



<u>Setup</u> - Preliminary data suggested an interference effect between students' abilities to answer vector/scalar related questions and the type of instruction that they were receiving at the time. Data were collected weekly throughout the introductory, calculus-based physics sequence at Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). This project was designed to further investigate if students view problems involving vector concepts and problems involving scalar concepts differently depending on whether the current topic of instruction is vectors or scalars.

Tasks Investigated:	A
Electrostatics - 4 Questions	FI
Magnetism - 4 Questions	N/
Field and Potential - 10 Questions	Fi
Gravitational Potential - 4 Questions	G
Vectors - 13 Questions	Ve

**Question**: For the pair of vectors below, is their dot product positive, negative, or zero?



**Question**: A hollow insulating sphere is electrically neutral. A small amount of negative charge is placed at one point on the outside of the sphere. If we check on this charge sometime later, where will it be?

**<u>Features</u>**: Above the chance line, some variance within the graph but no pattern related to type of instruction.

Conclusion: There was a great diversity in the shapes of response plots. Some showed a well-defined learning curve, whereas others were completely static. Even though these questions were statistically significant, there was no clear correlation between vector/scalar instruction and students' abilities to answer related questions.

**Further Investigation:** The data were also split by gender, final grade in the course, and current co-registration in a math course to see if an interference effect occurred within the groups. However, after dividing by these effects and by quarter week, the sample size was too small to draw any meaningful conclusions.

## Vectors in the Time of Scalars

Daryl McPadden Colorado School of Mines dmcpadde@mymail.mines.edu

## **NOVA Statistics:**

lectrostatics – 4/4 significant lagnetism – 3/4 significant ield and Potential – 7/10 significant ravitation Potential – 2/4 significant ectors – 11/13 significant



ANOVA Tests: ANOVA tests were performed on the number of correct answers as a function of the week within the semester that the task was taken.

**Question**: There is a large current in a wire coming out of the page. What direction does the magnetic field point directly above and directly to the left of the wire?



**Features**: Hovering around the chance line, little improvement. This type of graph was not meaningful, along with those graphs that hovered around the ceiling.

Eleanor C. Sayre **Kansas State University** esayre@ksu.edu

**Features**: This graph shows the typical learning curve – before the students did not know something, then they learned something. While good, this does not support the hypothesis.



**Task Design**: Given the results from the previous set of data, the tasks were rewritten to make them more comprehensive and longer. The new tasks were designed to be completed in 5 – 10 min, rather than 2 – 3 min.

**Design**: Questions were designed with the following possible research questions in mind. Field Interference – between gravitational fields and

- electric fields
- Math vs. Physics Context Study

## **Sample Questions**:



**Test Validation:** The questions were tested for clarity and content by 11 people, ranging from undergraduate REU students, to graduate students, to faculty members.

Future Plans: These questions will be put into tasks and distributed to students at RIT throughout the Fall semester. Interviews will be conducted in October to further evaluate the questions.

This work supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant number PHY-1157044.



 Equation vs. Concept Approach Concept Tracking across the Course of the Semester The tasks were designed to be broad enough to investigate other research problems.