

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

BACHELOR THESIS

[201000166]

Teaching quantum mechanics using qCraft

Author:

Micha VAN DEN ENK
[s1004654]

Supervisors:

Dr. H. H. LEEMKUIL
Second SUPERVISOR

May 6, 2015

Contents

Preface	2
The Generic Model	2
Analyses	3
Context Analysis	3
Learner Analysis	6
Task Analysis	8
Theoretic Framework	9
Design	10
Development	11
Formative Evaluation	12
References	13

Preface

The Generic Model




Figure 1: The generic model by Plomp et al. (1992)

Analyses

The first step of the Generic Model by Plomp et al. (1992) (see figure 1 on page 2) is Analysis. Smith and Ragan (2005) give an elaborated description of how to perform these analyses for instructional design. They distinguish three different kinds of analysis: analyzing the learner context, analyzing the learner and analyzing the learning task. The analysis of the learning context can provide the instructional needs and a description of the different factors influencing the instruction. The purpose of the learner analysis is the characterization of the end user of the instruction, which is in this case the middle school students. In the task analysis the test specifications are written, with which the content of the instruction can be established. These three analyses are executed in the following three chapters.

Context Analysis

A learning task always takes place in a certain learning context. In this case this is the middle school. It entails not only the place, but also the temporal and social environment (Smith & Ragan, 2005). The analysis of the learning context can provide the instructional needs and a description of the different factors influencing the instruction. With the instructional needs, the designer can establish the main learning goals for the instruction. The description of the learning environment can provide the learning opportunities and constraints which have to be taken into account for the instruction.

Needs Assessment

The first goal of the need assessment is to investigate whether there exists a need for the instruction. Without a need, it would be a waste of resources to develop the instruction (Smith & Ragan, 2005). Next to this, it is conducted to better specify the need for the instruction. In the context of instruction, the assessment often results in a learning goal, which is the main goal of the instruction. This main goal is needed to continue the rest of the analyses, because all other analyses are conducted in respect to this goal. The goal can also be used to construct

the summative evaluation, because when this goal is achieved, the instruction has proved to be successful.

The condition Smith and Ragan (2005) identify three different models for the needs assessment, namely the problem model, the innovation model and the discrepancy model (see figure 2). The problem model is used when there exists a problem in the current system which has to be solved. As can be seen in figure 2, this model is to be used as a prerequisite for the other two models for assessment. With this model, it is determined whether there really is a problem, whether the cause of the problem is related to employees' performance or learners' achievement, whether the solution to the problem is learning and whether instruction for these learning goals is currently offered. After the problem model, the needs assessment splits into the two other models. The innovation model is used when there is a new learning goal that the learners should achieve, and the discrepancy model is used when the already available instruction is not adequate to achieve the learning goal. The designer should choose one of these models for his needs assessment.




Figure 2: The three sides of needs assessment (Smith & Ragan, 2005)

In the case of the instruction which will be constructed for this assignment, at first the problem model will be used to investigate the problem, and which of the two follow-up models should be used for the needs assessment.

The problem In the Netherlands, quantum mechanics always used to be a topic which schools themselves could choose to teach or not to teach. The only skill students had to know for the Centraal Eindexamen (the national central exams at

the end of high school) which comes close to quantum mechanics is to elucidate the photoelectric effect and the wave-particle duality, mentioned within point 20 under subdomain E3 (Laan, 2013). However, one of the changes in the Centraal Eindexamen of 2016 was the addition of domain F1, which is called Quantum world (Groenen et al., 2014). For this subdomain the candidate has to be able to apply the wave-particle duality and the uncertainty principle of Heisenberg, and to explain the quantization of energy levels in some examples with a simple quantum physical model. In order to give all candidates a chance of passing this subdomain, schools have to alter their programs in order to meet the expectations of the Centraal Eindexamen.

However, when searching the internet using the search machine Google concerning the implementation of quantum mechanics in Dutch high schools, the quantity and the quality of the results are very low. There are also no results to be found in the Dutch papers. An example is the Dutch site <http://www.quantumuniverse.nl/>, where teachers can find a small amount of brief courses on fundamental quantum mechanics, and where the forums are very quiet with only 5 discussions, of which 4 are just started threads from the site administrator.

Upon finding this information, an expert was consulted to confirm this conjecture. The expert was researching the implementation of quantum mechanics on middle schools, and she also a first degree physics teacher. She stated that within her school there were no initiatives to bring this topic in their classrooms, and that their school was no exception as well.

The fact that next year domain F1 has to be fully implemented and taught to all vwo students who chose physics as an examination subject is therefore slowly turning into a sword of Damocles. This stresses the urgency for the development of course material.

Cause of the problem

Is the solution learning

Instruction currently offered

Nature of the innovation

Learning goals

Priority and suitability

Learning Environment

The learning environment description is the other major component of the learning context analysis (Smith & Ragan, 2005). The description contains information of all the external factors influencing the instruction. These are the mediators of the instruction, the already existing curricula which takes place in the environment, the available equipment available on the location of the instruction, the characteristics of the facilities at the location of the instruction, the characteristics of the organization in which the instruction will take place, and the philosophies and taboos of the larger community in which this organization exists.

Teachers

Existing curricula

Equipment

Facilities

Organization

Larger system

Learner Analysis

The second analysis is that of the learners (Smith & Ragan, 2005). The purpose of this analysis is the characterization of the end user of the instruction, which is in this case the middle school students. For this analysis it is important to determine the similarities and differences between the learners. Smith and Ragan (2005) provide a list of factors which play a role in designing the instruction. They categorize these factors with a 2×2 matrix (see table 1), creating the categories stable similarities, changing similarities, stable differences, and changing differences.

	Similarities	Differences
Stable	Stable similarities	Stable differences
Changing	Changing similarities	Changing differences

Table 1: The four categories of Learner Characteristics (Smith & Ragan, 2005)

Stable Similarities

Sensory capacities

Information processing

Types and conditions of learning

Changing Similarities

Intellectual development processes

Language development processes

Psychosocial development processes

Moral development processes

Other development processes

Stable Differences

Aptitudes

Cognitive styles

Psychosocial traits

Gender, ethnicity, & racial group

Changing Differences

Intellectual development state

Other development state

General prior learning

Specific prior learning

Task Analysis

The final step is analyzing the learning task (Smith & Ragan, 2005). In this analysis the goals from the needs assessment during the analysis of the learning context have to be translated to test specifications, with which the content of the instruction can be established. In order to achieve these test specifications, first the type of learning has to be established. Having this established, the information-processing analysis can be conducted. Every type of learning has its own kind of information-processing analysis. Zeilinger (2005) provides a clear conceptual understanding of quantum teleportation, and will therefore be used to conduct this information-processing analysis. The next step is the prerequisite analysis. The outcome of this has to correspond to the outcome of the learner analysis. Finally, the learning objectives can be written, which form the test specifications. Every learning objective has to contain a description of the terminal behaviour or actions that will demonstrate learning, a description of the conditions of demonstration of that action and a description of the standard or criterion (Smith & Ragan, 2005). Every learning objective will fall into a category of Bloom his taxonomy of learning objectives (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Hrathwohl, 1956), and will use appropriate action verbs. Most learning objectives within will be knowledge objectives, because there is a lot of new knowledge which has to be provided and it forms the basis for all other objectives. There will be no or very few synthesis and evaluation objectives, because these objectives would take too much time within the instruction to achieve to be feasible to use.

Learning goal

Types of learning

Information-processing analysis

Prerequisite analysis

Learning objectives

Test specifications

Theoretic Framework

Design

Development

Formative Evaluation

References

Bloom, B. S., Englehart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Hrathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook i, cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.

Groenen, E., Michels, B., Smeets, P., de Leeuw, A., van de Poppe, D., Bouwens, R., ... Meek, H. (2014, April). *Syllabus natuurkunde vwo centraal examen 2016, nader vastgesteld*. Utrecht.

Laan, H. W. (2013, April). *Syllabus natuurkunde vwo centraal examen 2015*. Utrecht.

Plomp, T., Feteris, A., & Pieters, J. (1992). *Ontwerpen van onderwijs en trainingen* (W. Toic, Ed.). Utrecht: LEMMA.

Smith, P. L., & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional design*. Oklahoma: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Zeilinger, A. (2005). *Einsteins spuk. teleportation und weitere mysterien der quantenphysik*. München: C. Bertelsman Verlag.