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# Evolution of UW Physics Education Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early 1970’s:</td>
<td>K-12 teacher preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 1970’s:</td>
<td>Physics Education Research (PER) and Ph.D. program in Department of Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980’s:</td>
<td>Research-based development of curriculum for K-12 teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990’s onward:</td>
<td>Research-based development of curriculum for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• K-12 teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research-based professional development of TAs as instructors in undergraduate physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discipline-based research on learning and teaching

- differs from traditional education research (in which emphasis is on educational theory and methodology)
- focuses on student understanding of science content
- is an important field for scholarly inquiry by science faculty in science departments

*can be an effective approach for improving student learning (K–20+)*
Perspective on teaching as a science (as well as an art)

Results from documented research

indicate:
  • many students encounter same conceptual and reasoning difficulties
  • same instructional strategies are effective for many students

are:
  • generalizable beyond a particular course, instructor, or institution
  • reproducible

become:
  • publicly shared knowledge that provides a basis for acquisition of new knowledge and for cumulative improvement of instruction

constitute:
  • a rich resource for improving instruction
Criteria for effectiveness of instruction

**Teaching as an art**

- Motivational effect of personal qualities and style of instructor
- Instructor’s subjective assessment of student learning
- Student enthusiasm and self-assessment of learning
- Student evaluations of the course or instructor

*Criteria are not tightly linked to student learning.*

**Teaching as a science**

- Assessment of student learning by specified intellectual outcomes

*Criterion is student learning.*
Physics Education Group

Goal: ongoing cumulative improvement in
– research base on student understanding of physics
– undergraduate instruction (introductory and beyond)
– K-12 teacher preparation (preservice and inservice)
– professional development (grad. students, post-docs, faculty)

within culture and constraints
of research-oriented physics department

Perspective:
– Research in physics education is a science.
Physics Education Group

Procedures:

– conduct systematic investigations
– apply results (e.g., develop instructional strategies)
– assess effectiveness (e.g., through pre- and post-testing)
– document methods and results so that they can be replicated
– report results at meetings and in papers

The procedures are characteristic of an empirical applied science.
Systematic investigations of student learning (at the beginning, during, and after instruction)

• **individual demonstration interviews**
  – for probing student understanding in depth

• **written questions with explanations**
  (pretests and post-tests)
  – for ascertaining prevalence of specific difficulties
  – for assessing effectiveness of instruction

• **descriptive studies during instruction**
  – for providing insights to guide curriculum development
Application of research to development of curriculum

- Research
- Curriculum Development
- Instruction at UW
- Instruction at pilot sites
Research-based curriculum development

Preparing precollege teachers to teach physics and physical science

– Physics by Inquiry –
(John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1996)

Self-contained, laboratory-based, no lectures

Improving student learning in introductory physics

– Tutorials in Introductory Physics –
(Prentice Hall, 2002)

Supplementary to lecture-based course
Examples in two different contexts

- Electric circuits
- Mechanics
Investigation of student understanding: an example from electric circuits


What students *could* do

Solve many end-of-chapter circuit problems by applying Kirchhoff’s rules
What students could *not* do

The bulbs are identical. The batteries are identical and ideal.
Rank the bulbs from brightest to dimmest. Explain.

Correct response given by ~ 15%

- students in calculus-based physics (N > 1000)
- high school physics teachers
- university faculty in other sciences and mathematics

given by ~ 70%

- graduate TA’s and postdocs in physics (N ~ 100)

*Results independent of whether administered before or after instruction in standard lecture courses*

Answer: A = D = E > B = C
Generalizations on learning and teaching

inferred and validated

by research and development of

Physics by Inquiry and
Tutorials in Introductory Physics

serve as a practical guide in ongoing iterative process
of curriculum development
Facility in solving standard quantitative problems is not an adequate criterion for functional understanding.*

Questions that require qualitative reasoning and verbal explanations are essential for assessing student learning.

Such questions are an effective strategy for helping students learn.

*Ability to apply concepts and reasoning to situations not explicitly memorized
Similiar situation at other universities (e.g., Harvard University; Eric Mazur)

Paired examination questions

When the switch is closed, do the following increase, decrease, or stay the same?

• intensities
• \( i_{\text{bat}} \)
• voltage drops

Student performance substantially worse on conceptual problem.
Certain conceptual difficulties are not overcome by traditional instruction. (Advanced study may not increase student understanding of basic concepts.)

Persistent conceptual difficulties must be explicitly addressed.
Examples of persistent conceptual difficulties with electric circuits

- belief that the battery is a constant current source
- belief that current is “used up” in a circuit

Basic underlying difficulty
- lack of a conceptual model for an electric circuit
Important note:
Use of term ‘misconception’ may trivialize the problem

Concepts in physics are interrelated. They cannot be ‘fixed’ in isolation.
A coherent conceptual framework is not typically an outcome of traditional instruction.

Students need to go through the reasoning involved in the process of constructing scientific models and applying them to predict and to explain real world phenomena.
On certain types of qualitative questions, student performance is essentially the same over a wide range of student ability:

- before and after standard instruction
- in calculus-based and algebra-based courses
- with and without standard demonstrations
- with and without standard laboratory
- in large and small classes
- regardless of popularity of the instructor

Hearing lectures, reading textbooks, seeing demonstrations, doing homework, and performing laboratory experiments often have little effect on student learning.
Teaching by telling is an ineffective mode of instruction for most students.

Teaching by questioning can be more effective.

Students must be intellectually active to develop a functional understanding.
Evidence from research indicates a gap

Instructor

Student

Curriculum

Gap greater than most instructors realize
Traditional instruction in physics:

* is based on perspective of university instructors
  * present understanding of physics
  * belief they can “transmit” knowledge to students and teachers
  * personal perception of students and teachers

* ignores differences between physicists and students
  * small for future physicists and some K-12 teachers
  * large for most students and most K-12 teachers

As a result, students often:

* tend to view physics as a collection of facts and formulas
* make less progress on concepts and reasoning than they could
Need for a different instructional approach

guided inquiry

Physics by Inquiry
and
Tutorials in Introductory Physics
Instruction by guided inquiry:
an example from the Electric Circuits module in Physics by Inquiry

• Students construct a conceptual model for an electric circuit based on their observations through “hands on” experience with batteries and bulbs. (i.e., develop a mental picture and a set of rules to predict and explain the behavior of simple circuits)

• Questions that require qualitative reasoning and verbal explanations guide development of a functional understanding.

• Curriculum explicitly addresses conceptual and reasoning difficulties identified through research

Example of instructional strategy: elicit, confront, resolve
apply, reflect, generalize
Assessment of student learning

Virtually all teachers (K-12) develop a model that they can apply to relatively complicated dc circuits.

\[ E > A = B > C = D \]
Application of research and teaching experience to large introductory course

Challenge

to improve student learning in standard physics courses
(constraints of large class size, breadth of coverage, and fast pace)

Need

to secure mental engagement of students
(at a sufficiently deep level)

Requirement

to develop a practical, flexible, sustainable approach
(acceptable to physics faculty)
Response

improve instruction in introductory physics through cumulative, incremental change
(evolution not revolution)

• by recognizing the constraints imposed by lecture-based courses

• by developing research-based tutorials that supplement standard instruction with a modified version of the intellectual experience provided by *Physics by Inquiry*

• by implementing weekly, small-group tutorials that foster development of reasoning ability

*Tutorials in Introductory Physics*
Tutorials respond to the research question:

Is standard presentation of a basic topic in textbook or lecture adequate to develop a functional understanding?

(i.e., the ability to do the reasoning necessary to apply relevant concepts and principles in situations not explicitly studied)

If not,

what needs to be done?
Emphasis in tutorials is on

• constructing concepts
• developing reasoning ability
• relating physics formalism to real world

not on

• solving standard quantitative problems
Context (at UW) for tutorials

Each week:

– 3 lectures (50 minutes)
– 1 laboratory (2-3 hours)
– 1 tutorial (50 minutes)

Use at other institutions can vary, depending on constraints.
(e.g., class size, room availability, number of lecturers, number of TAs or peer-instructors, etc.)
Tutorial Components

• weekly pretests
  – given usually after lecture on relevant material but before tutorial

• tutorial sessions or interactive tutorial lectures
  – small groups (3-4) work through carefully structured worksheets
  – tutorial instructors question students in semi-socratic manner

• tutorial homework

• examination questions
  – all examinations include questions as post-tests on tutorial topics

• required weekly seminar for tutorial instructors
  – TA’s, peer instructors, etc.
  – preparation in content and instructional method
Many iterations of curriculum are required to:

- to clarify the nature, persistence, and inter-relationship of specific student difficulties
- to produce consistent, long-term gains in student learning

*Research-based ≠ Research-validated*
NFW Example: a tutorial from mechanics

Pretest
Motivation for Tutorial
Part I of Tutorial
Part II of Tutorial
Assessment of student learning
NFW Example:
a tutorial from mechanics

Pretest
NFW Example:
a tutorial from mechanics

Pretest

Motivation for Tutorial
Motivation for tutorial

*Investigation of student understanding of the impulse-momentum and work-energy theorems*

- **Individual Demonstration Interviews (1981 - 1984)**
  - 12 students in honors calculus-based physics
  - 16 students in algebra-based physics
  

- **Descriptive Study & Curriculum Development (1991-present)**
  - 1400 students in calculus-based physics
  
Apparatus used in Individual Demonstration Interviews

Pucks are pushed with constant force between starting and finishing lines by steady stream of air.
Tasks

- After crossing the finish line, do the brass (B) and plastic (P) pucks have the same or different:
  - kinetic energy?
  - momentum?
Criterion for understanding

Ability to apply work-energy and impulse-momentum theorems to a simple real motion

Correct Response:

\[ K_B = K_P \quad because \quad \Delta K = F\Delta x \]
\[ p_B > p_P \quad because \quad \Delta p = F\Delta t \]
Results from interview tasks and written questions

Correct explanation required for responses to be counted as correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct on:</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Written questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honors physics (N = 12)</td>
<td>Algebra-based physics (N = 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinetic energy comparison</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momentum comparison</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connections among concepts, formal representations (algebraic, diagrammatic, graphical, etc.) and the real world are often lacking after traditional instruction.

Students need repeated practice in interpreting physics formalism and relating it to the real world.
Example of intervention during interview

I: ...What ideas do you have about the term work?

S: Well, the definition that they give you is that it is the amount of force applied times the distance.

I: Okay. Is that related at all to what we’ve seen here? How would you apply that to what we’ve seen here?

S: Well, you do a certain amount of work on it for the distance between the two green lines: you are applying a force for that distance, and after that point it’s going at a constant velocity with no forces acting on it.

I: Okay, so do we do the same amount of work on the two pucks or different?

S: We do the same amount.

I: Does that help us decide about the kinetic energy or the momentum?

S: Well, work equals the change in kinetic energy, so you are going from zero kinetic energy to a certain amount afterwards ... so work is done on each one ... ... but the velocities and masses are different so they (the kinetic energies) are not necessarily the same.

Incomplete causal reasoning
◊ Short responses (even if correct) do not necessarily indicate understanding.

There is a need for probing.
Incorrect Comparison

Incorrect Reasoning

$$p_P = p_B \quad (\text{instead of } p_P < p_B)$$

Common incorrect explanations:

- compensation: $\text{(small } m\text{)} \cdot \text{(large } v\text{)} = \text{(large } m\text{)} \cdot \text{(small } v\text{)}$
- ‘momentum is conserved’ (memorized rule)
- same $F$ so same momentum (and same kinetic energy)

$$K_P > K_B \quad (\text{instead of } K_P = K_B)$$

Common incorrect explanation:

- compensation: $\text{(small } m\text{)} \cdot \text{(large } v^2\text{)} > \text{(large } m\text{)} \cdot \text{(small } v^2\text{)}$
Correct Comparison

Incorrect Reasoning

\[ K_P = K_B \]

Common incorrect explanations

- compensation: \((\text{small } m) \cdot (\text{large } v^2) = (\text{large } m) \cdot (\text{small } v^2)\)
- ‘energy is conserved’ (memorized rule)
- same \(F\) so same kinetic energies

Right answers for wrong reasons
Compensation arguments often used by students

Theorems treated as mathematical identities

Cause-effect relationships not understood
Need for tutorial on work-energy and impulse-momentum theorems
Facility in solving standard quantitative problems is not an adequate criterion for functional understanding.

Questions that require qualitative reasoning and verbal explanations are essential for assessing student learning.

Questions that probe student understanding may often be transformed into effective instructional strategies.

*Improvement during some interviews suggested a basic design for the tutorial.*
Example of a research-based tutorial
From *Tutorials in Introductory Physics*

*Changes in energy and momentum*
Tutorial: Changes in energy and momentum

• Start on Section II, page 3 (Part I has been discussed)
• Work in groups of 4
• Discuss your answers and your reasoning with your partners
• Use large sheets of paper to record drawings and answers. Please draw diagrams LARGE.

Tutorial intended for use after students have studied all relevant concepts (work, kinetic energy, momentum, etc.)

Students would have completed various tutorials on kinematics, forces, work, energy, and momentum)
Commentary on tutorial:  
Changes in energy and momentum

Part I: Application of theorems in one dimension

(Guides students through the reasoning to answer pretest)

Part II: Application in more than one dimension

(Guides students in applying theorems in more complicated situation in order to strengthen their conceptual understanding – as well as their ability to reason with vectors.)
Assessment of effect of tutorial on student understanding of changes in energy and momentum (in one dimension)

Comparison of pretest and post-test results from UW calculus-based course
Examples of questions used for assessment

**Pretest**

- Start
- Finish
- \( \vec{F} \) to \( B \)
- \( \vec{F} \) to \( P \)
- same \( \Delta x \)
- frictionless table

\[ m_B > m_P \]
\[ v_0 = 0 \]
Same F

**Post-test**

- Start
- Finish
- \( \vec{F} \) to \( B \)
- \( \vec{F} \) to \( P \)
- same \( \Delta t \)
- frictionless table

\[ m_B > m_P \]

Compare final K and p.

**Pretest**

- K:
  - Same \( F\Delta x \) \( \rightarrow \) \( K_B = K_P \)

- p:
  - (Same \( \Delta x \) so brass takes longer. Thus)
    - \( * \) \( F\Delta t_B > F\Delta t_P \) \( \rightarrow \) \( p_B > p_P \)

**Post-test**

- (Same \( \Delta t \) so brass does not go as far. Thus)
  - \( * \) \( F\Delta x_B < F\Delta x_P \) \( \rightarrow \) \( K_B < K_P \)

- Same \( F\Delta t \) \( \rightarrow \) \( p_B = p_P \)
Results from pretest and post-tests
UW Introductory Calculus-based Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct with correct explanation</th>
<th>Pretest (same Δx)</th>
<th>Post-test (same Δt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After lecture</td>
<td>After lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before tutorial</td>
<td>and tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N = 985 )</td>
<td>( N = 435 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( K ) comparison</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p ) comparison</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results on other post-tests consistent
## Results from pretest and post-tests

### Physics TA’s at UW and faculty in national workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct with correct explanation</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TA’s</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>TA’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before tutorial</td>
<td>Before tutorial</td>
<td>After tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 74</td>
<td>N = 382</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K comparison</td>
<td>Same $\Delta x$</td>
<td>same $\Delta x$</td>
<td>$\Delta t_P \neq \Delta t_B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$\Delta x_P \neq \Delta x_B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>95%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All 20 gave correct comparisons but one gave no explanation.
Comparison of in-depth and broad assessment of student understanding
Mechanics Baseline Test (MBT) published in *The Physics Teacher*

- Two of the multiple-choice test questions were based on the UW comparison (pretest) tasks.

- Results from 8 groups of students at other universities and high schools reported in *TPT*.

- UW results near bottom of range reported in *TPT*.

Nationally reported MBT results and UW pretest results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBT results after standard instruction*</th>
<th>UW Pretest after standard instruction (but before tutorial)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 1100</td>
<td>N = 985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K comparison</strong></td>
<td><strong>p comparison</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% - 70%</td>
<td>30% - 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In some instances, instruction before the MBT included the tasks.
Why were UW results near the bottom of the range of MBT results?

- **MBT is multiple-choice**
- **UW pretest requires explanations**

Reassessed UW results ignoring explanations.
With explanations ignored,

- pretest results at UW after traditional instruction are consistent with nationally reported MBT results.

- post-test results at UW after tutorial and lecture are at or above the top of the nationally reported MBT results. The tutorial:
  - helps students understand the theorems
  - is an opportunity to strengthen ability to reason
Nationally reported MBT results and UW post-test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBT results after instruction</th>
<th>UW Post-test after lecture and tutorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same $\Delta x$</td>
<td>same $\Delta t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 1100$</td>
<td>$N = 435$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanations?</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>considered</th>
<th>ignored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K$ comparison</td>
<td>10% - 70%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ comparison</td>
<td>30% - 70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With explanations ignored, UW post-test results for motion in one dimension are at the top of the nationally reported MBT results.
Assessment of student learning

Effect of tutorials on student performance

On qualitative problems:
  – much better

On quantitative problems:
  – typically somewhat better
  – sometimes much better

On retention:
  – sometimes much better

despite less time devoted to solving standard problems
Answers without explanations are not a good measure of student understanding.

Explanations of reasoning must be required on homework and examinations in order to assess student understanding.
Advanced study often does not result in a functional understanding of basic concepts.

Need for systematic preparation of tutorial instructors.
Practical criterion for effectiveness of a tutorial:

Post-test performance of introductory students matches (or surpasses) pretest performance of graduate students.
Growth in reasoning ability does not result from traditional instruction.

Scientific reasoning skills must be expressly cultivated.

Increasing the emphasis on reasoning can raise standards for student learning and does not “dumb down” a science course.
The tutorials are an example of how, with a small time allotment, a research-based and research-validated curriculum can help develop the type of qualitative understanding that can:

- make physics meaningful for students
- provide a foundation for quantitative problem solving
- develop scientific reasoning ability

For most students, the most important intellectual benefit from introductory physics is the development of scientific reasoning ability.