DOCUMENT SUMMARY

This research article from the field of Physics Education Research introduces the "Resources Framework," a cognitive model explaining how students think and learn. It is critically relevant to Enlitens because it provides a scientific basis for challenging the validity of standardized testing. The author demonstrates that individuals often answer questions incorrectly not due to a lack of knowledge, but because of "epistemological framing"—their unconscious, context-driven assumptions about what kind of thinking is required for a task. This framework provides powerful language and evidence to argue that standardized tests do not measure intelligence or ability, but rather a person's capacity to adopt the test-maker's specific, and often narrow, cognitive frame, thereby failing to capture the true reasoning of neurodivergent individuals.

FILENAME

Redish_2013_Cognitive_Framing_Critiques_Standardized_Assessment.md

METADATA

- **Primary Category**: RESEARCH
- **Document Type**: research_article
- **Relevance**: Core
- **Key Topics**: cognitive framing, assessment critique, selective attention, context-dependent knowledge, epistemology, learning theory, metacognition
- **Tags**: #framing, #cognition, #assessment_critique, #selective_attention, #context_dependence, #epistemology, #metacognition, #standardized_testing_bias, #resources_framework

CRITICAL QUOTES FOR ENLITENS

"When our students miss a question whose answer they should know or be able to work out as a result of what we have taught them, we typically assume that that they have failed to learn or understand what we have taught them."

"If many students do the same thing, or if some students repeat the same mistake despite repeated instruction, we may say they bring a misconception into our class and expect that they will need a strong remedial effort to fix it. Sometimes this is the case. However, the two-level version of the resources theoretical framework I describe below, built on solid results from psychology, neuroscience, socio-linguistics, and anthropology, suggests that errors of this type can have other causes than failures of knowledge."

"So errors, even reliably reproducible ones, may occur not only because of lack of knowledge but also through failures in the moment of control structures: mismatches of situations and

expectations about the task that result in students failing to access knowledge they actually have."

"Memory is not veridical. It's not an accurate recording, but rather is 'reconstructed' from stored bits and pieces and plausible stock items."

"This surprising phenomenon is called inattentional blindness-when you are paying attention to something you think is important, you may fail to notice other important things. The fact that we pay attention to some things and ignore others (often without conscious decision) is called selective attention. This is the psychological core of the phenomenon that I refer to as framing, which is the heart of the phenomena about teaching and learning that I want to emphasize here."

"It's not just the socio-cultural environment that matters: rather, it's a student's perception of the socio-cultural environment that affects that student's behavior."

"As in experiment 3, if our students fail to perceive what we have set up for them or asked them to do, it might as well not be there."

"Student responses don't simply represent activations of their stored knowledge. They are dynamically created in response to their perception of the task and what resources are appropriate to bring to bear. As a result, their behavior may have a complex structure. The (often unconscious) choices they make as to how to activate, use, and process knowledge are often determined by their social and cultural expectations (framing)."

"We need to keep in mind the possibility that students may not just be 'wrong', 'not know', 'not understand', or 'exhibit difficulties', but that they may rather be 'doing the wrong thing'."

"Now, my theoretical frame helps me see this as an inappropriate role reversal. I shouldn't have been viewing the student's question from a focus on the content of the question. Rather, I should have been trying to answer the question, 'Why can't this student, to whom I have taught this material, answer this question for herself?' I should have been diagnosing her learning difficulty, not answering the content of her question."

"My hope is that some student will raise the issue and I will be 'forced' to accept answer [e] as correct. This encourages students to think about their tests, think about their thinking, and challenge my grading. This is a much better situation for epistemological development than simply looking at it and saying, 'Oh. I got it wrong. I better memorize this answer.'"

KEY STATISTICS & EVIDENCE

Johnstone's Chemistry Exam Analysis:

- An analysis of a chemistry exam on "the mole" given to 22,000 sixteen-year-old students was conducted.
- Student success was considered as a function of the total number of mental "pieces" required: (1) pieces of information in the question, (2) pieces to be recalled, and (3) processing steps.

- The results showed a "dramatic drop off" in student success when the number of pieces of information reached six, which is consistent with George Miller's "
  7±2" hypothesis about the limits of working memory.

Gravity vs. Horizontal Pulling Clicker Questions (N=111 students):

- **Question 1 (Gravity)**: "The prof drops two metal spheres, one of 1 kg, the other of 5 kg. They hit the ground at (almost) exactly the same time. The force of gravity on the 5 kg weight is:"
  - Results: About half of the students incorrectly answered that the forces were the same. (Graph shows ~32% said greater, ~12% said less, ~54% said the same).
- **Question 2 (Horizontal Pull)**: "You are pulling two weights along a table with equal force. Which one would speed up faster?"
  - Results: More than 80% correctly answered that the lighter mass would speed up faster. (Graph shows ~88% said the 1 kg weight, ~2% said the 5 kg weight, ~4% said they'd speed up the same way).
- **Conclusion**: The error in the first question is not a lack of knowledge, but a framing error. "They see 'gravity' in the first question and remember from Physics 1, 'Oh yeah. We had a funny result about falling and the implication was that gravity was the same.' They reconstructed a memory and did not include in their epistemological framing the need to check their memory against their intuition."

METHODOLOGY DESCRIPTIONS

Experiment 1: Limited working memory "Our first experiment demonstrates the critical result that our brains have difficulty in managing tasks of too high a complexity at one time. For this task you will need a partner. Have your partner read you the following strings of numbers and after each one, try to quickly say them back in reverse order. So if your partner says '123' you respond '321'. Now try it with the following number strings: 123 4629 38271 539264 9026718 43917682 579318647 Get the idea? It gets harder and harder and above a certain string length it's impossible. (You can develop techniques to do this task, but the experiments I present are designed to show the limitations of the untrained brain.) George Miller proposed the limit of '

7±2' on processing capacity more than 50 years ago. These observations are the basis of the important psychological construct of working memory the part of your brain that you use to think with and that manipulates bits of the large store of knowledge your long-term memory contains."

Experiment 2: Reconstructive recall "In our second experiment, consider the 24 words given in the list shown in Fig. 1. Look at them for one minute and try to memorize as many as possible. Don't do anything special or organized : just look at the words and try to remember as many as you can. After one minute, look away and try to write down as many as you can recall. [List of words: Thread, Pin, Sewing, Haystack, Eye, Sharp, Injection, Point, Knitting, Syringe, Thimble, Cloth, Bed, Rest, Blanket, Doze, Awake, Tired, Dream, Slumber, Snore, Nap, Snooze, Yawn] Now look at your list. Check endnote [31] to see if you had either of the two test words on your list. [The test words are "needle" and "sleep"]. When I give this task to my class, typically more than half of the students put one or both of the test words on their list and are shocked to discover that they aren't there. They were sure they remembered seeing them! This illustrates a critical principle of memory: Memory is not veridical. It's not an accurate recording, but rather is 'reconstructed' from stored bits and pieces and plausible stock items."

Experiment 3: Selective attention "For our final experiment, you need an Internet connection. In this task, a group of six students (shown in Fig. 2) serve as two teams, one with white shirts and one with black. Each team has a basketball and during the short video they move around quickly, passing their ball among members of their own team. Your task is to see how well you can concentrate by counting the number of passes among the members of the white-shirted team. You have to pay careful attention, since things happen fast! Go to the link http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IGQmdoK ZfY and maximize the screen without reading any of the text there (or below) until you are done. Many people manage to count the number of passes successfully, but fail to see the dramatic events and changes that take place during the clip that are identified at the end. This surprising phenomenon is called inattentional blindness-when you are paying attention to something you think is important, you may fail to notice other important things. The fact that we pay attention to some things and ignore others (often without conscious decision) is called selective attention."

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

The Resources Framework This paper outlines the "Resources Framework" as a theoretical structure for understanding how students think and learn. The core idea is that thinking is not just about having knowledge, but about accessing and using cognitive "resources" in the moment. The framework is built on foundational principles from psychology and social sciences.

Key Principles from Psychology:

1. **Limited Working Memory**: The brain can only manipulate a small number of items at once (Miller's "7±2"). This bottleneck means the brain must use strategies like "chunking" (compiling knowledge into blocks) or "memory reconstruction" to handle complexity.
2. **Reconstructive Recall**: Memory is not a perfect, accurate recording. It is dynamically reconstructed from stored information and plausible assumptions, which can lead to false memories.
3. **Selective Attention**: The brain actively filters sensory input, paying attention to what it deems important and ignoring other information, even if it's dramatic ("inattentional blindness"). This is the core mechanism of framing.

Cognitive & Socio-Cultural Structure: The framework proposes a two-level model of cognition:

1. **Associations**: Knowledge exists as a network of linked "bits of knowledge." Activating one bit can activate or inhibit others, leading to interpretation and meaning-making. These can be tight, automatic associations ("compiled") or looser ones that depend on context.
2. **Control**: Higher-level processes, influenced by socio-cultural knowledge and expectations, control which associations are activated. The brain uses its understanding of a situation to filter its vast long-term memory, controlling selective attention and deciding what knowledge is relevant. This is the control structure.

The Grain-Size Staircase & Framing: Human behavior is analyzed at multiple scales, from neurons to broad social cultures. Higher levels of this "staircase" (e.g., classroom culture,

disciplinary culture, societal views on schooling) feed back and constrain individual behavior at lower levels. The mechanism for this feedback is

framing.

Framing Explained: "The anthropologist Erving Goffman studied how people interpret and respond to the social environments they find themselves in from moment to moment. He suggested that people are continually asking themselves the question (though not necessarily consciously), 'What's going on here?' The answer to that question controls (again, not necessarily consciously) what behaviors the individual activates. Goffman referred to the process of answering that question by drawing on experiences stored in long-term memory as framing."

In an educational context, this is called

Epistemological Framing: the process that generates an individual's answer to the questions: "What is the nature of the knowledge we are learning in this class and what do I have to do to learn it?" This framing process determines which cognitive resources a person activates for a given task.

Four Identified Maladaptive Epistemological Framings:

1. **One-step thinking**: "The answer is obvious. I don't have to worry about context or coherence." This is the belief that one should know every answer immediately through direct recall, without deeper thought or checking against other knowledge.
2. **P-priming**: "The answer is obvious. I don't have to worry about how it works." This involves using an intuitive sense ("phenomenological primitive") to answer a question without considering the underlying mechanism. Example: "a longer tape takes a longer time."
3. **Rote reasoning**: "I know the process to generate this answer. I don't have to think about meaning." This involves applying a learned procedure or equation without sense-making or checking if it's appropriate for the context.
4. **Disciplinary siloing**: "Since this is a physics course, I don't have to bring in any knowledge from chemistry." This is the classification of knowledge as belonging to only one domain, refusing to apply it in other contexts. This can be extended to the gap between scientific/academic knowledge and personal lived experience.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

How a Theoretical Framework Improves Teaching (and by extension, clinical practice):

1. **Makes responses to student questions more effective**:
    - The goal shifts from simply providing the correct answer to diagnosing the underlying difficulty.
    - The key question becomes: "Why can't this student, to whom I have taught this material, answer this question for herself?"
    - This leads to understanding that the problem may be a framing error rather than a knowledge deficit, requiring careful questioning to identify the true issue.

    - **Example**: A student was failing an exam, stating "I didn't know any of these answers so I just guessed." By prompting her on *how* to approach the problem (using a free-body diagram), she realized, "Oh! I'm supposed to figure them out!" Her problem was not a lack of physics knowledge, but an incorrect epistemological frame about what an exam question required.
2. **Leads to more respect for students' thinking and opinions**:
    - It encourages giving students more latitude and persistently following up on "wrong" answers.
    - "Wrong" answers can illuminate the instructor's own tacit, unstated assumptions.
    - **Example**: In a question about the electric potential in a capacitor, some students chose "none of the above." Their reasoning was more sophisticated than the "correct" answer: one student considered that potential should spike near individual atoms on the plate, and another noted that at a great distance, the potential should go to zero symmetrically. The instructor realized the "obvious right answer" was only right under a series of unstated "toy model" assumptions. This led to a valuable discussion about approximations and models.
3. **Encourages "meta-cognitive formative evaluation"**:
    - This involves creating activities that help students become aware of their own thinking processes and the limitations of "natural thinking."
    - Regular "tricky" quizzes are given that are designed to produce wrong answers if students use one-step thinking or ignore mechanisms.
    - The goal is explicitly formative: "learning how to take a test where 'thinking is required'."
    - The subsequent discussion about *why* students chose wrong answers is often the most valuable part of the lesson, leading to better epistemological development than simply being told an answer is wrong.
4. **Helps generate hypotheses for research**:
    - The framework prevents misinterpreting common errors as simple "misconceptions."
    - It forces the researcher to consider that the problem may not be what the student *knows*, but what knowledge they *activate* in the moment.
    - These two problems (lack of knowledge vs. failure of activation) have identical symptoms (wrong answers) but require "dramatically different cures."