



HAL
open science

Approaches to learning of linear algebra among engineering students

Ragnhild Johanne Rensaa

► **To cite this version:**

Ragnhild Johanne Rensaa. Approaches to learning of linear algebra among engineering students. CERME 10, Feb 2017, Dublin, Ireland. hal-01941314

HAL Id: hal-01941314

<https://hal.science/hal-01941314>

Submitted on 30 Nov 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Approaches to learning of linear algebra among engineering students

Ragnhild Johanne Rensaa

UiT the Arctic University of Norway, Norway, ragnhild.rensaa@uit.no

The present paper investigates engineering students' own descriptions of what they mean by learning of linear algebra and how they know that they have learned something. I seek to extract keywords from engineering students' descriptions of learning of this discipline by drawing on grounded theory techniques and classifying the answers in conceptual and procedural approaches. By this, both detailed and more meta perspectives on learning are obtained. Results indicate that when explaining their learning of linear algebra, conceptual more than procedural approaches are emphasized. However, in order to know that they have learned something, many engineering students need to know that they are able to solve relevant tasks in the discipline.

Keywords: Approaches to learning, linear algebra, engineering students.

Introduction

Students' learning of mathematics is a main interest within the community of researchers in didactics of mathematics. We seek to know how students learn, what they learn, but also how they perceive their own learning (Sfard, 2007). Learning may be defined according to which point of view one has in an investigation, but also by taking into consideration what is relevant for the particular individuals of a study. A classical definition is given by Hiebert and Lefevre (1986), distinguishing between conceptual and procedural knowledge that may yield conceptual and procedural learning. Conceptual knowledge is defined as "knowledge that is rich in relationships" (ibid.1986, p. 6), which means that it cannot exist in isolation. Procedural knowledge includes sequential relationships or step-by-step instructions. Engelbrecht, Bergsten and Kågesten have found conceptual and procedural notions valuable in their research of engineering students (2009), and because the target group of the present investigation is engineering students, these constructs will be utilized.

The present paper focuses on engineering students' interpretation of their own learning in a linear algebra course. Such reflections are beneficial because the students then have to reflect on how they see their mathematical knowledge and for what purposes they study the discipline. Thus, asking questions about learning is valuable and frequently done by researchers. An immediate example is the present data collection, in which questions asked to the students were picked from a research investigation of a related group of students in a mathematics and physics foundation program for students going into an engineering program (Marshall, Summers, & Woolnough, 1999). Based on data from a longitudinal study over an academic year, they derive conceptions of learning held by these students. In my study the setting is somewhat different as the students are experienced engineering students, their reflections about learning are confined to a particular domain in mathematics, and it identifies students' reflections at the end of the course. In this particular setting the following research questions are asked: Which approaches do engineering students include in their description of learning in linear algebra and how do they explain their knowing that they have learned something?

Theoretical background

The study reported on here investigates engineering students' description of their learning approaches rather than the cognitive processes of learning itself. As will be argued for, such approaches are adequately split in two main categories: approaches connected to conceptual and to procedural knowledge. The definitions were originally given by Hiebert and Lefevre (1986) and are widely used. In this framework, conceptual knowledge is pieces of knowledge connected together or, as explained by Kilpatrick, Swafford, and Findell (2001), "an integrated and functional grasp of mathematical ideas" (p. 118). Procedural knowledge, on the other hand, includes familiarity with symbols but also representation systems in mathematics along with knowledge of rules and procedures that can be used in task solving strategies in mathematics (Hiebert & Lefevre, 1986, p. 6). However, conceptual and procedural knowledges are partners and the interplay between them is valued, emphasizing how one knowledge may lead to the other (Rittle-Johnson & Alibali, 1999). Indeed, they are increasingly regarded as interrelated and inseparable, but also object for extensions to superficial and deep qualities of the knowledges (Baroody, Feil, & Johnson, 2007). Such relationships are multifaceted, and researchers move towards more integrated views in which determining the dynamics between the two is the objective (Engelbrecht et al., 2009).

Students often perceive linear algebra as difficult. This stems from three sources of difficulties (Dorier & Sierpiska, 2001). It is about the pedagogical approach, as proofs are found difficult (Rogalski, 1990). It is also a matter of difficulty with grasping the theoretical concepts and mathematical language; the 'obstacle of formalism' (Dorier, 1997). Finally, linear algebra demands a 'cognitive flexibility' as one has to move between different languages, both theoretical and practical forms. Students tend to think in practical terms (Sierpiska, 2000), and lack of connection to theoretical structures may hinder their learning (Dorier & Sierpiska, 2001).

Engineering students recognize mathematics as a foundation of their education (Khat, 2010). Still, they consider the discipline as a routine practice of their profession (Steen, 2001) and expect to be exposed to real-world engineering problems in mathematics (Hjalmarson, 2007). With such an approach, the formalism of linear algebra may be especially hard to get a grip of. Engelbrecht and colleagues (2009) found that engineering students uphold mathematics as procedurally founded. As part of their investigation, the authors created tailor-made working definitions to focus on engineering students, thus these are adopted in the present study:

"Procedural approach: Use and manipulate mathematical skills, such as calculations, rules, formulae, algorithms and symbols.

Conceptual approach: Show understanding by e.g. interpreting and applying concepts to mathematical situations, translating between verbal, visual (graphical) and formal mathematical expressions and linking relationships." (Engelbrecht et al., 2009, p. 932).

Methodology

The present investigation is part of an ongoing study dealing with engineering students' views about the learning of linear algebra. The teaching format in the course which was taught in English was 'traditional', with large group lectures followed by task solving sessions where students worked in groups. The 'untraditional' part was that a well-functioning video recording system recorded all

lectures and published them in-time. The linear algebra course was scheduled in the students' fourth year of studies to become master engineers, postponed in accordance with Carlson's recommendations (1993). However, some basic tools in linear algebra had been introduced in a mathematics course in their first year of studies, since these are necessary for use in the professional disciplines. All together 59 students attended the course this year, and data was collected as I was the teacher and arranged for a questionnaire to be answered at the end of the course. The open questions picked from (Marshall et al., 1999) discussed in the present paper were: "What do you mean by *learning* in linear algebra? And how do you know that you have *learned* something?" Due to experiences from a previous investigation (Rensaa, 2014), the questionnaire was made mandatory but anonymous to increase truthfulness, and the response rate was very good; 93% (55 out of 59).

Data analysis was done in phases. Initially, grounded approaches were used (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) to obtain codes that embrace engineering students' approaches to learning. Next, these codes were related to the definition of conceptual and procedural approaches as described by Engelbrecht and colleagues (2009) since this definition is tailor-made for engineering students. It offers a meta-perspective on the analysis results from coding, and this provides answers to the research questions about engineering students' approaches to learning.

Analysis and results

The development of codes was done in steps. Initially, I wrote down headwords in each student's description which was given in English. By comparing these, some seemed to describe similar things, e.g., 'utilize for own goals' and 'use in gps' [Global Positioning System], both which could be interpreted as 'learning as applying mathematics'. Because I was working back and forth between statements and codes with an aim of reducing the number of codes without deteriorating their meanings, each time two replies were interpreted within the same category had to be put down as a criterion for the category. For instance, for descriptions of obtained learning, 'know the whole picture' and 'associate theory to applications' were both interpreted as being able to relate the different aspects of linear algebra to each other, thus crystalizing a category called 'ARel' (able to relate). The importance of emphasizing relation in this category was helped forward by a statement that did not fall into this category: 'use different theorems to achieve solutions to practical problems'. The emphasis here is on obtaining solutions more than the relation, thus crystalizing a category called 'ASol' (being able to solve problems). Going back and forth between statements and codes resulted in a final reduction to 8 categories for what learning is and 6 categories for what is meant by learning of linear algebra.

Next, the original data set and my developed codes were sent to another researcher for validation purposes. This researcher used the codes to independently code the data. Then, we met for comparison of results and refinement of codes. A main refinement was deepening the meaning of *applications*. Students had referred to applications when trying to describe learning in linear algebra, but we agreed that students should express that applications were actively studied in a mathematical connection in order to be coded as 'Study Applications' (SAp). An example of a statement where the coding was adjusted by this interpretation is the following:

Student 30: For me, learning is knowing the practical use of theory and how to execute said theory. As a computer engineer student specializing in games development, linear

algebra is central in the programming I perform. I only know I have learned something if I can associate theory to a problem I encounter.

We agreed that this student is not stating that he is studying applications, but rather that he is actually taking advantage of knowing applications from other disciplines as part of his learning process. Thus, 'Utilize Theory' (UTh) is a closer category as the statement points to how theory may be utilized for practical purposes. The other refinement of codes that was needed was a specification of *relations*, originally named 'Rel'. It was unclear which types of relations this was referring to. The category had derived from students' answers as relating back to previous knowledge, thus the category needed to be adjusted to 'RelB' (relating to background).

Two additional codes were agreed on: the categories 'NoAns' (no answer) and 'Other'. All blank responses could be categorized as 'NoAns', while 'Other' refers to answers that responded to something else than what was asked about. The 'Other' category developed from cases in which divergence in our separate coding appeared. We both encountered problems because none of the codes actually fit with some of the particular answers. An example is 'It really gives the knowledge of different engineering mathematical problems'. One researcher had interpreted this statement as 'Study Applications' (SAp), the other as 'Able to understand why/what is going on' (AUn), but the student does not seem to be actually describing his learning. Thus, the final coding for this response was 'Other'. This joint coding process showed that the codes were adequate and could be used to code all statements. However, we experienced that coding statements together often resulted in finding more information in a reply than what we had done individually.

Ending the process, the following codes crystallized for engineering students' description of what they mean by learning in linear algebra: **SAp** (Study Applications), **GUn** (Gain Understanding), **UTh** (Utilise Theory), **ForM** (Grasp Formalism), **SimP** (Simplify), **SoL** (Solve problems), **RelB** (Relating to Background), and **ToO** (Use Tools). Analytical results for this question are given in Table 1, presenting both the number of students in each category and percentage (rounded off) of the total number of 55 students. The category 'No Answer' consisting of 17 replies is left out, while a number of explanations covered approaches in more than one category. Thus, the sum of percentages does not add up to 100.

	SAp	GUn	UTh	ForM	SimP	SoL	RelB	ToO
Number/%	8/15%	11/20%	10/18%	2/4%	2/4%	11/20%	2/4%	2/4%

Table 1: Responses to what engineering students mean by learning in linear algebra

Coding responses to engineering students' description of how they know that they have learned something gave the following codes: **ASol** (Able to Solve), **AExp** (Able to Explain), **AUn** (Able to Understand Why/What is going on), **AAp** (Able to Apply), **ARel** (Able to Relate), and **ARem** (Able to Remember). Analytical results for this question are given in Table 2, including responses coded as **Other** (answering something else). The table presents both the number of students in each category and percentage, and again multiple codes were found in some answers.

	ASol	AExp	AUn	AAP	ARel	ARem	Other
Number/%	15/27%	3/5%	6/11%	9/16%	1/2%	2/4%	5/9%

Table 2: Responses to when engineering students know that they have learned something

When the codes and categories were set, I assigned the codes in conceptual and procedural parts. As the codes had developed based on engineering students' own descriptions, they were aligned with Engelbrecht and colleagues' working definition (2009) for conceptual and procedural approaches of engineers. This was done by linking the description of codes to statements given in the definition. Some codes were easier to categorize, like GUn. Gaining understanding was classified as a conceptual approach as this is necessary to be able to expose mathematical understanding. Other classifications were harder. An example is ASol. Problems may be complex, theoretical and demand deep argumentations, and solving these should classify as a conceptual approach. On the other hand, problems may as well be 'standard', connected to a set of skills that are more like a routine part of a learning process. Such dual interpretations of an activity highlight the complexity involved in interpreting conceptual and procedural knowledges in a praxeology. However, engineering students tend to 'proceduralize' problems, even those of a conceptual nature (Engelbrecht et al., 2009). Considering this, I deduced that ASol ought to be categorized as a procedural approach, but highly interdependent upon conceptual approaches

By going back and forth between the definition and codes, a final classification of codes was obtained. For what is meant by learning in linear algebra, the following codes were classified as *conceptual*: SAp fits with 'applying to mathematical situations'; GUn is about 'showing understanding'; UTh may be interpreted as 'translating between verbal and formal mathematical expressions'; and RelB is about 'linking relationships'. The remaining categories were classified as *procedural*: ForM is about 'manipulating' linear algebra expressions; SimP is simplifying by 'calculations'; SoL refers to a way of 'using mathematical skills'; and ToO is to use tools like 'rules, formulas and algorithms'. About knowing that something is learned, the following codes were classified as *conceptual*: AExp is about 'interpreting concepts'; AUn is about 'showing understanding'; AAP is about 'applying concepts to mathematical situations' and ARel is ability to 'link relationships'. The remaining codes were classified as *procedural*: ASol is knowing how to 'use and manipulate mathematical skills'; and ARem may be a part of the manipulation of mathematical skills by recalling how to do this. Drawing on these interpretations, Table 1 and 2 may be organized in conceptual and procedural approaches. Gray coloring of conceptual cells and white coloring of procedural cells indicate the appropriate classification. In many cases, an interpretation of a student's reply comprised more than one of the codes given. An example is the following statement with three codes of a conceptual type and one of a procedural type, codes included in parenthesis:

Student 6: Generally, I mean that learning is to study something until you understand (GUn) the theory (UTh), and is able to use it in both theoretical and practical problems (SAp and SoL).

A statement could be coded in a mix, as illustrated by the last part of the above statement. Interpreted as being ‘*able to use it*,’ this may be about studying applications as a way of utilizing knowledge in problem solving – SAp, a conceptual approach. Interpreted as being ‘able to *use it*’ this would be more about the solving process itself – SoL; a procedural approach. Thus, a statement could be coded in both procedural and conceptual categories, again illustrating the close relationship.

Discussion

The analysis results summed up in Table 1 and 2 give some indications of engineering students’ conceptions of learning. In many cases, an interpretation of a student’s reply comprised more than one of the codes and one phrase could be coded in a mix as illustrated by Student 6’s explanation. Engelbrecht and colleagues emphasize that the distinction between conceptual and procedural approaches are complex and not absolute (Engelbrecht et al., 2009). Thus, mixed coding may be expected. Brought together, however, the frequencies of codes give a meta perspective on which approaches (procedural or conceptual) are most appreciated by engineering students. In this perspective, Table 1 shows that engineering students emphasize conceptual approaches more than procedural ones when explaining what learning in linear algebra means to them.

Table 1 shows that ‘Gain Understanding’ (GUn) is important to students, having the highest response rate. However, understanding is often – like in the above example – connected to knowing how to *apply* this understanding. Only when being able to apply their knowledge the students think they have understood linear algebra. This result is in line with the fact that these students are engineering students, busy with relating to the use of mathematics (Hjalmarson, 2007). To some students, however, solving of problems becomes the main issue and the scale by which they measure their learning. Lower interest is given to understanding, as the main objective is to obtain a correct answer. An example is the following:

Student 34: in my opinion, linear equations are some kind of tool (ToO) to solve the problems (SoL) in real industrial areas such as factories and... (AAp).

Not all replies coded as describing learning in a procedural way focus on solving problems. Grasping formalism, which is an aspect of difficulty for students when learning linear algebra (Sierpinska, 2000), may also be interpreted as a procedural approach in terms of manipulating the linear algebra language. This is illustrated in the following student’s description:

Student 5: the meaning of learning linear algebra is actually learning a mathematical language (ForM), a language you can use to solve big questions with many variables (SoL).

Responses to the question about engineering students’ knowing that they have learned something, summed up in Table 2, are more equally distributed between procedural and conceptual approaches. This is mainly due to the category ‘Able to Solve’, which takes all together 27% of the responses. An example of a statement coded within this category is:

Student 35: The simplest way to know that I have learned something is that I can solve some problems (ASol), when I am faced with some practical problems using this method.

This student indirectly says that he seeks to apply the mathematics in practical situations but knowing that he has learned something is concentrated to the solution process itself.

Altogether, a rough answer to the stated research questions may be that the present engineering students emphasize conceptual more than procedural approaches when explaining learning of linear algebra, but in order to know that they have learned something a noteworthy amount need to know that they are able to solve relevant tasks in the discipline.

Conclusion

A result of the present analysis is that the engineering students emphasize conceptual aspects like understanding and utilizing theory as most important in their learning of linear algebra. This may be an anticipated result when dealing with students in general, but engineering students' expectations towards mathematics are slightly different. They consider mathematics more as a routine practice (Steen, 2001) and procedurally founded (Engelbrecht et al., 2009). Thus, the result is noteworthy. However, to know that they have learned something, the same students seek confirmation in terms of being able to solve problems; a more expected procedural approach. An explanation to this result may be that the mathematics course is one in linear algebra. This course is more theoretical framed than the initial calculus courses, thus students are somewhat new to proofs and proving when coming to the course. Students find such approaches difficult (Dorier, 1997; Dorier & Sierpiska, 2001; Rogalski, 1990), and engineering students may therefore put particular attention on these aspects in learning of linear algebra. Their consecutive measure of knowing that they have learned something in terms of ability to solve problems then shows that the connection between theory and task design is particularly important. Tasks should offer opportunities to engage in conceptual arguments on the preferred premises of solving tasks. However, as assessment guides students' ways of studying, task design in exams is the most vital part. Thus, an investigation of engineering students' learning approaches related to design of exam tasks will be an important follow-up of the present project.

Even if students in the present study were asked to reply in writing – which naturally reduces the richness of the replies compared to responding orally – interesting responses were given. The following is an illustration of this, concluding the paper:

Student 9: To learn does not necessarily mean to remember something, but to understand it in depth (GUn) and be able to utilize that information for your own goals (UTh). When one has truly learned something, one can easily explain it to someone else (AExp).

Acknowledgment

Great thanks to Professor Barbro Grevholm who readily validated the coding by using my developed categories in an outsider coding process.

References

- Baroody, A. J., Feil, Y., & Johnson, A. (2007). An alternative reconceptualization of procedural and conceptual knowledge. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 38(2), 115-131.
- Carlson, D. (1993). Teaching linear algebra: Must the fog always roll in? *College Mathematics Journal*, 24(1), 29-40.
- Dorier, J.-L. (1997). *L'Enseignement de l'algèbre linéaire en question*. Grenoble: La Pensée Sauvage éditions.
- Dorier, J.-L., & Sierpinska, A. (2001). Research into the teaching and learning of linear algebra. In D. Holton (Ed.), *The teaching and learning of mathematics at university level: An ICMI study* (pp. 255-273). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Engelbrecht, J., Bergsten, C., & Kågesten, O. (2009). Undergraduate students' preference for procedural to conceptual solutions to mathematical problems. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 40(7), 927-940.
- Hiebert, J., & Lefevre, P. (1986). Conceptual and procedural knowledge in mathematics: An introductory analysis. In J. Hiebert (Ed.), *Conceptual and procedural knowledge: The case of mathematics* (pp. 1-27). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hjalmarson, M. A. (2007). Engineering students designing a statistical procedure for quantifying variability. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 26, 178-188.
- Khiat, H. (2010). A grounded theory approach: Conceptions of understanding in engineering mathematics learning. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(6), 1459-1488.
- Kilpatrick, J., Swafford, J., & Findell, B. (2001). *Adding It Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Marshall, D., Summers, M., & Woolnough, B. (1999). Students' conceptions of learning in an engineering context. *Higher Education*, 38, 291-309.
- Rensaa, R. J. (2014). *Engineering students' use of web lectures in a linear algebra course*. Paper presented at the Norma14 Conference, Åbo, Finland.
- Rittle-Johnson, B., & Alibali, M. W. (1999). Conceptual and procedural knowledge of mathematics: Does one lead to the other? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(1), 175-189.
- Rogalski, M. (1990). *Pourquoi un tel échec de l'enseignement de l'algèbre linéaire?* Retrieved from Enseigner autrement les mathématiques en DEUG Première Année
- Sfard, A. (2007). When the rules of discourse change, but nobody tells you: Making sense of mathematics learning from a commognitive standpoint. *The journal of the learning sciences*, 16(4), 567-615.
- Sierpinska, A. (2000). On some aspects of students' thinking in linear algebra. In J.-L. Dorier (Ed.), *On the teaching of linear algebra* (pp. 209-246). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher.

- Steen, L. A. (2001). Revolution of stealth: Redefining university mathematics. In D. Holton (Ed.), *The teaching and learning of Mathematics at university level* (pp. 303-312). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.