

THE USE OF MODELS IN TEACHING NEWTONIAN MECHANICS

by

Ibrahim Abou Halloun

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 1984

THE USE OF MODELS IN TEACHING NEWTONIAN MECHANICS

by

Ibrahim Abou Halloun

has been approved

March 1984

APPROVED:

D. Hestenes, Chairperson
R. Keith VanLingen
Paul
Bee W. Searcy
Clement K. ...

Supervisory Committee

ACCEPTED:

C. Welch
Department Chairperson

Charles M. Wolf
Dean, Graduate College

ABSTRACT

The use of models in a student-centered teaching strategy is shown to improve the effectiveness of college physics instruction. The content of a college mechanics course is formulated as a theory of mathematical modeling with explicit construction and deployment rules. An accompanying teaching method that accounts for individual differences in students' preinstructional knowledge base is also formulated. Groups of college physics students were trained following the proposed strategy, and compared to control subjects taught by conventional methods. The comparison was made with respect to students' performance on course examinations and on a set of diagnostic tests. The diagnostic tests were validated to assess students' initial knowledge state and changes brought about by college physics instruction. Trained students are consistently shown to perform significantly better than control subjects both within and outside the context of the training program. A competence-performance comparison revealed that average and low competence students benefited most of the training.

To Thy Glory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
Preface	xiii
PART I: PROBLEM STATEMENT AND TEACHING STRATEGY.....	1
Introduction to Part I	2
Chapter 1: STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES IN LEARNING COLLEGE PHYSICS: EFFECT OF PREINSTRUCTIONAL KNOWLEDGE	5
1.1 Assessment of Students' Knowledge State Before and After Conventional Instruction of College Mechanics	6
STUDENTS' INITIAL KNOWLEDGE OF MECHANICS	8
1.2 Students' Common Sense Theories of Motion	10
1.2.1 Aristotelian Common Sense Theory	11
1.2.2 Impetus Common Sense Theory	13
1.3 Incoherence of Students' Common Sense Theories and Inconsistency of their Application	14
1.4 Resistance of Students' Common Sense Theories to Change in Conventional Physics Instruction	17
1.5 Effect of Students' Initial Knowledge of Mechanics on Their Performance in Conventional Physics Instruction	24
1.6 Catalog of Students' Common Sense Theories of Motion	27
1.6.1 General Concepts of Motion	28
1.6.2 Free Particle Motion	37
1.6.3 One-Dimensional Motion Under Constant Force .	42
1.6.4 Two-Dimensional Motion Under Constant Force .	51
STUDENTS' INITIAL KNOWLEDGE OF MATHEMATICS	59
1.7 College Students Possess Weak Abilities to Translate Among the Various Modes of Information Representation	60
1.8 Students' Deficit in Controlling Variables and in Recognizing Rules of Conservation	63
1.9 Effect of Students' Initial Knowledge State of Mathematics on Their Performance in Conventional Physics Instruction	66
Chapter 2: MATHEMATICAL MODELS OF NEWTONIAN MECHANICS ..	71
2.1 Structure of Newtonian Theory	71
2.2 Concepts of Newtonian Mechanics	73
2.3 Particle Models of Newtonian Mechanics	76
2.4 Paradigm Problems	82

2.5	How to Solve Mechanics Problems	86
2.5.1	Search for a Strategy	87
2.5.2	Evaluation of the Strategy	89
2.5.3	Implementation of the Strategy	90
2.5.4	Evaluation of the Solution	90
Chapter 3: TEACHING THE NEWTONIAN SYSTEM TO COMMON SENSE THINKERS		
	THINKERS	92
3.1	Teaching Method for College Mechanics	92
3.2	Mathematical Models: The Key for Efficient Understanding and Deployment of the Newtonian Theory ...	94
3.3	Individual Differences in Students' Competence	98
3.4	Self-Regulation	100
3.5	Motivation	103
3.6	How to Use the Handouts	104
3.7	How to Teach Problem Solving with a TOTE Approach .	107
3.8	Evaluation of the Teaching Strategy	116
Chapter 4: VALIDATION OF THE USE OF MODELS IN TEACHING NEWTONIAN MECHANICS		
	NEWTONIAN MECHANICS	118
4.1	Method	120
RESULTS		
	RESULTS	127
4.2	Internal Validity of the Training Program	127
4.2.1	Knowledge Organization and Systematic Strategic Decisions	128
4.2.2	Importance of Flexibility in Recitations	129
4.2.3	Importance of Geometric Representations in Model Deployment	132
4.2.4	Conflict Equilibration Between Students' Common Sense and Newtonian Mechanics	133
4.3	External Validity of the Teaching Strategy	135
4.4	General Validity of the Teaching Strategy	138
4.4.1	General Achievement	138
4.4.2	Controls for Motivation	140
4.4.3	Reproducibility of Results	141
4.5	Efficiency of the Teaching Strategy	142
4.6	Conclusion	144
PART II: BACKGROUND		
	BACKGROUND	147
	Introduction to Part II	148
Chapter 5: RESEARCH IN PHYSICS INSTRUCTION		
	RESEARCH IN PHYSICS INSTRUCTION	149
STUDENTS' COMMON SENSE KNOWLEDGE OF SPACE AND MOTION ...		
5.1	Champagne et al. (1980a and b, 1981, 1982a and b): Students' Preinstructional Knowledge Consists of Aristotelian Beliefs that have a Negative Effect on Their Performance in Physics Courses	151

Chapter 6: PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL RESEARCH	169
6.1 Piaget's Developmental Theory	170
6.2 Cognitive Psychology and the Information Processing System	176
6.3 Expert's Knowledge Base for Problem Solving	181
Chapter 7: PRE-NEWTONIAN SYSTEMS OF MECHANICS	185
7.1 Aristotle: Every Motion Requires Both an Agent and a Medium	186
7.2 Medieval Philosophers: In the Absence of Motive Agents a Body's Motion is Maintained by an Impetus	190
7.3 Galileo Galilei: Geometry is the Language of Mechanics Without Which One Wanders in a Dark Labyrinth	199
PART III: VALIDATION OF THE DIAGNOSTIC TESTS	206
Introduction to Part III	207
Chapter 8: EFFICIENCY AND PREDICTIVE VALIDITY OF THE DIAGNOSTIC TESTS	208
8.1 Subjects	208
8.2 Procedure	211
8.3 Apparatus	213
8.4 Scoring	215
8.5 Reliability of the Diagnostic Tests	215
8.5.1 Mechanics Test	215
8.5.2 Mathematics Test	217
8.6 Content and Face Validity of the Diagnostic Tests ..	218
8.7 Independence of the Diagnostic Pretests of Mechanics and Mathematics	219
8.8 Reproducibility of Students' Performance on the Diagnostic Tests	219
8.9 Individual Differences: Poor Predictors of Students' Achievement in College Physics	222
8.10 Clinical Interviews: Most Valid But Inefficient Tool	224
8.11 Efficiency and Predictive Validity of the Diagnostic Tests	226
TABLES AND FIGURES	235
REFERENCES	279
Appendix: DIAGNOSTIC TESTS OF MECHANICS AND MATHEMATICS	290

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1	Percentage Distribution of Students' Answers On the Pretest and Posttest of Mechanics Intuitions in the 1983 Summer Investigation 237
1.2	Comparative Diagnostic Tests Results Among Groups Taught by Different Professors 240
1.3	Score Distribution on the Diagnostic Tests According to Students' Grades in the 1982 Fall Investigation 241
1.4	Comparative Score Distributions On the Written Answers and Multiple Choice Diagnostic Tests According to Students' Grades 242
1.5	Percentage Distribution of Students' Answers On the Mathematics Pretest in the 1983 Summer Investigation 245
2.1	Paradigm Problems of Newtonian Mechanics in Tipler's Physics Textbook 249
4.1	Analysis of Variance on the Various Groups' Competence as Measured by the Diagnostic Tests 254
4.2	Analysis of Variance on the Various Groups' Primary Achievement in PHY 115 255
4.3	Analysis of Variance on Average and Low Competence Students' Primary Achievement in the Various Groups 256
4.4	Analysis of Variance on the Various Groups' Mechanics Pretest-Posttest Gain 257
4.5	Analysis of Variance on the Various Groups' Performance in Systems of Particles Mechanics 258
4.6	Analysis of Variance on the Various Groups' General Achievement in PHY 115 259
4.7	Final Grade Distribution in the Various Groups 263
8.1	Subjects' Class Distribution 267
8.2	Students' Percentage Distribution of the 1982 Fall Investigation According to their Physics and Mathematics Background 268
8.3	ANOVA on the Effect on Students' General Achievement of Background Courses of Mathematics (Spring 1983) and Physics (Summer 1983) 269
8.4	Analysis of Variance on the Mechanics Diagnostic Tests 271
8.5	Pearson Correlation Coefficients and their Probabilities Obtained in the 1982 Fall Investigation .. 272
8.6	Comparative Correlation Coefficients Between Written Answer and Multiple Choice Diagnostic Tests 273

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
8.7 Variance Loading of the Mathematics Pretest Components on Students' Primary and General Achievements as Measured by R Square in the Summer of 1983	274
8.8 Variance Loading of the Mechanics Pretest Components on Students' Primary and General Achievements as Measured by R Square in the Summer of 1983	275
8.9 Percentage Distribution of Actual versus Predicted Grades Obtained in the 1982 Fall Investigation	277
8.10 Percentage Comparison of Grades Correctly Predicted by the Written Answer and Multiple Choice Physics and Mathematics Diagnostic Tests Combined	278
8.11 Percentage Distribution of Accurate Competence-Performance Match for the Subjects of Table 8.10 ..	278

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1 Structure of Newtonian Particle Mechanics	236
1.2 Dependence of Impetus Paths on How Initial Velocity was Imparted	243
1.3 "Compromise" Path of a Projectile Released with Initial Velocity u in Gravitational Field g	243
1.4 Path of a Projectile Released in Gravitational Field g with Initial Velocity u	244
1.5 Typical Impetus Paths for Projectiles Launched in an Oblique Direction	244
2.1 Concept Analysis Chart	246
2.2 Force Chart	247
2.3 Particle Models Chart	248
2.4 Decision Plan for Particle Mechanics	250
2.5 How to Solve Mechanics Problems	251
3.1 Common "Free-Body" Diagram	252
3.2 TOTE Model for a Two-Level Process of Self- Regulation in Learning the Newtonian System	253
4.1 Comparative Performance of Trained and Control Groups in the 1983 Fall Semester	260
4.2 Comparative Performance of Trained and Control Groups in the 1983 Summer Session	261
4.3 Comparative Performance of Trained and Control Groups in the 1983 Spring Semester	262
6.1 Piagetian Model of Information Processing and Intellectual Development	264
6.2 Structure of an Information Processing System	265
7.1 Albert of Saxony's Projectile Path	266
8.1 R square Values Measured in a Stepwise Regression .	276

Preface

College physics courses suffer from high rates of attrition, and the performance of a good proportion of students who complete their courses is unsatisfactory to physicists. At Arizona State University, the rate of withdrawals ranges from 30% to 40% in the various introductory physics courses. Furthermore, 20% to 30% of the remaining students complete their courses with a final grade of "D" or "E". Overall, over 50% of students who register for college physics courses fail or drop out. Similar rates are reported in the literature for colleges and universities across the United States. This crisis triggered a number of investigations in the last two decades (Barowy and Lochhead, 1981; Champagne et al, 1980 through 1982; Chi et al, 1982; Clement, 1977 through 1982; Gunstone and White, 1981; Hudson and Lieberman, 1982; Larkin et al, 1978 through 1981; Lawson et al, 1980, 1981; Lochhead et al, 1980, 1981; McCloskey et al, 1980, 1981; Trowbridge et al, 1980, 1981; Reif et al, 1978 through 1981). Most researchers focus on the investigation of students' knowledge about a limited number of isolated Newtonian concepts. Some try to improve students' understanding of these concepts. This dissertation is concerned with: (a) assessing students' knowledge state before and after instruction about particle

models of the Newtonian theory, rather than isolated concepts, and (b) validating a teaching strategy intended to improve the effectiveness of college physics instruction.

The dissertation is divided into three parts. In part I, students' deficient understanding of Newtonian Mechanics is analyzed (Chapter 1); then a teaching strategy is proposed (Chapter 3) and validated (Chapter 4) to improve the effectiveness of physics instruction. The strategy emphasizes the use of models in representing and deploying the Newtonian theory (Chapter 2). Part II reviews the literature on related research in physics education (Chapter 5) and cognitive psychology (Chapter 6), as well as the historical development of Classical Mechanics from Aristotle to Galileo (Chapter 7). Part III documents the validation of diagnostic tests used for the purposes of chapters 1 and 4 to assess the competence of college students and predict their performance in conventional physics instruction (Chapter 8).