solving and reasoning was incorporated to explain the effect of structured problem solving on performance and conceptual understanding. Two complementary theories were offered to explain the results of the study. It was proposed that implementing the strategy fostered (1) the co-development of conceptual understanding and problem solving skills, and (2) the development of a conceptual approach to problem solving.

Implementation of structured problem solving is a small intervention aimed at developing new habits of problem solving. In the South African context, it can make a significant contribution towards the enhancement of learning and teaching physics in disadvantaged schools.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all those who had been involved in this project.

- The teachers and learners who participated in this project.
- The Gauteng Department of Education, for permission to conduct the research in public schools.
- My promoter, Professor John Rogan, for expert guidance and encouragement.
- Professor Max Braun, my co-promoter for support and suggestions.
- The National Research Foundation, in collaboration with the National Science Foundation for a grant to continue my research for a period of three months in the USA.
- Professor Peter Hewson, who acted as my mentor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Thank you for valuable discussions and critical evaluation of my work.
- The Faculty of Education at the University of Pretoria, for granting three months study leave.
- The research group at the Center for Science Education at the University of Pretoria (later the Joint Center for Mathematics, Science and Technology Education), for stimulating discussions.
- The Science Education research group at the University of Wisconsin-Madison for stimulating discussions.
- Professor Gilbert Onwu and my colleagues in the Department of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education at the University of Pretoria for encouragement and support during the past year.
- Mrs Suzette Booyens of the Gauteng Department of Education, for introducing me to informal teacher support initiatives.
- My husband and family for encouragement, patience and support.

Dedicated to Horace

# **CONTENTS**

| Chapter 1 |                                                    | Introduction                                      | 1  |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.1       | Resea                                              | rch questions                                     | 1  |
| 1.2       | The S                                              | outh African context                              | 1  |
| 1.3       | Ration                                             | nale                                              | 6  |
| 1.4       | The ro                                             | ole of problem solving in physics                 | 8  |
| 1.5       | The st                                             | ructured problem solving strategy                 | 10 |
| 1.6       | Outlin                                             | ne of the study                                   | 12 |
| 1.7       | Limita                                             | ations                                            | 13 |
| 1.8       | Organ                                              | isation of the thesis                             | 14 |
| Chap      | oter 2                                             | Literature survey                                 | 15 |
| 2.1       | Proble                                             | em solving in physics by individuals              | 15 |
| 2.2       | Conce                                              | eptual understanding of physics                   | 18 |
| 2.3       | Instru                                             | Instructional strategies                          |    |
|           | 2.3.1                                              | Structured problem solving                        | 21 |
|           | 2.3.2                                              | Explicit problem solving                          | 22 |
|           | 2.3.3                                              | Structured problem solving and cooperative groups | 23 |
|           | 2.3.4                                              | The classroom based study of Huffman              | 24 |
|           | 2.3.5                                              | Modelling Instruction                             | 25 |
|           | 2.3.6                                              | Overview, Case Study Physics                      | 26 |
|           | 2.3.7                                              | Qualitative strategy writing                      | 26 |
|           | 2.3.8                                              | Summary                                           | 27 |
| 2.4       | Implications for science education in South Africa |                                                   | 28 |

| Chapter 3 |                                             | Theoretical framework                                          | 30 |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 3.1       | Green                                       | o's model for scientific problem solving                       | 30 |
| 3.2       | The p                                       | roblem solving strategy interpreted in terms of Greeno's model | 34 |
| Chap      | oter 4                                      | Research methodology                                           | 37 |
| 4.1       | Desig                                       | n of the study                                                 | 37 |
| 4.2       | Sample                                      |                                                                | 39 |
| 4.3       | Collec                                      | ction of data                                                  | 41 |
| 4.4       | Data a                                      | analysis                                                       | 43 |
|           | 4.4.1                                       | Quantitative                                                   | 43 |
|           | 4.4.2                                       | Qualitative                                                    | 43 |
| 4.5       | Instru                                      | ments                                                          | 44 |
|           | 4.5.1                                       | Reliability                                                    | 44 |
|           | 4.5.2                                       | Validity                                                       | 44 |
| 4.6       | Valid                                       | ity of the design                                              | 46 |
|           | 4.6.1                                       | Internal validity                                              | 46 |
|           | 4.6.2                                       | External validity                                              | 46 |
| Chap      | oter 5                                      | Results: quantitative                                          | 49 |
| 5.1       | Samp                                        | le profile                                                     | 49 |
| 5.2       | Test s                                      | cores                                                          | 51 |
| 5.3       | Pass r                                      | ate                                                            | 55 |
| 5.4       | Quant                                       | titative evidence of reliability and validity                  | 57 |
| 5.5       | Interactions with the treatment             |                                                                | 59 |
| 5.6       | Quantitative description of conceptualizing |                                                                | 61 |
| 5.7       | Chapt                                       | er summary                                                     | 65 |

| Chapter 6 |                             | Results: qualitative                                         | 67  |
|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 6.1       | Soluti                      | ons maps                                                     | 67  |
|           | 6.1.1                       | Work and energy                                              | 68  |
|           | 6.1.2                       | Kinematics                                                   | 76  |
|           | 6.1.3                       | Electrostatics                                               | 82  |
|           | 6.1.4                       | Solutions maps interpreted in terms of a conceptual approach | 86  |
|           | 6.1.5                       | Section summary                                              | 89  |
| 6.2       | Case studies: video session |                                                              | 90  |
|           | 6.2.1                       | The accelerating charge                                      | 92  |
|           | 6.2.2                       | The pendulum collision problem                               | 96  |
|           | 6.2.3                       | Section summary                                              | 104 |
| 6.3       | Questionnaires              |                                                              | 105 |
|           | 6.3.1                       | Treatment group's questionnaire                              | 106 |
|           | 6.3.2                       | Video group's questionnaire                                  | 107 |
|           | 6.3.3                       | Teachers' questionnaire                                      | 108 |
|           | 6.3.4                       | Section summary                                              | 109 |
| 6.4       | Chapt                       | er summary                                                   | 110 |
| Chap      | oter 7                      | Synthesis                                                    | 112 |
| 7.1       | Interp                      | retation of results                                          | 112 |
|           | 7.1.1                       | Claims                                                       | 112 |
|           | 7.1.2                       | The co-development of conceptual understanding and problem   |     |
|           |                             | solving skills                                               | 116 |
|           | 7.1.3                       | The development of a conceptual approach to problem solving  | 117 |
| 7.2       | Significance of the study   |                                                              | 118 |
|           | 7.2.1                       | Social knowledge construction                                | 118 |
|           | 7.2.2                       | Second language development                                  | 119 |
| 7.3       | Recor                       | nmendations                                                  | 120 |

| REFERENCES  APPENDIXES |                                                | 123 |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----|
|                        |                                                | 129 |
| 1.                     | Pre-test Pre-test                              | 130 |
| 2.                     | February test                                  | 130 |
| 3.                     | March test                                     | 131 |
| 4.                     | May test                                       | 132 |
| 5.                     | June examination                               | 133 |
| 6.                     | Treatment group's questionnaire                | 139 |
| 7.                     | Video group's questionnaire                    | 140 |
| 8.                     | Teacher's questionnaire                        | 141 |
| 9.                     | Examples of conceptual and algebraic solutions | 145 |

### LIST OF TABLES

| Table 3.1  | Knowledge of electric circuits in terms of Greeno's model                                                                                                                          | 33 |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 3.2  | Activities required by using the problem-solving strategy interpreted as translations between Greeno's four knowledge domains                                                      | 35 |
| Table 4.1  | School information                                                                                                                                                                 | 40 |
| Table 5.1  | Number of students taking tests throughout the study                                                                                                                               | 50 |
| Table 5.2  | Comparison of the average test and examination scores for the treatment and control groups.                                                                                        | 52 |
| Table 5.3  | Comparison of average scores obtained by the two groups for separate questions in the June examination.                                                                            | 54 |
| Table 5.4. | Pass rate in the pre-test and June examination                                                                                                                                     | 55 |
| Table 5.5. | Pre-test performance of the 48 candidates who passed the problem section of the June examination                                                                                   | 56 |
| Table 5.6  | Correlation coefficients for scores for the tests and the June exam as well as for the June and September examination                                                              | 58 |
| Table 5.7  | Average scores by gender in the problem section of the June examination                                                                                                            | 59 |
| Table 5.8  | Two-factor ANOVA table corresponding to the insignificant gender x treatment interaction                                                                                           | 60 |
| Table 5.9  | Two-factor ANOVA results showing no interactions with the treatment                                                                                                                | 61 |
| Table 5.10 | Contingency table showing the differences in the treatment and control group's problem solving approaches                                                                          | 63 |
| Table 5.11 | Contingency table showing problem solving performance in relation to problem-solving approach for the entire sample                                                                | 63 |
| Table 5.12 | Breakdown of student performance in the June exam in terms of approach to problem solving, showing the treatment group, control group as well as the difference between the groups | 64 |
| Table 6.1  | Comparison of conceptual fractions for the treatment and control groups for selected examples from the June examination                                                            | 87 |

### LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 3.1  | Greeno's four domains of knowledge for scientific problem solving, shown with connections between as well as within domains       | 32  |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 3.2  | Greeno's explanation of insulated algebraic problem solving                                                                       | 34  |
| Figure 5.1  | Pretest profile of all the candidates who passed the problem section of the June examination                                      | 56  |
| Figure 5.2  | Scatter plot to relate test results and the June exam scores                                                                      | 57  |
| Figure 5.3  | Scatter plot to relate September and the June exam scores                                                                         | 58  |
| Figure 5.4  | Illustration of the insignificant interaction between the treatment and gender                                                    | 60  |
| Figure 6.1  | Breakdown of students' solutions to the energy conservation problem                                                               | 71  |
| Figure 6.2  | Breakdown of students' solutions to the work-energy problem                                                                       | 74  |
| Figure 6.3  | Breakdown of students' solutions to the kinematics problem                                                                        | 80  |
| Figure 6.4  | Breakdown of students' solutions to the electrostatics problem                                                                    | 84  |
| Figure 6.5a | Comparison of the C-index for the correct solution and an inappropriate formula-based solution to the energy conservation problem | 88  |
| Figure 6.5b | Comparison of the C-index for the correct solution and an inappropriate formula-based solution to the electrostatics problem      | 88  |
| Figure 6.6  | Ntombi's solution to the problem of the accelerating charge in the video session                                                  | 94  |
| Figure 6.7a | First part of Sam's solution to the problem of the pendulum-collision in the video session                                        | 98  |
| Figure 6.7b | Second part of Sam's solution to the problem of the pendulum-collision in the video session                                       | 100 |
| Figure 6.8  | David's solution to the problem of the pendulum-collision in the video session                                                    | 103 |