

FOSTERING CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING IN CHEMISTRY THROUGH GROUP WORK

Sani Adamu Gyako
Department of Chemistry,
College of Education,
Akwanga,
Nasarawa State.

Abstract

Although problem solving is a very important higher-order cognitive skill, our students seem to believe that this activity does not deserve too much effort and they develop the attitude that arriving at the answer is more important than understanding the process of solution. This is due in part to the way we teach problem solving. Usually, when teaching, we show them only some stages of the process, neglecting the analysis stage, because as experts we are now no longer able to recall the effort we had to expend the first time we tried to solve a problem, since it is now familiar to us. From this presentation, students see a clean, even elegant solution, having little in common with the uncertainty and the fuzzy thinking that they experience when they try to solve a problem by themselves. From research we know that it is quite difficult for students to develop creative solution to problems. The results reported here are promising in making students active developers of original solution. These results are tentatively attributed to the use of an active method of learning and to the students' motivation.

Keywords: chemistry, cooperative learning; creativity; group work, problem solving

Problem solving is very important for many subjects. Chemistry is no exception, combining in its problems characteristics of mathematics and physics problems, and adding its

distinct chemical features (stoichiometry, chemical synthesis, chemical analysis, etc.). In stoichiometry, important quantitative relations constitute conceptual building

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

blocks. But problem solving is a higher-order cognitive skill (Zoller, 2010) which demands many abilities, sometimes requiring much effort from the solver. Problem solving is a process in which various reasoning patterns are combined, refined, extended, and invented. It is much more than substituting numbers in well-known and practiced formulas; it deals with creativity, lateral thinking and formal knowledge. Research has tried to correlate some cognitive variables, such as formal operational reasoning, working memory capacity, disembedding ability, specific knowledge, concept relatedness and idea association, to science achievement and problem solving ability, (Camacho and Good, 1989; Tsapalis, G .Kausathama, M. and Nian M. 1998; Stamovlasis and Tsapalis, 2000; Lee , K..W.L, Tang, W.U, Goh, n.k. & Chia, L.S.(2009).

Suggestions from research are, that instructional methods should take into account the general strategies and methods of problem solving, thus providing a tool to increase reasoning skills in the problem solver. Life is, in essence, a continuous process of problem solving and selection from available and/ or created options, and it is sobering to note that sometimes people who have received formal training in problem solving are not necessarily the best problem solvers . Nevertheless, problem solving abilities/ decision making capacities are valuable and precious skills not only in academia,

but also in the world of business and industry and in daily living. Furthermore, in science these skills play an important role in the acquisition and organization of knowledge in a meaningful way .The way knowledge (both 'know-how' and 'know-what') is organized in memory is generally recognized to be critically related to the degree of success in problem solving (De Jong and Ferguson-Hessler, 2010). To help students organize and structure their knowledge, they are asked to draw concept maps (Novak, 1998) for every topic presented in the course syllabus.

Access to Knowledge

If an important prerequisite for being a successful problem solver is that knowledge must be activated in the Long Term Memory (L T M) when needed , this must have implications for the way we teach and the way in which students are encouraged to lay down knowledge in L T M . If the research on learning styles (Entwistle, 2009, Lawrence, 2011) is to be taken seriously, we have to admit that a lecture may not be the best way to facilitate the orderly linkage of knowledge in L T M. Not surprisingly, research shows that note-taking is affected by a person's information processing ability and by individual psychological factors such as field dependence/ independence (Johnstone and Su, 2011). Moreover, students taught almost entirely in a way that clashes with their learning styles, do not learn as much as students taught in

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

their preferred styles, and they retain less of what they learn (Felder, 2010). Many years ago, Whitehead warned about the danger of knowledge that is accessed only in a restricted set of contexts even though it is applicable to a wide variety of contexts, and he called it inert knowledge (Whitehead, 2007). Knowledge stored in sealed boxes without meaningful connections with other concepts is inert knowledge. This point is illustrated by Johnstone in another paper in this issue of *Chemistry Education and Research Practice (CERP)*, where he reports on the problem of teaching senior undergraduates in bioinorganic chemistry, complex formation and stability and organic ligands. It is clearly very uncomfortable for them to “open several boxes at once”. (Johnstone and Otis, 2013).

Several factors influence the abilities in solving problems, from the nature of the problem, to the learners' developmental level and their knowledge base, to motivation and problem solving skills, to many individual and psychological factors. A deep and comprehensive analysis of those factors can be found in the literature (Reid and Yang, 2012). This study looked at a group of chemistry students (42 girls and 48 boys, aged 19-22) in the first semester of their first year at the NCE. Two psychological measurements were applied to the group to see if there was any relationship between these results and the quality of the creative problem solving resulting

from this approach. These were (a) Formal Operational Reasoning and (b) Disembedding Ability.

The former was measured using the Group Assessment of Logical Thinking (GALT) test (Roadrang, V. Yean, R. H. & Palla, M. J. (1999). The scores ranged from 10 to 21 (out of 21 with a mean of 13.3 and standard deviation of 2.4.)

The latter was measured by the Field Dependence/Field Independence test devised and calibrated by El-Banna (2000) based upon the original work of Witkin (Witkin and Goodenough, 1998). Out of a possible score of 16 the range achieved was 3-15, with a mean value of 11.20 and a standard deviation of 2.6.

As we see in the literature, the development and improvement of education requires the fostering of creativity and critical thinking (CT) skills: “Critical thinking is reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do.” (Ennis, 1997). There is no question that many teachers would like to improve the CT abilities of their students. How can this be done? Or, in the Schoenfeld words: “The critical question is: can we train novices to solve problems as experts do?” (Schoenfeld, 2008).

To become an expert in any domain, a lot of work is needed. It is estimated to take about 10,000 hours; and much longer time than any NCE/undergraduate course (Hayes, 1988). However, the experience

described in this paper suggests that something valuable can be achieved in a short time. In their seminar work, Lee et al(2009) found four differences between experts and novices. Glaser and Chi (2005) enumerate seven characteristics of experts, but the difference, which is of major importance for the novice, is that the expert spends a great deal of time analyzing a problem qualitatively. In light of this thought, that a hypothesis was formed that students can be more successful in problem solving if they get accustomed to spending more time in analyzing problems. The experience described in this paper is an attempt to encourage students to analyse problems and to apply novel methods to their solution.

Attempting to Improve Analysis Skills

As teachers we believe that working on problems is an effective way to learn. Unfortunately, our students usually develop the attitude that arriving at the answer is more important than understanding the solving process. Many students start to calculate something from the text of the problem, without ever asking themselves whether this calculation will get them closer to the correct solution. Why might this be so? "Textbook solutions to problems and solutions presented by instructors on the blackboard are always efficient, well-organized paths to correct answer." (Herron, 2003). They apply algorithms developed by experts after repeated solutions of similar problems. "They provide no indication of the false starts,

dead ends, illogical attempts, and wrong solutions that characterize the efforts of students when they work in problem solving". (Herron, 2012, Bodner, 2013) . If we want to help our students, we have to find a different way to teach problem solving, a way that obliges students to spend more time analyzing the problem. It was decided to try a fresh approach to teaching problem solving based upon the analysis, synthesis and verification (ASV) method developed by the author (Cardellini, 2009) and incorporating the use of a cooperative approach involving small group working.

The initial problems tackled were non-chemical and non-algorithmic to emphasize the analysis and synthesis operations without the interference of chemical concepts which students may not have mastered as yet. Examples of the kind of problems are shown below.

Problem 1: Consider two containers, X and Y. Container X has 12mL of water in it from River Mada, Y contains 10mL of water from River Gudi. Suppose that 1mL of River Mada water is removed from container X and put into Y. After the liquid in Y is mixed thoroughly, 1 mL of the mixture is removed and added to the content's of container X. Which container now has the greater amount of foreign water, the River Mada water being foreign to Y. or the Gudi water to X?(Adapted from Cardellini, 2008).

Problem 2: Two friends meet after a long time. While catching up on each other's news, one discovers that the first

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

has married and has three sons. Then the second asks their ages and the first one answers – “the product of their ages is 32 and their sum is equal to that house number there” – pointing to the number under the porch of the house. But the second replies – “it is not sufficient.” And the first one – “Ok. Then I will also add that the youngest has blue eyes.”

Without any familiar algorithms to depend upon, students have to reason their way into the problems, draw diagrams (if necessary) to represent the problems and then, having analyzed them, to plan a method for their solution. At the end came the verification of the results to be assured of their reasonableness. The ASV approach was aided by a number of questions which helped the students to subdivide the problems to reduce the load on working memory.

A key feature of the approach was small group working. (Wood, 2012). The class was organized into groups of three, giving six groups of girls and seven of boys. Before starting on the problems, they were briefed on the use of concept maps (to aid the problem analysis) and in the techniques of group work. Effort has to be made to try to change the students' attitude toward problem solving: to shift the focus from looking at the product (the solution) to the importance of viewing problem solving as a conscious reasoning process.

Solving these problems requires time and it is not possible to apply a formula to them, so students have to use

their reasoning. Maybe for the first time, students have to use some heuristic strategies such as decreasing the complexity of the problem, breaking down the task into sub-problems, making the problem visible by translating it into pictures, diagram or graphs, solving an analogous problem, or even working backwards, if this can help.

The first stage in problem solving is probably where the solver works hardest trying to understand the problem, extracting relevant information and translating it, or part of it, into a familiar form. “This is a holistic or gestalt stage where relevant information is ‘disembedded’ from the problem, and the elements of the problem are juggled more or less simultaneously until the problem is ‘restructured’ or transformed into a problem that the student understands” (Bodner and McMillen, 2003).

In this method of teaching problem solving, there is a special way of dealing with the students' errors. When the students have solved the problem in groups, one of them presents the solution on the blackboard, which is then discussed with the class. The same is done with the wrong solutions. At the end of every lesson, some problems are suggested as homework. Before starting each lecture, comments are made on the problems collected and corrected the day before, and the new problems are collected for correction.

The Cooperative Learning Approach in Detail

Cooperative learning is a method of active learning where students are involved in some activity beyond listening to the teacher. In the past students have been expected to learn how to solve problems by looking at the way teachers solve the problem at the blackboard. Instead, in this approach the students are actively involved in the learning process. Students tackle problems in groups, according to certain roles (problem solver, Sceptic, Checker/Recorder) and follow a structured procedure under conditions that meet the five criteria of cooperative learning set out below. Felder, (2010) .

1. Positive interdependence, Team members must rely on one another to accomplish goals.
2. Individual accountability, Members are held accountable for (a) doing their share of the work and (b) mastering all material.
3. Face-to-face interaction, Some or all of the work is to be done by members working together.
4. Appropriate use of interpersonal skills, Team members practice and receive instruction in leadership, decision-making, communication and conflict management.
5. Self-assessment of group functioning, Team periodically reflects on what they are doing well as a team, what they could

improve, and what they will do differently in the future.

According to this method, the problem solver has to think aloud, and the sceptic has to understand the solution, asking for explanations when necessary. By working in groups, students are more likely to activate some critical thinking process. So the role of the Sceptic is very important, especially if he helps the problem solver to move away from assumptions which might lead to a dead end. Because, for every new problem, the roles rotate, every student has the opportunity to improve her/his capacity in the analysis, synthesis and verification processes. Thinking aloud has the additional benefit of reducing the speed of the thinking process, discouraging jumping to conclusions and improving the chances of arriving at a more accurate conclusion. Constructing the solution in the group, negotiating the meaning, explaining inferences, teaching one another, making sense of the relationships facilitates the deep understanding of the solution. Making the groups work fruitfully, requires competence in applying the cooperative learning method, and effort from the teacher.

The students were told that there would be less class time spent on lectures and about half the time or more on problem solving. Since problem solving is so important, they were promised that the teacher would correct every single problem they solved and

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

give each of them his opinion and suggestions on their solution. The teacher explained why this was being done, assuring the students that it was not an expedient to make his life easier—quite the contrary, but in this way they would learn more and they would become more confident in their abilities. Experience shows that students learn in a more meaningful way if they teach one another some of the time rather than just listen to lectures (Cardellini, 2011).

They were reminded that this method of problem solving also would prepare them for their professional careers where they would certainly have to work in teams. Before each new lesson (three lessons amount to seven hours every week), students were asked to sit according to their groups, and the maps they had constructed and the problems they had solved as homework were collected. Then the maps collected and corrected the day before were given back, with advice on how to improve them, and from time to time, someone was asked to come to the blackboard to answer questions about the material reported on the map. This was done to be sure that they had studied the theory behind the problems, and to make sure that the teacher had explained it properly. They had the teacher cell-phone number and e-mail address. They knew they could ask him about anything that was not clear, but they also knew they needed to be prepared when they came to the class.

Students were quite happy to work in this way and play according to

the rules. In the 50 hours of the course more than 1900 solutions of problems were collected and corrected. The best 10% of the students (final mark in Chemistry 23/30) solved, on average, 62 individual problems (ranging from 25 to 78). Almost all of them tried to solve problems in a creative way. The majority of the remaining students successfully solved at least one problem in a creative way. Several students verified their results according to the ASV method, but few solved all the problems using (the three formal steps of the method) ASV entirely. The time spent in verifying the result was quite valuable, and from the solutions of the collection there is proof that many students understood why and where they made errors and were able to correct themselves. None of the weak students verified the result of their solutions.

Some Examples of Creative Solutions Devised by Students


Student I

A mixture formed by NaCl, NaClO and KClO contains 16.64% of oxygen and 21.52% of Na. calculate the percentage of K in the mixture (mxt).

1. Formal definition of the problem

He represented the problem by looking at the chemical formulas in this way:

J.DEP



From the total mass, subtracting the oxygen and the sodium, the mass of Cl and K will be obtained. In NaCl and NaClO, Na and Cl are in the same ratio: subtracting Na from (total) Cl, Cl in KClO is obtained because it is in stoichiometric relation with K. He considered 100.0g of mixture (mxt).

2. Selection of Appropriate Information

Atomic masses: 16.00g O/1 mol O; 22.99g Na/1 mol Na; 35.45g Cl/1 mol Cl; 39.10g K/1 mol K.
 $100.0\text{g mxt} - (21.52\text{g Na} + 16.64\text{g O}) = 61.84\text{g K} + \text{gCl}$.
 $21.52\text{g Na} \equiv 9.361 \times 10^{-1}\text{mol Na} \equiv \text{mol Cl in NaCl and NaClO}$.

3. Combine the various information

$\text{g Cl (in NaCl)} + \text{g Cl (in NaClO)} = (9.361 \times 10^{-1}\text{molCl}) \times (35.45\text{g Cl/molCl}) = 33.18\text{g Cl}$.
 $(\text{gK} + \text{g Cl}) \text{ in KClO} = 61.84 (\text{gK} + \text{g Cl}) - 33.18\text{g Cl} = 28.66\text{g}$
 $74.55\text{g KCl}: 39.10\text{g K} = 28.66\text{g}: x \text{ g K}$
 $x = 15.03 \text{ g K}$

Verification

$74.55\text{g KCl}: 90.55\text{g KCl} = 28.66\text{g KCl}: x \text{ g KClO}$
 $x = 34.86\text{g KClO}$
 $34.86\text{g KClO} - 28.66\text{g KCl} = 6.202\text{g O (in KClO)}$
 $16.64\text{g O} - 6.202\text{g O} = 10.44\text{g O (in NaClO)}$
 $16.00\text{g O}: 22.99\text{g Na} = 10.44\text{g O}: y \text{ g Na}$
 $y = 15.00\text{g Na} \equiv 48.57\text{g NaClO}$
 $21.52\text{g Na} - 15.00\text{g Na} = 6.52\text{g Na (in NaCl)} \equiv 16.57\text{g NaCl}$
 $16.57\text{g NaCl} + 48.57\text{g NaClO} + 34.86\text{g KClO} = 100.0\text{g mxt}$

Another student developed this interesting and very sophisticated solution. This is a strategy that Marvin Levine (1994) called "look at the extremes".

If the % of NaClO = 0, then 21.52g Na are all from NaCl and 16.64g O are from KCl. How many grams of oxygen there are in this mixture?
 $58.44\text{g NaCl}: 22.99\text{g Na} = x \text{ g NaCl}: 21.52\text{g Na}; x = 54.70\text{g NaCl}$
 $100.0\text{g mxt} - 54.70\text{g NaCl} = 45.30\text{g KClO}$

How many grams of oxygen there are in this mixture?
 $90.55\text{g KClO}: 16.00\text{g O} = 45.30\text{g KClO}: y \text{ g O}; y = 8.004 \text{ g O (the minimum content of O in the mixture)}$.

If NaCl = 0, then 21.52 g Na are all from NaClO. How many grams of NaClO there are in the mixture.
 $74.44 \text{ g NaClO}: 22.99 \text{ g Na} = z \text{ g NaClO}: 21.52 \text{ g Na}; z = 69.68 \text{ g NaClO}$
 $100.0 \text{ g mxt} - 69.68\text{g NaClO} = 30.38\text{g KClO}$

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

How many grams of oxygen there are in this mixture?

$[(69.68\text{g NaClO}/74.44\text{g NaClO}) + (30.38\text{g KClO}/90.55\text{g KClO})] \times (16,00\text{g O}) = 20.34\text{g O}$ (the maximum content of O in the mixture).

KClO can vary from 45.30g to 30.38g, and this make the variation of oxygen in the mixture from 8.004g to 20.34g.

Variation of KClO: $45.30\text{g} - 30.38\text{g} = 14.94\text{g}$

Variation of O: $20.34\text{g} - 8.004\text{g} = 12.34\text{g}$

$(12.34\text{g O}) \times (1\text{g KClO}) / (14.94\text{g KClO}) = 8.260 \times 10^{-1}\text{g O}$

$16.64\text{g O} - 10.46\text{g KClO} = 34.84\text{g KClO}$ in the mixture

$8.636\text{g O} / 8.260 \times 10^{-1}\text{g O} = 10.46$ (variation of KClO)

$45.30\text{g KClO} - 10.46\text{g KClO} = 34.84\text{g KClO}$ in the mixture

$(34.84\text{g KClO}) / (90.55\text{g KClO/molKClO}) = 3.848 \times 10^{-1}\text{molKClO}$

$(3.848 \times 10^{-1}\text{molKClO}) \times (1\text{mol K}/1\text{molKClO}) = 3.848 \times 10^{-1}\text{mol K}$

$(3.848 \times 10^{-1}\text{mol K}) \times (39.10\text{g K/mol K}) = 15.04\text{g K}$

Another original solution for a similar problem, developed by two students who worked cooperatively, has already been reported (Cardellini, 2009).

Discussion

Students are not obliged to solve the difficult problems that are presented during the course, but know that they can get a bonus if they are able to solve the problem in a way that is judged

appropriate, original or new. Almost a third of students solved the problems by their reasoning to find a creative solution. This is an important result, since examples of creative problem solving are reported to be very rare; Mayer, (1992). For the creative students, their GALT scores were equal to or greater than 15. Their disembedding scores were equal to or greater than 13. The creative problem solvers were clearly in the upper part of the distribution of formal reasoning skills and were also able to disembed relevant information from its surroundings in a problem. The majority of these creative students turned out to be very successful in the overall chemistry assessment as well as in their other subjects. Cognitive skills seem to have a role in successful problem solving, but personal motivations may be equally decisive (Hofstein and Kempa, 2005).

Conclusion

The approach to this problem solving experience is based on a constructivist view of learning which was summarized in a single statement by Bodner, "Knowledge is constructed in the mind of the learner", (Bodner, 2006). Students are actively engaged in finding the correct solution to the problem proposed and in making sense of the solution. They know that, at the end of the task, one of them will be called to the blackboard to explain the procedures used during that group's solution to the whole class and that a discussion will take place. The role of

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

the teacher is mainly as a coach, a stimulus for reaching new goals. Students are asked to work in what is called the Zone of Potential Development (Brown and French, 2009). By working in a group they solve problems that they would be unlikely to solve alone. The method offers the students an environment in which they can learn and be motivated to learn as much as they can. This can be seen as an example of the experience enjoyed by the student who said, "they didn't teach me anything, but I learned a lot", (Moore, 2010).

References

- Bodner, G.M. (2006). Constructivism: A Theory of Knowledge, *Journal of Chemical Education*, 63:873-878
- Bodner, G.M. (2006). Problem Solving: the Difference Between what we do and what we tell Students to do, *University Chemistry Education*, 7,37.
- Bodner, G.M. &McMillen, T.L.B. (2013). Cognitive Restructuring as an Early Stage in Problem Solving, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 23, 727-737.
- Brown, A.L. & French, L.A. (2009). The Zone of Potential Development: Implications for Intelligence Testing in the Year 2000, *Intelligence*, 3, 255-273.
- Camacho, M. & Good, R. (1989). Problem Solving and Chemical Equilibrium: Successful Versus Unsuccessful Performance, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 26, 251- 272.
- Cardellini, L. (2009). Metodo ASV Perrisolvere Problem Chimici, *La Chimia Nella scuola*, 6, 4-6
- Cardellini, L. (2011). An Interview with Alex H. Johnstone, *Journal of Chemical Education*, 77, 1572.
- De Jong, T. & Ferguson-Hessler, M.G.M. (2010). Cognitive Structures of Good and Poor Novice Problem Solvers in Physics, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 279-288.
- El-Banna H. (2000). The Development of a Predictive Theory of Science Education Based Upon Information Processing Theory, University of Glasgow.
- Ennis, R.H. (1997). A Taxonomy of Critical Thinking Dispositions and Abilities, In Baron J.B. and Stemberg R.J. (eds), *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory and Practice*, W.H. Freeman and Co., New York, p.10.
- Entwistle, N. (2009). *Styles of Learning and Teaching: an Integrated Outline of Educational Psychology*

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

- for Students, Teachers, and Lecturers*, David Fulton, London.
- Felder, R.M. (2010). Active-Inductive-Cooperative Learning: an Instructional Model for Chemistry. *Journal of Chemical Education* 73,832-836.
- Glaser, R. & Chi M.T.H (2005). Overview in Chi M.T.H. Glaser R. and Farr, M.J.(eds), *the Nature of Expertise*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, p. xv-xxviii.
- Hayes, J.R. (1988). *The Complete Problem Solver* (2nded) Hillsdale, N.J. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Herron J.D., (2003). What Can we do About sue: a Case Study of Competence, *Journal of Chemical Education*, 63, p. 530.
- Herron J.D., (2012) Research in Chemical Education: Results and Directions. In Gardner, M. et al., (eds), *Toward a Scientific Practice of Science Education*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.p.35.
- Hofstein A. & Kempa R.F., (2005), Motivating Strategies in Science Education: Attempt at an analysis, *European Journal of Science Education*, 7,221-229.
- Johnstone A.H. & Su, W.T., (2011), Lectures-A Learning Experience?, *Education in Chemistry*, 31,75-79.
- Johnsone A.H. & Otis K.H., (2013) Concept Mapping in Problem Based Learning: a Cautionary tale, *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 7,84-95.
- Lawrence G., (2011), *People Types and Tiger Strips*, Center for Application of Psychological Type, Gainesville, FL.
- Lee K.-W.L., Tang W.-U Goh, N.-K & Chia, L.-S., (2001), *The Predicting Role of Cognitive Variables in Problem Solving in Mole Concept*, CERAPIE,2, 285-301, [http://www.uoi.gr/conf_sem/cerapie]
- Levine M., (1994), *Effective Problem solving*, 2nd Edition Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Sec. 7.
- Moore J.W, (2010), Editorial: They didn't Teach me Anything, but I Learned a lot, *Journal of Chemical Education*, 73, A 291.
- Novak J.D., (1998), *Learning, Creating, and Using Knowledge: Concept Maps as Facilitative Tools in Schools and Corporations*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

Fostering Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry through Group Work - Sani Adamu Gyako

- Rein, N. & Yang, M.J. (2012), The Solving of Problems in Chemistry: the more Open- Ended Problems, *Research in Science and Technological Education*, 20, 83-98.
- Roadrangka, V. Yeany R.H. & Padilla, M.J. (1991), The Construction and Validation of Group Assessment for Research in Science Teaching, Dallas.
- Schoenfeld, A.H. (2008), Teaching Problem-Solving Skills, *American Mathematical Monthly*, 87, 794-805, pg. 795.
- Stamovlasis, D. & Tsaparlis G. (2000), Non-Linear Analysis of the Effect of Working Memory Capacity on Organic Synthesis Problem Solving
- Tsaparlis, G, Kousathama, M. & Niaz M. (1998), Molecular Equilibrium Problems: Manipulation of logical Structure and M-demand, and their Effect on Student Performance. *Science Education*, 82, 437-454.
- Whitehead, A.N. (2007). The Aims of Education and other Essays in Northrop, F.S.C and Gros. M.W.(eds), Alfred North Whitehead, Macmillan, New York.
- Witkin, H. A. & Goodenough, D.R. (1989), Cognitive Styles: Essence and Origins. *Field Dependence and Field Independence*, International Universities Press, New York.
- Wood, C. (2012), The Development of Creative Problem Solving in Chemistry in Glasgow, *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 7, 96-113.
- Zoller, U. (2010), Are Lecture and Learning Compatible? *Journal of Chemical Education*, 70, 195-197.