

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDINGS
OF CLASS INCLUSION CONCEPTS IN GEOMETRY**

PENELOPE ANNE SEROW

Dip. in Teaching (Catholic College of Education Sydney, NSW)

B.Ed. (University of New England, NSW)

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
of the
University of New England

October 2002

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not being currently submitted for any other degree.

I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

Signature _____



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

One of the most rewarding elements of completing a project such as this is stepping back and acknowledging the people whose support, encouragement, and assistance has made it all possible. I wish to express sincerely my gratitude to those people.

My thanks go to the support of many staff and students within the School of Education at the University of New England. My supervisor, Professor John Pegg played a pivotal role in the establishment of the project, and subsequent writing of the thesis. I would also like to thank Dr Ted Redden for his professional support in the final stages of writing, Dr Ken Vine and Dr Scott Dickson for the expert advice in quantitative aspects of the study. In another dimension, I acknowledge the powerful support provided by those who could always be relied upon to keep one's self-esteem in tact. In this light, the friendship and assistance provided by Kathy Jenkins, Linley Lloyd, Michaela Inglis, Dr Judy Miller, and Cathy Coleman had a significant role to play. I thank Professor Mike Shaughnessy for the inspiration and fellowship he provided despite the distance involved.

On reflection, I recognise the essential gifts provided by my parents, that of instilling the importance of the development of knowledge and creating an environment of belief that you can reach your goals. In addition, my Dad's own example of excellence in teaching provided the foundation to continue in this field. I would like to thank all my family for their tireless support in many different aspects of the thesis journey.

To my husband Chris, whose faith in me, constant encouragement, love, support and patience was evident throughout the many hurdles involved in writing this thesis. To my children, Elise, Michael, and Charles, whose understanding of 'study time' and cooperation greatly assisted the completion of this thesis, thank you.

To enable the work involved in this study, I acknowledge the financial assistance in the form of an Australian Postgraduate Award provided by the University of New England.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		v
LIST OF FIGURES		vii
ABSTRACT		ix
INTRODUCTION		1
CHAPTER		
1	Review of Geometrical Framework	5
	The Van Hiele Theory	6
	Levels: Features and research	13
	Level Three	32
	Conclusion	39
2	Review of Class Inclusion and the SOLO Model	41
	Review of class inclusion concepts	42
	Geometrical class inclusion	55
	The SOLO model— System to analyse responses	64
	Conclusion	78
3	Research Methodology	81
	Context of the study	81
	Design of the study	86
	Methodological issues	93
	Data analysis plan	99
	Evaluation of the design	101
	Conclusion	109
4	Triangle Results	110
	Relationships among triangles	110
	Relationships among triangle properties	134
	Conclusion	162

5	Quadrilateral Results	166
	Relationships among quadrilateral figures	167
	Relationships among quadrilateral properties	191
	Combined qualitative framework	213
6	Integration of Triangle and Quadrilateral Results	219
	Quantitative synthesis	220
	Conclusion	240
7	Student Case Studies: Cross Sectional and Longitudinal Analysis	243
	Student 1: Narelle	244
	Student 2: Brendan	251
	Student 3: Scott	261
	Student 4: Louise	270
	Conclusion	280
8	Conclusions	283
	Possible limitations of the study	283
	Overview of results	284
	Implications for theoretical frameworks	298
	Implications for teaching	301
	Future research directions	303
	Conclusion	304
	REFERENCES	307
	APPENDICES	
A	Pilot Study	320
B	Studies 1 and 2 interview proforma	323
C	Interview resources	326
D	Intrarater and interrater reliability	337
E	Plain language statement—consent form	338
F	Relationships among triangles task analysis	340
G	Relationships among quadrilaterals task analysis	344
H	Quadrilateral properties tasks contextual groupings	348
I	SOLO response codings for Studies 1,2, and 3	349
J	Rasch analysis coding	350

LIST OF TABLES

1.1	Descriptions of the van Hiele levels	8
1.2	Descriptions of the van Hiele teaching phases	10
3.1	Overview of research sample	90
4.1	Interview format for the task concerning relationships among triangles	111
4.2	The SOLO model and relationships among triangles	132
4.3	Triangle characteristic cards	135
4.4	Interview format for the task concerning relationships among triangle properties	136
4.5	Key to diagrammatical summary symbols	138
4.6	Combined triangle properties response groupings	157
4.7	The SOLO model and relationships among triangle properties	160
5.1	Interview format for the task concerning relationships among quadrilaterals	167
5.2	The SOLO model and relationships among quadrilaterals	189
5.3	Quadrilateral characteristic cards	192
5.4	Interview format for the task concerning relationships among quadrilateral properties	193
5.5	Optimum selection of characteristic cards	194
5.6	Quadrilateral property context groupings	195
5.7	SOLO categorisation of quadrilateral property responses	197
5.8	The SOLO model and relationships among quadrilaterals	210
5.9	Summary of relationships among figures SOLO codings	213
5.10	Summary of SOLO codings concerning relationships among properties	215
6.1	Fit statistics for item estimates	221
6.2	Fit statistics for case estimates	221
6.3	Triangle figures development—comparison of Interventions 1 and 2	222
6.4	Quadrilateral figures development—comparison of Interventions 1 and 2	223
6.5	Mean triangle properties development—comparison of Interventions 1 and 2	223
6.6	Mean quadrilateral properties development—comparison of Interventions 1 and 2	223

6.7	Overall item difficulty	228
6.8	Item response category difficulty levels	229
6.9	Step difficulties	237
7.1	Narelle's SOLO codings for Interventions 1 and 2	244
7.2	Brendan's SOLO codings for Interventions 1 and 2	251
7.3	Scott's SOLO codings for Interventions 1 and 2	261
7.4	Louise's SOLO codings for Interventions 1 and 2	270
8.1	Overview of developmental pathway leading to an understanding of class inclusion notions	287

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	The SOLO model: modes and forms of knowledge	68
2.2	Diagrammatic representation of SOLO levels associated with the concrete symbolic mode	73
3.1	NSW Secondary Mathematics Courses	82
3.2	Overview of the research design	93
4.1	Narelle's triangle groupings summary	113
4.2	Peter's triangle relationships summary	114
4.3	Ellen's triangle relationships summary	115
4.4	Megan's triangle relationships summary	117
4.5	Suzanne's triangle relationships summary	119
4.6	Cameron's triangle relationships summary	121
4.7	Frances' triangle relationships summary	123
4.8	Beth's triangle relationships summary	124
4.9	Nathan's triangle relationships summary	125
4.10	Dianne's triangle relationships summary	126
4.11	David's triangle relationships summary	128
4.12	Adam's triangle relationships summary	129
4.13	Type A equilateral triangle properties relationships summary	139
4.14	Type B equilateral triangle properties relationships summary	141
4.15	Type C equilateral triangle properties relationships summary	142
4.16	Type D equilateral triangle properties relationships summary	143
4.17	Type E equilateral triangle properties relationships summary	145
4.18	Type A right isosceles triangle properties relationships summary	147
4.19	Type B right isosceles triangle properties relationships summary	148
4.20	Type C right isosceles triangle properties relationships summary	150
4.21	Type D right isosceles triangle properties relationships summary	151
4.22	Type E right isosceles triangle properties relationships summary	153
4.23	Type F right isosceles triangle properties relationships summary	154
5.1	Frances' quadrilateral relationships summary	169
5.2	Narelle's quadrilateral relationships summary	170
5.3	Tracy's quadrilateral relationships summary	172
5.4	Megan's quadrilateral relationships summary	174
5.5	Andrew's quadrilateral relationships summary	176
5.6	Peter's quadrilateral relationships summary	177
5.7	Alice's quadrilateral relationships summary	179

5.8	Jenny's quadrilateral relationships summary	181
5.9	David's quadrilateral relationships summary	183
5.10	Brendan's quadrilateral relationships summary	186
5.11	Bifurcation evident in first cycle of formal mode	212
6.1	Item map	222
6.2	Item and case estimates (thresholds)	225
6.3	Case estimates—Intervention 1 and Intervention 2	226
6.4	Case estimate correlation	227
6.5	Relationships among figures mean step difficulty	238
6.6	Relationships among properties mean step difficulty	238
6.7	Item response difficulties	239

ABSTRACT

This study investigated students' understandings of class inclusion concepts in Geometry. The purpose was to identify a developmental pathway leading to an understanding of the interrelationships among two-dimensional figures and their properties. The design involved a tightly focused investigation of the manner in which geometrical class inclusion concepts evolve, in particular, relationships among triangle and quadrilateral figures, and relationships among their properties. Empirical evidence is provided to explain the difficulties students face in understanding of class inclusion notions. This evidence has theoretical as well as practical implications.

The theoretical base for this study is the van Hiele Theory, which comprises five levels of development in Geometry. Numerous studies have involved a focus upon the holistic aspects of the first four van Hiele levels and this has resulted in supportive empirical evidence of the existence and nature of the levels. Pertinent to this study, the level associated with a student who accepts and utilises notions of class inclusion is described as Level 3. This aspect of Level 3 is regarded as both a difficult concept to acquire and a prerequisite for formal deductive reasoning. This study extends research into the van Hiele Theory by narrowing the microscopic lens and providing a focused analysis on the understanding and development of class inclusion concepts in Geometry. In an attempt to refine the characteristics of the development of this concept, this study utilised the SOLO model to provide deeper insights into the van Hiele levels.

The investigation comprised three studies. The first of these, Study 1, explored the context of triangles, and included two main components. These components were relationships among triangle figures, and relationships among triangle properties. Study 2 extended the baseline data of Study 1 via the investigation of students' understanding of relationships among quadrilateral figures and relationships among quadrilateral properties. Each of these studies involved in-depth interviews with 24 students of higher mathematical ability, purposely selected, within Years 8–12 (ages 13–18 years) in two secondary schools. Study 3 also consisted of two parts. The first of these, a quantitative synthesis, based upon the application of ACER's QUEST analysis program, utilised Rasch measurement theory. This part of Study 3 also considered developmental changes from a longitudinal perspective. The second part of Study 3 considered developmental changes in the form of four case studies.

A central finding of this study was the identification of a broad generic framework which describes the developmental pathway leading to an understanding of class

inclusion notions. This pathway characterises student growth in understanding of relationships among figures, and relationships among properties. The pathway was characterised by two cycles of responses of the concrete symbolic mode (SOLO), and two cycles of responses of the formal mode (SOLO). The existence of this pathway has challenged accepted characterisations of van Hiele's Level 3. Behaviours previously described as requiring Level 3 thinking have been found by this study to include Level 3, Transitional Level 3/4, and Level 4.

This study identified student difficulties associated with attaining Transitional Level 3/4. Here, students need to focus upon relationships that are not supported by visual cues. This is identified as formal thinking. The characterisation of transitional groups, evident at Level 3/4, provides guidance concerning teaching activities and implications, to assist students' in their progression from Level 3 to Level 4.

In general, the known property relationships assisted students in the formation of sub-class relationships. In addition, property relationships did not emerge as an identifiable sequence; instead they appeared dependent upon student familiarity with individual properties. However, developmental patterns were evident in terms of language-use where property descriptions appeared to hinder the formation of relationships at Level 2, and property descriptions were conducive to the utilisation of relationships at Level 3, Transitional Level 3/4, and Level 4. Of surprise were the similarity of results for two different contexts of quadrilaterals and triangles. This finding providing support for the notion that thinking at a particular level in one context assists the progression to the same level in other contexts.

The quantitative synthesis across contexts validated the chosen instrument and the developmental trends highlighted by the application of the SOLO model. There was consistency across the triangle and quadrilateral contexts concerning relationships among figures and relationships among properties. The longitudinal student responses, over the two-year period, were interpreted along the previously identified developmental path. Evidence presented in the case studies indicated that individual student responses to similar tasks within different contexts were not always at a consistent SOLO level, dependent upon individual familiarity of triangles or quadrilaterals. It was also evident that some students responded at a higher SOLO level concerning either relationships among properties or relationships among figures.

The research highlights the reasons students find class inclusion concepts in Geometry difficult to grasp. Secondary-school (ages 12–18 years) curriculum content concerning

such notions have been identified as requiring thinking at van Hiele's Level 3, Level 3/4 and Level 4. Thus the hurdles encountered by many students are detailed through the characterisation of the development of relationships among figures and relationships among properties. In addition, this study highlights the use of the SOLO model as an interpretive tool for research in Mathematics education.