

[O26] Physics education research and UK physics; tensions and possible remedies

David Sands

Department of Physical Sciences (Physics)
University of Hull
d.sands@hull.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Physics education research (PER) is a systematic activity aimed at identifying weaknesses in students' understanding of physics in order to develop instructional methods to overcome them. These methods stress understanding over content, which inevitably leads to reservations about applying the findings in UK universities where physics is taught within a dedicated and concentrated programme with a prescribed minimum core content. In this paper the findings of PER are shown to be consistent with established cognitive theory and models of thinking. Thus the outcomes of PER can be generalised and extended to other areas of the physics curriculum and a cognitive model for teaching physics is established. This model allows teaching for understanding without reducing too much the course content. In particular, the educational value of small-group work for instruction in problem solving skills is emphasized.

INTRODUCTION

The view has arisen that conventional teaching methods serve only the minority in today's higher education system (1). Biggs in particular has put forward the view that constructive alignment of teaching should lead to improved learning. Constructive alignment is based on the principle that it is what the student does that determines what is learnt rather than what the teacher does, so by aligning teaching methods to student learning

activities learning can be enhanced. This view applies to higher education in general but remarkably it coincides with the results of physics education research (PER) in the USA. Unlike much of education research, which is concerned with educational theory and cognitive psychology, PER is regarded as a research discipline which sets out to identify misconceptions and find instructional methods to overcome them. In the words of one of its leading exponents (2),

'Physics education research differs from traditional education research in that the emphasis is not on educational theory or methodology in the general sense, but rather on student understanding of physics. Such research requires an in-depth knowledge of the subject as well as access to students, which means that it can usually only be carried out by physicists working in physics departments. The findings form a rich resource that provides insights into how students learn physics. When teachers apply this information and document the results for others to use, cumulative improvement in instruction is possible ...Our research indicates that although students vary in the way they learn best, learning is not as idiosyncratic as is often assumed. Students at the same level of study respond in a remarkably similar way to certain kinds of questions, both before and after standard instruction via lectures, textbooks and lab classes.'

PER identifies the following difficulties with the standard 'chalk and talk' method of course delivery (3,4).

- Facility in solving standard quantitative problems is not an adequate criterion for functional understanding
- Connections among concepts, formal representations, and the real world are often lacking after traditional instruction
- Certain conceptual difficulties are not overcome by traditional instruction and advanced study might not increase understanding of basic concepts
- A coherent conceptual framework is not typically an outcome of traditional instruction
- Growth in reasoning ability often does not result from traditional instruction
- Teaching by telling is an ineffective mode of instruction for most students

The solution to these difficulties is to change both the methods of instruction and assessment. Students must be intellectually active to develop a functional understanding so questions that require qualitative reasoning and verbal explanation are not only essential for assessing student learning but are also effective for helping students learn. In addition, scientific reasoning skills must be explicitly cultivated. Persistent conceptual difficulties must be explicitly addressed in multiple contexts and students need repeated practice in interpreting physics formalisms and relating them to the real world. Students need to participate in the process of constructing qualitative models and applying these models to predict and explain real-world phenomena.

Physics Education Research is thus a systematic activity of assessing where difficulties lie and finding instructional methods to overcome them. The methods described

above take time and often understanding is achieved at the expense of coverage. Perhaps it is desirable to sacrifice content for improved student understanding in the USA, where nearly all university students are expected to study some physics, even if it is only one module, but in the UK, physics is usually taught within a concentrated and dedicated degree programme accredited by the Institute of Physics. Students are exposed to a prescribed minimum body of knowledge which includes the five core areas of electromagnetism, wave phenomena, classical and quantum mechanics, statistical physics and thermodynamics, and properties of matter. To the extent that misconceptions of basic concepts exist among students, it is likely that the problems faced by US academics are similar to the problems faced by academics in the UK, but to what extent content can be reduced in favour of improved understanding is not so clear.

The purpose of this paper is to show that the deficiencies in traditional methods identified by PER, together with the solutions, are firmly in line with current cognitive thinking on learning and teaching. In particular, the SOLO taxonomy (structure of observed learning outcomes) developed by Biggs provides a direct explanation of many findings. Herrmann's quadrant model of thinking, which is pragmatic metaphor that has been applied very successfully to business, is shown to complement SOLO and the synthesis of the two leads directly to a cognitive model of problem solving which can be taught to, and used metacognitively by, students. The implications for course delivery by conventional lectures are discussed in order to suggest alternative means of improving understanding whilst maintaining coverage.

COGNITIVE BACKGROUND: SOLO

SOLO is an important application of cognitive theory to modern education. In order to place SOLO in context, it is necessary to look into some of the preceding work in cognition.

Halford (5) has looked into cognitive development in terms of problem solving ability, ie deductive thinking or the process of drawing inferences. Halford has presented a complex flow diagram to illustrate the thinking involved in solving a problem, but in essence it resolves into a three-step process first developed by Craik in 1943 (see 5);

- translate the problem into an equivalent model
- operate on the model
- re-translate back to the physical situation

This coincides with the three-step model of mathematics that most physicists would recognise as descriptive of the relationship between maths and physics, which involves expressing the physics in mathematical terms, operating on the mathematics, and finally, interpreting the mathematical solution in terms of physics. Halford's ideas on cognition would therefore appear to be directly applicable to physics education, especially as he uses logico-mathematical operators to define the different stages of cognitive development.

Halford identified three developmental stages and three meaningful levels of thought corresponding to the complexity of operations that can be performed. Level one is limited to relations between pairs of objects. Level two allows for binary operations, that is using two pieces of information together to derive a third, and level 3 corresponds to compositions of binary operations, ie where three or more pieces of information are used together. Halford suggests that level three cognitive functions are well developed by the age of 17–19, which corresponds to first year university entrants. We should therefore expect all our students to be able to demonstrate the highest levels of cognition by considering several pieces of information together and

drawing inferences from them. As we know, this is not always the case. Nor is it the case that students have mastered the problem solving aspects of mathematics in physics.

Biggs (6) recognised that cognitive tests such as those used by Halford require a background knowledge of some sort, and student responses simply indicate how well this material has been learnt and understood. In short, what is measured are actually learning outcomes. Cognitive development is hypothetical in so far as it is nigh on impossible to measure it without recourse to something that has been learnt. The complex relationship between how well material is first encoded by reading or listening and how well it is subsequently reproduced means that cognitive structure cannot be reliably assessed.

The origins of SOLO lies with work on younger age groups, but it is applicable to all ages. One of Biggs' examples, a poem called 'Spring and Fall – to a young child' by Gerard Manly Hopkins (GMH), which is in fact quite difficult to interpret, illustrates learning outcomes from students around 20 to 21 years of age. The responses ranged from a literal interpretation with no generalization, to some generalization bounded by the context, and finally to a description of the poem as a metaphor in which the context is seen simply as a vehicle for conveying the central message. Generalizing to this last level represents a high level of cognitive functioning, but only those who had an interest in poetry and had studied it at university were able to present this sort of analysis. Clearly, analysis is underpinned by knowledge.

It is a necessary condition of being able to demonstrate high level cognitive functioning that students must acquire knowledge. Lectures are a very effective means of delivering it, but they not so effective at delivering understanding. The principle of constructive alignment described at the beginning of this paper holds that the student

must develop this understanding through engagement with the subject matter, and PER shows the same. Students who have developed an understanding should be able to demonstrate high level cognitive functioning, but weak students who might have learnt a lot but can apply it in only limited circumstances will only be able to demonstrate knowledge. The SOLO taxonomy provides a means of differentiating between these cases by defining understanding in general terms independent of discipline. There are five levels: prestructural, unistructural, multistructural, relational, and extended abstract. In a prestructural response the answer is confused or the question is simply repeated. A unistructural response focuses on a single fact or concept, multistructural on several unrelated facts or concepts, relational ties the various components together, and extended abstract generalises from the given to the new.

Knowledge used in this way is 'functioning'. In its most basic form knowledge is either declarative or procedural. The former is propositional - as the name implies it is used to declare this or that - and the latter is knowledge gained through repeated practice of procedures and doesn't necessarily imply understanding. To a great extent mathematical knowledge is procedural for the physicist. It is acquired through repeated practice, though of course there is an element of declarative knowledge. When these two - procedural and declarative - are combined with a knowledge of how and when to use them they become functioning. PER and constructive alignment are in agreement in so far as both stress that intellectual engagement is essential for learning, and that assessment has a role to play. PER has shown how to achieve functioning knowledge across a range of topics, but room is made within the class for intellectual engagement and functioning knowledge therefore comes at the expense of the range of declarative knowledge. Engagement in the students' own time, through, for example, formative assessment should have a similar effect but without detriment to the course coverage.

A MODEL OF LEARNING

It is quite natural to regard these cognitive levels as hierarchical, so that a relational response is seen as representing a higher level of thought than a unistructural response. For example, extended abstract is more likely from a postgraduate physicist rather than an undergraduate except perhaps in problem solving, where necessarily the idea is to synthesize something new from given information. Problem solving is an important skill in physics and the subject will be revisited after the development of an effective learning model.

It is important not to confuse the level of the subject with the level of the response or the ability of the student. Some of the unistructural and multistructural responses to GMH came from people who would be considered able and intelligent in their own fields, so interest and motivation, as well as prior learning, are important factors which determine to a great extent how information is interpreted. This can be at a unistructural, multistructural, or relational level but this is not necessarily how it will be conveyed some time later. A multistructural view can only be transformed into a relational view if a deliberate attempt is made to relate the disparate components. If little or no thought is applied the output will be at a lower cognitive level. PER supports this directly with the observation that students' epistemological views influence strongly how well they learn physics (7). Three typical views are: learning physics is about retaining formulas and problem-solving algorithms; learning involves relating fundamental concepts to problem-solving techniques; and, learning involves building one's own understanding. The first of these is clearly multistructural, the second is relational, and the third is extended abstract in so far as the student attempts from the outset to build something new from what has been given.

Thus PER confirms the premise of SOLO. The cognitive level at input determines the

cognitive level at output, as students who perceive physics in a multistructural manner are very unlikely to develop a higher cognitive view. It would seem necessary, therefore, to alter the way that some students think about physics. Unfortunately, SOLO, as the name implies, is concerned with classifying observed outcomes. Although the same terms can be used to classify inputs, SOLO itself provides no guidance on how perceptions at the input stage might be changed. First it is necessary to identify a cause, and though motivation is identified as one factor it is by no means clear that this is the main, or only reason, that information is encoded at a particular cognitive level. An alternative model of thinking provides some insight.

Herrmann developed a four-quadrant model of thinking in the 1970s whilst working as a human resources manager with General Electric in the US (8). It is based on the celebrated left-right split in the brain with a further subdivision based on the evolutionary structure of the brain. This leads to four quadrants, each of which metaphorically describes a particular thinking pattern, but it is not suggested that thinking is located in these physically distinct areas. Moving anti-clockwise, the upper left, A, is analytical and logical, the lower left, B, organisational, the lower right, C, emotional and empathetic and concerned with personal relations, and the upper right, D, is strategic but encompasses the artistic and creative as well as conceptual thinking. The dominance of one quadrant or another is not a matter of intelligence but simply of personal characteristics. Each of us prefers to think in one or sometimes two particular quadrants and will tend to apply this type of thinking to new situations even when it is not appropriate. Students' epistemological views of physics described above can be related respectively to quadrants B, A and D therefore probably reflect their natural thinking patterns (called by Herrmann 'brain profiles') as much as any prior conceptions developed at school.

There would appear to be some correspondence between the cognitive levels of SOLO and Herrmann's model. The organisational and analytical quadrants correlate with multistructural and relational, and possibly extended abstract corresponds to aspects of the strategic quadrant. However, Herrmann stresses preferences whereas SOLO implies a hierarchy. None-the-less, the quadrant model can explain the situational aspects of cognitive encoding implied in Biggs' work. A logical and analytical mind may well be unable to interpret the metaphors contained in GMH, hence the lack of interest and the consequent multistructural responses from otherwise able people. Hence, an effective model of learning is to describe the input in terms of preferred thinking and the output in terms of SOLO. It is more important to ensure that material is delivered in a way that can be understood by students with different thinking patterns than to try directly to alter their perceptions of physics. Otherwise there is a good chance that students will not build up sufficient knowledge to be able to develop different modes of thinking.

This model has two very important implications for the delivery of any higher education programme, not just physics. The first concerns effective communication. If the audience is characterised by different thinking styles the message must contain information encoded in ways that each can take something from it. Initially, the collective brain profiles of first year undergraduates is likely to contain a good proportion from at least three of the four quadrants (organisational, analytical, and strategic). Possibly some students will also exhibit a dominant empathetic brain profile, but, these are probably better suited to people oriented activities and probably will not last the course. By way of example, Herrmann has compared the collective brain profiles of entry-level undergraduate engineers at a college in the US with those of Faculty. Among the students there was an even mixture of all four quadrants, but the Faculty profiles resembled very much the average characteristics of

professional engineers in which the analytical quadrant dominates, perhaps even at the expense of some creativity. Inevitably some selection, as well as development, occurs from student to professional.

If something similar happens with physicists we can expect a shift towards the two quadrants that tend to be dominant in professional physicists, viz. the analytical and the strategic. At the later stages of a course it will be reasonable both to deliver and assess material at a predominantly relational level but in the earlier years material should ideally be delivered at several levels. The PER finding that persistent conceptual difficulties must be overcome by teaching in multiple contexts is an expression of this. The single concept is unistructural, the several different contexts is multistructural, and there may be a relational element as well. Within a single lecture the unistructural level would emphasize the single most important idea, the multistructural level would identify other important ideas, and if these can be linked by a concept the relational level is supplied. Students will take away the information most appropriate to their own thinking.

The second implication relates to group work. Herrmann has shown that groups composed of members with similar thinking styles will rapidly converge upon an agreed course of action, whereas groups constructed from representatives of all four quadrants will take as much time as is allotted, and possibly more, to air a range of possibilities. Indeed, they might not even come to a conclusion. Within SOLO Biggs has also related the cognitive levels to three categories of mental operation or function, one of which relates to arriving at a decision. At the lower cognitive levels decisions are reached quickly at the expense of consistency, but at the extended abstract there is a strong need for consistency, sometimes at the expense of a firm decision. A comparison with group whole-brain thinking implies that extended abstract is also whole-brain thinking.

In order to develop extended abstract thinking (problem solving), students need to mimic

group behaviour, which is to look at the problem in a variety of different ways: unistructural, to identify the most important idea; multistructural, to identify and organise the separate components; relational, to analyse and link the components together; strategic, to identify wider aspects and possible courses of action; and finally to synthesize and solve. In terms of quadrants, the student must organize, analyze, empathize (where necessary) and strategize. The student has to switch metacognitively to a different mode of thinking as the need arises. Herrmann calls this 'situationally whole-brained' thinking, as it seems that true whole-brained thinking occurs in only 2.5% of the population. These people show equal strength in all four quadrants, but each of us can learn and develop our thinking in other quadrants. Group activities can help students to learn physics, but they also serve as exemplars of problem solving.

CONCLUSION

PER has been shown to be consistent with both the SOLO taxonomy and quadrant model of thinking. A cognitive model of physics teaching has been established from the synthesis of the quadrant model and SOLO. The main findings of this work are:

1. Knowledge learnt in lectures is declarative, but this in itself is necessary.
2. Functioning knowledge is developed only if students engage with the subject.
3. Material should be taught at several cognitive levels.
4. A clear problem-solving strategy emerges from the synthesis of SOLO and quadrant thinking.
5. Group work provides an exemplar for the development of problem solving skills.

REFERENCES

1. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*, Second Edition, John Biggs, The Society for Research into Higher Education and OU Press, 2003
2. Lillian C. McDermott, *Physics Education Research: the key to student learning*, Physics World, IoP Publishing, January 2004
3. L. C. McDermott and E. F. Redish 1999 *Am. J. Phys.* **67** 755
4. L. C. McDermott, 2001 *Am. J. Phys.* **69**(11) p1127
5. Graeme S. Halford, *Toward a Redefinition of Cognitive Developmental Stages, in Cognition, Development and Instruction*, edited by J. R. Kirby and J. B. Biggs. (N.Y. Academic Press. , 1980)
6. J. B. Biggs, *Developmental Processes and Learning Outcomes, in Cognition, Development and Instruction*, edited by J. R. Kirby and J. B. Biggs. (N.Y. Academic Press, 1980)
7. Andrew Elby, *Phys. Educ. Res, Am. J. Phys. Suppl.* **67** (1999) (1999) S52-S57.
8. *The Whole Brain Business Book*, Ned Herrmann, McGraw-Hill Harvard Business School Press, 1996, ISBN: 0070284628.

[O27] LeAP interaction: towards curriculum change in HE

Derek Raine and Sarah Symons

Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Leicester

ABSTRACT

Although problem-based learning (PBL) is a well-established methodology in several scientific and technological disciplines, attempts to introduce it into physics education provide an interesting insight into the management of change in higher education (HE). This paper will describe experiences from projects in a variety of institutions implementing curriculum change towards PBL. It will identify factors that predispose implementations to successful outcomes and embedding of enhanced practice.

On the one hand we have the problem-based learning (PBL) community preaching the new panacea – a teaching method you really can rely on. Put your students together in groups, given them a meaningful and sufficiently complex, open-ended real-world problem to get their engagement, offer some gentle guidance and watch them research the problem, find a (not ‘the’) solution and see how they learn new and difficult material, which they will own forever (1). Surely the evidence must tell us how much better this is than the traditional methods. On the other hand we have the ‘proud to be traditional’ tradition, which produces some really good students and excellent reports from external examiners. Surely the evidence points to no real problems with the traditional methods. Can both views be right?

Two questions to begin with: can we really demonstrate anything wrong with the traditional approach? And can we prove that PBL does any better?

Bertand Russell (2) gives us the following warning about the one-time popularity of Hegelian philosophy. Hegel’s major works are very difficult to understand – you have to spend quite a large fraction of a lifetime to even partly master them. Academic philosophers having put in this effort and achieved the status of Hegelian expert find it difficult to admit that the great works are less than wholly meaningful and that their lifetime’s work has been a waste of time. Is this the dilemma of the PBL adherents? Or of the traditionalists?

Outside Physics there is at least some possible evidence beyond the anecdotal for the efficacy of PBL. The original introduction of PBL in medicine led to measurable improvements in the propensity to keep up to date with new developments amongst PBL trained doctors. Retesting of engineering students in Maastricht after a year’s break showed significantly greater retention amongst PBL-trained students (3). For obvious ethical reasons it is difficult to get extensive and reliable comparative data, although the effect of co-operation on learning has been widely explored (4). Some claims to show that PBL itself has at most marginal benefits have been challenged (5).

When we turn to Physics matters are even less clear. Bowe (6) in DIT was able to compare two first year classes taught the same material, one by PBL and one by lectures, and to show a large benefit in retention rates and engagement amongst the PBL students, although not a large difference in examination performance. On the other hand, Lennon (7) in Dundalk has

found a large improvement in one first year class using PBL in end-of-year examinations. Although the novelty effect cannot be ruled out here, the result is in agreement with the force concept inventory (FCI) approach (8), which showed a factor 2 improvement (in the FCI defined gain) in the ability to manipulate force concepts amongst students taught through PBL. The stark fact is that none of these data relate to the 'good' physics students in major UK institutions.

The other way of looking at this then is to ask whether there is any evidence that change is required. The Hegelian antithesis holds here too in a way. Staff who have spent half a lifetime learning how to lecture well are unlikely to come to the conclusion that they should never have been lecturing at all. Students having put an inordinate amount of effort in choosing the course that was right for them then, somewhat strangely, assume that all courses use the same approach to teaching: they have been led to expect that university courses are taught by lectures, supplemented, if they are lucky enough to go to a posh university, by tutorials. Students, having trusted their entire education to a department, appear reluctant to criticise their own institutions and their views are usually that no major change is required.

Finally there is a lot of inertia in the system. There are a number of reasons for this. The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) weightings on funding coupled with the inelasticity of student numbers, mean that departmental resources are more likely to be directed to research activity than to changing teaching practice. External examiners give their approval to systems they know: no one thinks that they have to prove that lectures work. (It is the students' fault if they do not.) I recall a subject review visit in which reviewers spent the four days bemoaning how much better university teaching ought to be, and then awarding full marks to the department for fulfilling their stated aims and objectives.

Project LeAP was set up through the HEFCE fund for the development of teaching and

learning to investigate the use of PBL in various modes and contexts in physics and to disseminate the results. From our visits to about ten departments in the UK we can characterise the various negative responses to PBL in physics as follows.

- (i) Our quality indicators tell us that no change is required.
- (ii) Not invented here; the PBL method was designed for professional education and may work well in medicine and engineering, but there is no evidence that it works in physics and may well be ill-suited for leading physics departments.
- (iii) PBL may have been shown to work for some students, for example high-flyers who can be trusted to take responsibility for their own learning, or weaker students who need motivation, or students for whom physics is not their major study, or at school level, or in the early years of a course when we are not trying to teach relativity, or in the later years of a course when students have mastered the core material, but is not, really not, suitable for 'my' students.
- (iv) We would like to introduce PBL if we could, but we cannot, because of (a) staff opposition (b) opposition from the HoD (c) the RAE (delete as applicable).
- (v) PBL cannot (?) be used to teach general relativity therefore it cannot be any good.

If we are going to find a significant case for the introduction of PBL into physics clearly we must recognise from these findings that thus far we are looking in the wrong place. Where PBL has been introduced as a significant component of physics teaching it has been through leadership from senior management (the University of Delaware for example), or under extreme pressures, for example from severe difficulties of recruitment or retention. *These examples are characterised by a vision that PBL is not a*

more or less effective teaching method, but represents a cultural change. PBL is about providing not only a different, but a coherent, learning environment in which the student prior learning, discipline objectives, assessment and community aspects are aligned in a way that is rarely the case in conventionally taught courses (9).

PBL is therefore a way of addressing the key problem with current higher education in physics: that *we have an elitist system operating, relatively unsuccessfully, in a mass market.* By an elitist culture I mean an approach that requires students to have mastered a significantly large body of knowledge before they can be expected to engage meaningfully in the professional process of the scientific discipline. While this is a common assumption in many sciences, it is manifestly not the case in all disciplines. One only has to mention the empathetic approach to history or the introduction of creative writing in English at the level of primary education. Attempts to address the appeal of physics to a mass market through curriculum development, while welcome in ensuring a curriculum with contemporary relevance, do not appear to have altered the elitist culture.

It is unnecessary to rehearse again the need for some success in increasing the appeal of physics in HE. PBL represents *an* attempt to address this problem at source: it is based on the creation of an environment of engagement in which students learn science by doing science, that is by solving scientific problems through (guided) scientific research.

Our experience of visiting UK and overseas departments who have introduced PBL in a substantial portion of the curriculum has shown that PBL, although currently rare in physics departments, can be implemented in a wide variety of institutions. However, some common factors can be identified which may indicate potential for successful implementations.

- (i) A group of colleagues with a similar vision: although there can be individual champions of PBL their work is unlikely to outlast their own tenure.
- (ii) A supportive management who see PBL as a component of the institutional teaching and learning strategy.
- (iii) Identifiable issues to be addressed: these could include retention and recruitment as well as attendance and student performance.
- (iv) Reasonable expectation of outcomes: it may be necessary to introduce PBL over a period of years and to expect substantial revisions over that timescale.
- (v) Time for preparation, but not too much time so that preparation is focussed. The time budget needs to include problem development and staff training.
- (vi) An appropriate physical environment: PBL is possible in tiered lecture theatres but it is easier in flat teaching areas with moveable furniture.

There is some evidence of suppressed recognition of the potential of PBL. In a survey carried out in the LeAP project at least 40% of physics departments in the UK claimed to offer some PBL or PBL-like activities in their programmes (from a response rate of just over 50%). What therefore are the impediments to expanding this, not to an exclusive use of PBL, but to a situation in which the traditional lecture-based methods are used, as appropriate, in a PBL environment, not vice-versa? It seems to us that there are at least two major obstacles.

One is the lack of PBL resources in physics. Few lecturers construct a lecture course from scratch: there are books, problem sets, web resources, past examination papers and often their own experience of being lectured to (if

not their actual notes!). With PBL there are no textbooks of problems, no established assessment routines and the web resources mostly seem to have been written for different types of students (as indeed most have). Another is the exposure to failure. We often expect to hone a lecture course after its first delivery and we have to accept that, at least in our experience, a PBL problem is rarely perfect first time. The usually quoted complaint that PBL takes a lot of resources to develop has not been our experience if the comparison is made fairly with the time taken to develop a lecture course or a new laboratory experiment from scratch. Nor is it our experience that the courses are excessively labour intensive to run, although one can get carried away with the assessment load for both students and staff, and it does require appropriate time for staff development for facilitation.

Thus, Project LeAP is attempting to contribute to overcoming these obstacles by providing a freely available bank of PBL problems of various types, and in sufficient quantity, to act as a resource for PBL developers, together with supporting resources for assessment and facilitator training. The CETL in Innovative Physics Teaching will take on this role when the LeAP project comes to an end.

REFERENCES

1. Barrows H. S. (2000) *Problem-Based Learning Applied to Medical Education* (Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, Springfield, Ill.)
2. Russell, B. (1946) *History of Western Philosophy* (Allen and Unwin)
3. M. Savin-Baden (2000) *Problem-based Learning in Higher Education: Untold Stories* (SRHE and OU)
4. Smith, K. A., Sheppard, S. D., Johnson D. Wand Johnson, R. T., (2005) *Pedagogies of Engagement: Classroom-Based Practices* J. Eng Education p1 also at http://www.ce.umn.edu/~smith/docs/Smith-Pedagogies_of_Engagement.pdf
5. Newman M. *A pilot systematic review and meta-analysis on the effectiveness of Problem Based Learning* PEPBL report, July 2004 (<http://www.hebes.mdx.ac.uk/teaching/Research/PEPBL/PSR-PBL.pdf>)
6. Bowe, Band Cowan J. (2004) *A comparative evaluation of Problem-Based Learning in Physics in Challenging Research into Problem-Based Learning* M Savin-Baden and K Wilkie (eds) (SRHE/ Open University)
7. Lennon T. (2005) *A PBL Programme at DkIT in Possibilities: a Practice Guide to Problem-Based Learning in Physics* D J Raine and S L Symons (eds) (HE Academy Physical Science Centre)
8. Hake, R. (1998) *Interactive-Engagement vs. Traditional Methods: A Six-Thousand Student Survey of Mechanics Test Data for Introductory Physics Courses* American Journal of Physics, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 64-74.
9. D. J. Raine (2002) *Independent learning for the unwilling* U. Chem. Ed 6, 84-88.

[O28] Industry-supported context-based chemistry practicals

David J. McGarvey

Lennard-Jones Laboratories, School of Physical and Geographical Sciences
Keele University
d.j.mcgarvey@chem.keele.ac.uk

Keywords: laboratory work, context-based learning, chemistry, industry, photochromism, sunscreens

ABSTRACT

Two industry-supported context-based undergraduate chemistry practicals are described. The extent of the industrial involvement is primarily through in-kind support and this is explained for each practical. One experiment is concerned with spectro-photometric and kinetic analysis of commercial photochromic dyes, whilst the other is concerned with UV absorption spectroscopy and Beer-Lambert analysis of commercial UV sunscreens. Both experiments involve the students carrying out measurements that would be routinely undertaken by the industrial partner and they are able to make direct comparisons of their data with the company's published data. Both experiments are supported by pre-lab and post-lab activities and extensive on-line resources.

INTRODUCTION

'Wow, why don't textbooks and lab manuals do a better job of communicating what these real-world chemists do?' (1)

This is a quote from the preface to *'an industry-based laboratory manual'* by John Kenkel and is an appropriate pre-text to the work described here.

In recent years the author has been active in the development of problem-based practical work for undergraduate chemistry students and some of this work has been disseminated via the LTSN and elsewhere (2). The work reported here focuses on the development of context-based undergraduate chemistry laboratory experiments that owe their inception to liaison with industrial partners. To place the industrial involvement in perspective, the author has secured in-kind support in the form of commercial samples as well as technical advice and electronic materials (articles/ brochures). The practicals involve topical contemporary industrial contexts that require knowledge and understanding of practical and theoretical aspects of core chemistry topics.

Context-based practical work clearly has the potential to show *'purpose'*, *'relevance'* and *'application'*, provided the context is valid and credible. This work reported here is concerned with the use of tangible industrial/commercial contexts that draw upon specific core topics in chemistry to form the basis for undergraduate chemistry practicals. In addition, a particular (although not pre-requisite) aspect of these practicals is that there is some form of industrial support/sponsorship, even if this is just in-kind support through the supply of materials and/or resources. The educational aim of the work is to enrich the student

learning experience in the laboratory through provision of contemporary and topical industrial contexts within which they can learn and apply theoretical and practical aspects of core topics in chemistry. The approach described is flexible and adaptable to other laboratory-based sciences.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PRACTICALS

1. Photochromism: The Importance of Kinetic, Spectroscopic and Thermodynamic Factors in Potential Applications

'Photochromism' is an example of a photochemical phenomenon with tangible and recognisable applications in products such as photochromic sunglasses. Moreover, the kinetic, thermodynamic and spectroscopic properties of such dyes are important considerations when selecting a dye for a particular application.

For this practical the industrial partner is James Robinson Ltd (3-5), who have kindly supplied free samples of various organic photochromic dyes (Reversacol product range). The experiment forms part of the level 1 physical chemistry module, CHE-10004 'Energy and Dynamics', at Keele University. The first page of the script and an image of the relevant website are shown on the right.

The experiment involves:

- (i) Acquisition of UV-VIS absorption spectra of the colourless and coloured forms of the dyes,
- (ii) Measurement of the rate constants and half-lives for the fading of the coloured forms of the dyes
- (iii) Investigation of the temperature dependence of the fade rate and measurement of the activation energy for the fading process of one of the dyes
- (iv) Chemical structure drawing and

JAMES ROBINSON
making change possible

Reversacol Photochromic Dyes

PDP

MODULE CHE-10004: ENERGY & DYNAMICS

EXPERIMENT 21

PHOTOCHROMISM: THE IMPORTANCE OF KINETIC, SPECTROSCOPIC AND THERMODYNAMIC FACTORS IN POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS

Aim of the experiment

The aim of this experiment is to highlight the importance of kinetic, spectroscopic and thermodynamic considerations in the selection and design of photochromic dyes for specific applications. You will work in a team of 4 (see the notice board in the teaching laboratory).

The photochromic dyes you will investigate are isophorone derivatives or spiro-isophorone derivatives (Figure 1).

Isophorone

Spiro-isophorone

Figure 1. Chemical structures of isophorone and spiro-isophorone.

The experiment provides experience in:

- Designing and planning an experiment
- UV-VIS Spectrophotometry

James Robinson Photochromic Reversacol Photochromic Dyes Microsoft Internet Explorer

James Robinson Ltd

Reversacol Photochromic Dyes

making change possible

Welcome

Creative Innovation

James Robinson is world leader in the development of reversible photochromic dyes. These are special dyes that can store charge colour upon exposure to visible light, such as sunlight. James Robinson produces and markets a large range of dyes under the Reversacol brand.

The Reversacol photochromic dye product range currently includes over 20 different colours. There is even a range of clear (clear colourless photochromic dyes), which offer the advantage of achieving a neutral colour without the need to use neutral dyes.

Reversacol

Reversacol can be used in plastic, film and coatings and there is a wide range of applications, including uses of the following:

- (v) Use of online resources available on the James Robinson website.

In tasks (i)-(ii) students carry out measurements that would be undertaken by James Robinson Ltd and other manufacturers of photochromic dyes.

In the process of carrying out the experiment students learn about first order kinetic data analysis, the variety of chemical structures used for organic photochromics, their

spectroscopic and chemical properties, how they work, their applications and how kinetic, spectroscopic and thermodynamic considerations are important for these. They also learn about some of the technical jargon/terminology used in the industry. The experiment is supported by a number of informative pdf articles/brochures/data sheets freely available from the James Robinson website and relating to spectroscopic and kinetic data on the individual molecules as well as more general articles on photochromism. The students compare their data with the spectroscopic and kinetic data published by James Robinson. The practical shows how an understanding of 1st order kinetics and spectrophotometry are important within an industrial context and also how this understanding aids interpretation of technical product data.

2. An Investigation of the UV Absorbing Properties of Commercial Organic Sunscreens.

For this practical the industrial partner is DSM Nutritional Products (6), who have kindly supplied free samples of three organic UV sunscreens (Parsol 5000, Parsol MCX and Parsol 340). The experiment has been piloted with trainee chemistry teachers on a TTA Chemistry Enhancement Course and will form part of the level 1 physical chemistry module, CHE-10004 'Energy and Dynamics', at Keele University from 2005-2006. The experiment involves:

- (i) Measurement of the UV absorption spectra of the three sunscreens
- (ii) Application of the Beer-Lambert law for the determination of the molar absorption coefficients of the three sunscreens,
- (iii) Investigation of any modifications to the UV absorption profile of the sunscreens as a result of exposure to UV light inducing photoisomerisation
- (iv) Use of an on-line sunscreen simulator (provided by Ciba (7) and requires registration before use) to formulate a sunscreen and obtain SPF and UVA protection factor information in addition to spectral data.

Tasks (i) – (iii) involve the students carrying out measurements that would be undertaken by DSM and other sunscreen manufacturers when developing new sunscreens, and in this respect the industrial context is tangible. For (iv), the students are required to include one of the sunscreens they have studied in their formulation and individual results can be saved as a pdf file for submission with their laboratory reports.

In the process of carrying out the experiment students learn about the variety of chemical structures that form the basis of organic UV sunscreens, their physical, spectroscopic and chemical properties, how they work, some of the technical jargon/terminology associated with the industry and the wide range of companies involved in their manufacture. The students also learn about the beneficial and harmful effects of exposure to solar radiation as well as the background to sunscreen testing and formulation. The experiment is supported by a number of informative pdf articles/brochures freely available from the DSM website and relating to technical data on the individual molecules as well as more general articles on sun care. The students compare their data with the data published by DSM and this requires students to work between different types of units for molar absorption coefficients. The practical helps students to appreciate the importance of the value of the molar absorption coefficient as a key parameter for organic sunscreens and shows where the Beer-Lambert law is used directly within an industrial context. The students also acquire a sense of scale in relation to what the values of molar absorption coefficients for UV absorption bands of organic molecules.

