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Students' difficulties in quantum mechanics may be the result of unproductive framing rather than a fundamental inability to solve the problems or misconceptions about physics content. Using the theoretical lens of epistemological framing, we applied previously developed frames to seek an underlying structure to the long lists of published difficulties that span many topics in quantum mechanics. Mapping descriptions of published difficulties into errors in epistemological framing and resource use, we analyzed descriptions of students’ problem solving to find their frames, and compared students’ framing to the framing (and frame shifting) required by problem statements. We found three categories of error: mismatches between students’ framing and problem statement framing; inappropriate or absent shifting between frames; and insufficient resource activation within an appropriate frame. Given this framework, we can predict the kinds of difficulties that will emerge for a given problem in quantum mechanics, yielding a possible deeper structure to student difficulties.

I. INTRODUCTION

Researchers in student understanding of quantum mechanics have used a “difficulties” framework to understand student reasoning identifying long lists of difficulties which span many topics in quantum mechanics. The goal of research in quantum difficulties is to determine common, repeatable incorrect patterns of students’ reasoning. Researchers refer to identified difficulties as universal patterns, since they occur across a wide range of student populations despite varying academic backgrounds.

Although the realms of quantum and classical mechanics are different – the classical world is simpler and more intuitive than the quantum world – researchers have long considered the possibility of difficulties in quantum mechanics being analogous to the misconceptions in classical mechanics. This similarity is due to both persistent misconceptions or difficulties in students’ reasoning, and students not having enough preparation with the formalism of quantum mechanics.

Research has detailed lists of student difficulties in determining the time dependency of stationary, superposed, and degenerate eigenfunctions; the effect of time dependency of different physical systems on the probability densities; energy measurements of a quantum mechanical system; concepts of the time dependent Schrödinger equation (TDSE); and the role of Hamiltonian physics in determining energy.

However, we posit that these disparate difficulties can be unified through the lens of epistemological framing, errors in frame transitions, and errors in the content of a frame (e.g. with the Resources Framework). This paper presents a secondary analysis of published difficulties in quantum mechanics through the lens of epistemological framing.

Our goal in this paper is to reanalyze students’ difficulties in quantum mechanics. We apply a set of frames previously developed by our research team to a long list of published difficulties in quantum mechanics in order to find an underlying structure to them. After developing our theoretical lens on our own video-based data, we turned to the published literature on student difficulties in quantum mechanics to seek an underlying structure to students’ difficulties.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Difficulties

In a misconceptions view, students apply an incorrect model of a concept across a wide range of situations independent of the context. The core of conceptual understanding occurs by confronting the incorrect conception, and replacing the new concept. This unitary view of students’ reasoning guides our attention as researchers toward the identification of topics with which students have difficulties at the cost of missing students’ epistemological changes because a difficulties view predicts a stable model of thinking that is repeatable, and does not account for sudden or contextual changes in the nature of student reasoning.

A large number of students showing the same wrong answer to the same question implies a widespread difficulty in a certain topic; if the same difficulty presents across multiple questions or over time, it is robust. There have been many difficulties identified in quantum mechanics over the last 20 years across many different topics. For example, there are several sub-topic difficulties reported related to the topic of time dependence of the wave function: incorrect belief that the time evolution of a wave function is always via an overall phase factor of the type $e^{-i\hbar t}/h$; inability to differentiate between $e^{-iHt}/\sqrt{\hbar}$ and $e^{-i\hbar t}/\sqrt{\hbar}$; and belief that for a time-independent Hamiltonian, the wave function does not depend on time.
Research into student difficulties is often focused on eliciting them in regular ways (possibly also involving the development of research-based conceptual assessments), developing curricula to ameliorate or replace them, and iteratively improving the curricula. Common methods for the identification and documentation of difficulties are outlined in section III A; this paper is not concerned with the curriculum development or evaluation aspects of difficulties research.

B. Manifold views

An alternative view to a unitary difficulties view is a manifold “knowledge in pieces” view. In this view of student reasoning, we conceptualize student thinking as being highly context dependent and composed of small, reusable elements of knowledge and reasoning called “pieces”. These pieces are not themselves correct or incorrect, but the ways in which students put them together to solve problems may be. By focusing on the pieces of student reasoning and how they fit together, this view of student reasoning foregrounds the seeds of productive student reasoning and not just incorrect answers. Theories in this family include phenomenological primitives (p-prims), resources, and symbolic forms.

A strong thread of research using knowledge in pieces is to investigate students’ epistemologies. Epistemological resources connect to conceptual and procedural resources in networks to help students solve problems.

The mechanism that allows control of which subset of resources are activated locally in a given context is epistemological framing. Framing shows the nature of students’ knowledge that emerges from a coherent set of fine-grained resources which coherently and locally work together in a situation.

Epistemological frames reveal students’ ways of thinking and expectations. They govern which ideas students link together and utilize to solve problems. Students’ epistemological framing is highly context sensitive. Being in the appropriate frame and shifting between frames are determining factors in students’ success. Productive problem solving requires both an appropriate frame and appropriate shifting between frames. Careful observation of student behaviors, gaze, and discourse can provide clues for determining students’ epistemological frames.

In our prior work, we developed a set of four interrelated frames around the idea of math-in-physics (Figure 1). We applied it to observational data to model students’ framing in math and physics during in-class problem solving in two upper-division courses, quantum mechanics and electromagnetic fields. Briefly, our math-in-physics frames capture students’ framing in math and physics, expanded through the algorithmic and conceptual space of students’ problem solving. The four frames are: algorithmic math, conceptual math, algorithmic physics, and conceptual physics. We briefly characterize each frame as follows:

**Algorithmic mathematics frame**: Students are in an algorithmic mathematics frame if they think about mathematics algorithmically, e.g. when students do pure mathematical manipulations, such as taking a derivative, or checking for sign errors in their procedural problem solving. One of the hallmarks of an algorithmic problem solving is that it is fast. Students in this frame take several fast and trivial steps over a long period of time.

**Algorithmic physics frame**: Students are in an algorithmic physics frame if they think about physics algorithmically, e.g. when laying out physics definitions by using mathematical formalisms. Additionally, students might only use an algorithmic heuristic to find a physical relation without writing down mathematics and only stating their reasoning verbally. This further clarifies the difference between algorithmic mathematics and algorithmic physics frames.

**Conceptual mathematics frame**: Students are in a conceptual mathematics frame when they think about the features of a physical systems, or think conceptually about the mathematical functions. Students instead of running through the math algorithmically, they reason based on the general class of information in mathematics, e.g. when students notice an integral is equal to zero, without explicit calculations, and only due to identification of the mathematical properties of the integrand function.

**Conceptual physics frame**: Students are in a conceptual physics frame when they think about the features of a physical systems, or think conceptually
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about physical laws, or explain a concept. Students may use graphical representations to better visualize the physical system. Students by taking a conceptual approach create more sense making opportunities with less need for writing several algebra-based steps.

Using this set of frames, we looked for moments where students’ problem solving is impeded because they are in an unproductive frame or when a problem statement requires shifting between frames and students are unable to make that transition. This paper applies the math-in-physics frames to secondary analysis of quantum mechanics difficulties. We present a mapping of over thirty in-physics frames to secondary analysis of quantum mechanics difficulties. We have remapped the space of frames to many kinds of quantum mechanics student data. However, our work in this paper is limited to the amount of information that is provided in the difficulty papers. We have excluded examples that we do not have enough evidence to map the difficulty into our categorizations.

These categories represent a rotation of the basis set for student difficulties. We have remapped the space of difficulties, which is loosely grouped by physics topics, into the space of frames, seeking an underlying cognitive structure.

C. Interactions between problem statements and responses

Students’ reasoning comes as responses to specific questions, and those questions strongly influence their framing. We examined problem statements for what frame(s) they initially promote. For example, consider these two problems:

- Using the time-independent Schrödinger equation (TISE), calculate the changes to \( E_0 \), the ground state, as the given well shrinks from \( L \) wide to \( L/2 \) wide.

- What happens to the energy of the ground state when a finite square well gets narrower?

The first encourages students to think mathematically (“calculate”) and algorithmically (by hinting at a procedure). The second is more conceptual, specifying neither numbers nor procedures.

A major element of difficulties research is to carefully craft problem statements so as to best elicit student difficulties. To honor this careful work, our secondary analysis of difficulties considers difficulties as they are paired to problem statements.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Difficulty identification

Because this paper reinterprets existing datasets using new theory, we first review where the data come from and how they were originally analyzed using a difficulties framework.

Researchers in difficulty studies have multiple methods for data collection, both quantitative and qualitative. The population of students in these studies are from advanced undergraduate students and first year graduate students from several different US universities. Students are administered a written test, usually at the beginning of the semester\(^2\), or after relevant instructions\(^3,4\). Some students also participate in think aloud interviews intended to both develop the test and discover common responses to it. Data analysis on the interviews and written responses extracts common difficulties despite the differences in the students’ backgrounds. The results of the analysis from both sources of interviews and tests are consistent; several cycles of test development and administration adjust the questions to best elicit student difficulties and ensure validity and reliability.

The original data in two papers\(^3,4\) were collected at the University of Washington (UW), where undergraduate students are required to take between one to three quantum mechanics courses. The first course (sophomore-level) covers the first five chapters of McIntyre’s textbook\(^28\), and the second and third courses (junior-level) cover all the materials of Griffiths’ textbook\(^29\). Students were given a pretest in a written form before relevant tutorial instruction, but after lecture instruction. In some of the tasks a variation of the questions were given to the students.

In the third paper\(^2\), survey data of first-year graduate students were collected from seven different universities. Researchers also conducted interviews with fifteen students at the University of Pittsburgh.

Both research groups at the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Washington have long histories of difficulties research in quantum mechanics and other physics subjects, and their expertise in developing questions, developing tests and curricula, and identifying difficulties is second to none. We chose their papers for secondary analysis because they represent the best that difficulties research in quantum mechanics has to offer.

B. Mapping students’ difficulties to framing

We posit that many student difficulties in quantum mechanics may be due to unproductive framing in problem solving, because students' current frame may not help them with actual problem solving, because students find themselves temporarily unable to shift to a more productive frame, or because they cannot activate productive resources within their current frame. To investigate
this postulate, we conducted a secondary analysis of published student difficulties in quantum mechanics.

We mapped descriptions of published difficulties into errors in epistemological framing and resource use. We considered the problem statement as the “jumping off” point for students’ framing, reasoning that students’ initial problem framing is probably strongly influenced by framing in the problem statement. From published descriptions of student responses – including their written responses, where available – we identified students’ response frames and compared them to the frame of the problems to categorize errors.

Because this is a secondary analysis, we take the difficulty as the unit of analysis, not an individual student’s response. This is a practical choice on our part, as some authors do not identify the frequency of each difficulty they identify and we did not have access to all of the descriptions of students’ problem solving. The numbers reported for the error rates indicate how many difficulties fall in each of these categories and do not indicate how many students have the difficulties under a category. This kind of analysis is strange in the knowledge-in-pieces research tradition, as it severely hampers us from looking at what students do that is correct or productive; difficulties-focused research does not report productive ideas, only incorrect ones.

C. Methodology for secondary analysis

1. Selection criteria

We gathered published works which describe student difficulties in quantum mechanics from Physical Review Special Topics – Physics Education Research, Physical Review – Physics Education Research, and the American Journal of Physics. We identified four papers and thirty-six student difficulties in quantum mechanics.

From these papers, we sought difficulties in which the authors had sufficiently described their problem statements (or instructor interactions) for us to determine initial problem framing, excluding those difficulties whose problem statements were omitted, or where variations on a problem statement were alluded to but not presented. Twenty seven difficulties survived these selection criteria.

2. Coding

We examined students’ responses with respect to the features of four frames in our math-in-physics set and coded the student framing present. We started with student responses to problems that matched our qualitative data\(^\text{12}\). Descriptions of student responses – and the resulting difficulties identified by researchers – matched our observational qualitative data well. The detailed analysis of examples from our own observational data is not within the scope of this study, but can be found in section VI.A of the preceding published study\(^\text{12}\). In that study, using the lens of our developed theoretical framework, we identified students’ frames and transitions in frames from analyzing in-class group problem solving activities, as video-recorded in a senior-level quantum mechanics class\(^\text{12}\).

Emboldened, we extended our coding of student responses to difficulties not present in our qualitative data. As much as possible, we investigated students’ statements (or equations, on occasion) to identify the nature of their reasoning. For example, a response which is just a piece of an equation suggests that the student used an algorithmic frame to generate their response, whereas a response which coordinates energy and probability descriptions comes from a conceptual physics frame.

Some problem statements, particularly multipart problems, require students to start in one frame and shift to another one (for example, see section IV.A). In those cases, we coded for which sequence(s) of frames would yield correct answers.

Through intensive discussion among multiple researchers, we coded for which frame(s) a problem statement promoted, and which frame(s) were evident in students’ reasoning. For some difficulties, students’ responses or the descriptions of students’ reasoning did not contain enough detail to figure out students’ framing. Our goals in these discussions were to come to agreement about our inferences of student reasoning. As our discussion reached consensus and our codebook stabilized, two independent raters coded both the rating of the problem statements and the ratings of the students responses (or the descriptions of students’ reasoning), with an agreement rate of > 90% for both kinds of coding.

3. Error type determination

Once problem statements were coded for frames promoted and student responses were coded for frames used, we classified students’ difficulties into three categories:

Transition error: when a problem statement requires shifting between frames, and students are unable to make that transition.

Displacement error: when a problem statement promotes one frame, but students’ reasoning puts them in another frame.

Content error: when students appear to be framing the problem correctly, but are not activating appropriate resources to solve it.

This naming scheme relies heavily on the metaphor of framing as a location in a plane. In other words, transition error is going to the wrong place, displacement error is being in the wrong place, and content error is being in the right place but using the wrong ideas. We have illustrated each error visually in Figures 2-4, by considering
a hypothetical problem statement that promotes conceptual physics frame as the starting frame, and requires transition to conceptual mathematics frame.

Figure 2 shows a transition error for a hypothetical student that does not go to the right place (conceptual mathematics frame). Figure 3 shows a displacement error when the student is in the wrong place (algorithmic mathematics frame). Figure 4 shows a content error when a student is in the right place (conceptual physics frame), but using wrong ideas.

4. Limitations

Many student responses to these questions are correct, and our secondary analysis of student difficulties cannot capture those responses. This is a fundamental limitation of difficulties-based research: it seeks to describe the ways students are wrong, not the ways that their responses are reasonable.

Some difficulties could have arisen because of multiple types of error. This is a limitation of secondary analysis – we do not have full reports of student reasoning – and of the survey-style free-response data on which many of the original difficulties are based. For this reason, we classified some difficulties as arising from multiple error types. With sufficiently detailed data, we believe that each difficulty-displaying student response can be classified into a single error type.

Additionally, some surveys were multiple choice. While the original researchers based the choices on common student reasoning, and that reasoning could have showed evidence of student framing, the multiple-choice answers themselves are often insufficiently detailed to determine students’ framing. As much as possible, we coded researchers descriptions of student difficulties, but sometimes we simply did not have enough information.

There were times when our research team came to consensus that there was not enough information to determine difficulties’ probable framings (Difficulties on problems for which the problem statement was not reported in enough detail are excluded from our analysis altogether). Out of thirty six difficulties, twenty seven difficulties survived. Nine difficulties did not have enough information for us to figure out what the framing could have been and we excluded them from further analysis, simply because there was not enough context to determine students’ reasoning frames.

In the follow sections, we show examples of each kind of error, arguing from published difficulties that difficulties can be categorized by framing error type. Within each type, we tabulate published difficulties. Because some problems require transitions between frames and some do not, we classify difficulties first by the kind of prob-
lem they come from and second by the kind of errors they produce. More particularly, for each framing error type, the error categorization is first provided for problems that require transitions, followed by simpler problems that do not require transitions. The table arrangements also appear in the same order. Error types are labeled by capital letters and the small letters stand for the kind of problem.

IV. TRANSITION ERROR

Transition errors occur when a problem statement expects students to shift between two frames, and the students either do not shift, or shift into an unproductive frame. In this section, we first motivate the idea of transition errors through extended analysis of one example, then tabulate all difficulties which exhibit transition errors.

A. Transition error example

The first example illustrates a transition error which arises from interpreting a graph of wave function vs position \(3\) (Figure 5). The problem asked students to explain if the probability of finding the particles within a marked region depends on time or not.

The probability density depends on time if the modulus square of the wave function depends on time. The wave functions are given at time \(t = 0\). The authors mention that the problem requires students to think about the time dependent phase of each term in the superposition wave function. This encourages students to frame the question as thinking about what it means to be in a superposition of states, what are the energies of each term in the superposition, and how the system evolves over time. Additionally, the problem statement includes multiple representations for students to conceptually coordinate. This way of framing the problem suggests conceptual physics as the initial frame.

Students may start this problem by thinking of the time evolution operator, which is determined by the Hamiltonian of the system. After students recognize the correct time phase factors, they need to coordinate mathematical representations to show how the phase factors determine the time dependence of the probability density. Our set of math-in-physics frames has two possible transitions from conceptual physics into mathematics frames:

Algorithmic math: In algorithmic math, a student would manipulate the modulus square of the superposed wave function explicitly and algorithmically, finding that the time dependence of the pure terms falls out, and the time dependence of the cross terms persists.

Conceptual math: In conceptual math, a student initially could use a conceptual mathematical shortcut: the exponential term multiplied by its complex conjugate sets the product equal to one. However, this solution leads to neglecting the role of the cross terms.

Because the problem starts in a conceptual physics frame, it may be easier or more appealing to transition first into conceptual math than algorithmic math; in our observational data, this is the transition we observed\(^{12}\).

Emigh et al.\(^3\) describe student reasoning in response to the same task:

**Student:** While it it true that the general wave function is of the form \(\sqrt{|\psi_1|^2} e^{-iE_1t/\hbar} + \sqrt{|\psi_2|^2} e^{-iE_2t/\hbar}\) again the function we are interested in is \(P(x) = |\psi|^2\) which loses its time dependence.

The first part of this statement shows that the student has correctly used the ideas of the problem statement frame to note the different energies of each energy eigenstate in the wave function. The second part of the statement suggests that the student coordinates the physics and conceptual math to recall that the probability density is the modulus square of the wave function. However, the student would not do any further algorithmic calculations, instead arguing that the probability “loses the time dependence”. This is congruent with conceptual math reasoning above.

10 – 20% of Emigh et al’s students (\(N=416\)) applied the same kind of reasoning to argue that the “time drops out” or “the probability is squared and the time won’t matter”\(^3\). These arguments indicate that students do not feel a need to actually do the math, because their conceptual math frame has solved and justified their time dependent answer. While Emigh et al interpreted these responses as a difficulty – students’ “tendency to treat all wave functions as having a single phase” – we interpret it as an example of error in frame transition.
B. Difficulties which exhibit transition errors

We found two published difficulties for which students exhibit only transition errors (Table I).

In the first difficulty non-stationary state wave functions (T1) in Table I, the students were asked if different wave functions: \( A \sin^3(\pi x/a) \), \( \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}} \sin(\pi x/a) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}} \sin(2\pi x/a) \) and \( A e^{-\left(\frac{x-a}{\pi}\right)^2} \) can be proper candidates for an infinite square well of width \( a \) with boundaries at \( x = 0 \) and \( x = a \). This problem requires students to start from a conceptual physics frame to extract the boundary condition information and readout that the potential is infinite at the boundary conditions. The wave function has to become zero to satisfy the continuity of the wave function at the boundaries. This problem requires transition as students may need to plug the values of the boundary conditions, do some algorithmic steps and figure out if the solution satisfies the boundaries of the problem. On this problem students perform two error categories of displacement and transition.

Some students considered that just the linear combination \( A \left[ \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}} \sin(\pi x/a) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}} \sin(2\pi x/a) \right] \) or a pure sinusoidal wave function are allowed; but the \( A \sin^3(\pi x/a) \) is not allowed and “only simple sines or cosines are allowed” as proper wave functions. Some other students mentioned that for a particle in a box, only the wave functions in the form of \( A \sin(n\pi x/a) \) are allowed and the \( A e^{-\left(\frac{x-a}{\pi}\right)^2} \) wave function is only allowed for a simple harmonic oscillator. We consider that students with this type of responses are not in the frame of the problem as they are not thinking about the characteristics of the boundary conditions. Instead, they just recall what the solutions for physical systems of a particle in a box or a harmonic oscillator look like. They assert that they know how the answer should look, having worked out the problem before. While the students might not necessarily attempt the algorithmic processes to arrive at this conclusion during the interview, they are relying on the fact that they have done these calculations before and can recall the conclusion. This tendency stems from having previously worked through the problem of a particle in a box, which fits into the algorithmic physics frame. We categorized students with this type of responses as having a displacement error.

Another type of incorrect response suggests that many of the students reasoned that two conditions must be satisfied. First, wave functions are smooth, single valued, and satisfy the boundary condition of the physical system. Second, wave functions can be written as a superposition of stationary states, satisfying the time independent Schrödinger equation (TISE). A typical response of the students looks like:

Student: \( A \sin^3(\pi x/a) \) satisfies b.c. but does not satisfy Schrödinger equation that is, it cannot represent a particle wave. The second one is a solution to S.E., it is a particle wave. The third does not satisfy b.c.

The author mentions that students do not note that even the superposition wave function does not satisfy the TISE. We think that this student is in the frame of the problem since they match the boundary conditions with each wave function to see if they satisfy the boundaries of the physical system. However, we do not have further information that how students are working on this problem as part of their solution: if they take some algorithmic steps to match the boundary condition or if they just reason verbally.

We think this student can activate ideas regarding expansion of the function \( \sin^3(\pi x/a) \) based on the energy of stationary states by making a transition to the conceptual mathematics frame.

The second difficulty is that students believe the wave function is time independent because it satisfies the TISE. Students who generate these responses provide a mathematical basis for their answer. The author mentions that students think that the superposition wave function satisfies the TISE.

Student: [both wave functions] satisfy the time independent Schrödinger equation so \( \Psi_1 \) and \( \Psi_2 \) do not have time dependence.

Although the solution to the TISE does not depend on time, the TISE solution is incomplete because this problem is time-dependent. We categorized this difficulty as a transition error, as students need to shift to conceptual frames (either conceptual physics or conceptual mathematics) to complete the problem. Shifting to conceptual physics may lead them to think in terms of the independent eigenfunctions of space and time; shifting to conceptual math may lead them to think about missing orthogonal functions.

V. DISPLACEMENT ERROR

Displacement errors arise when students are meant to be in one frame, but are instead operating in another. In this section, we first reinterpret a student’s response to the extended example problem in the prior section as if the student exhibited a displacement error, then tabulate difficulties which exhibit displacement errors for problems with and without transitions.

A. Displacement error example

For the same task as shown above in Figure 5, other difficulties are possible. For example, this student writes the time dependence of the wave function instead of finding the probability, which is an incomplete answer:

\[
\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-iEt/\hbar}(\psi_1 + \psi_2)
\] (1)
TABLE I. Difficulties that exhibit transition error only. These difficulties are labeled “T” for transition errors; the ordering of the difficulties in the table is for labeling purposes only and does not represent a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Mathematical representations of non stationary state wave functions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Belief that the wave function is time dependent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This short answer segment suggests that the student is in an algorithmic frame; there is no other information about student reasoning (such as narration or a graph provided by the student). This student has not picked up the conceptual framing intended by the problem statement. Starting from the conceptual physics frame could enable the student to think conceptually about superposition of wave functions and the different energy terms instead of a single time dependent phase. The authors do not provide the percentage of students that answered in this way. However, they mention that the tendency to consider just a single phase wave function for a superposition state is very common. 25% of their students (N = 223) on a final exam showed the same difficulty on a version of the same task. Students were given the time dependence wave function, and they were asked about the “time dependence of the probability of a particular outcome of a position measurement”.

We classify this difficulty as a displacement error: the student is in the wrong frame initially, and does not transition to a more productive frame.

B. Difficulties which exhibit displacement errors

In problems which require frame shifting (like the problem in Figure 5), we found five difficulties which exhibit only displacement error (Table II).

One problem from Emigh’s study (Problem in Figure 5), the difficulty Confusion between the time dependence of the potential and other quantities (Ds2) in table II shows that students correspond the time dependence of one quantity to another such that both of physics quantities obtain the same time evolution. Between 5%-20% of the students in their data (N=416) have provided this type of reasoning.

Student: The wave function is time independent. Thus, its probability density does not change. If the wave function is time dependent, then [its] probability density would change in time too.

This piece of data suggests that this student is not initially in the conceptual frame of the problem. The student might have been previously derived that some properties, which is the probability density is time independent for a stationary state. However, they do not accurately remember the conclusion. The incorrect notion that the wave function is time independent rather than the probability density further implies that the student is in an algorithmic physics frame and tries to recall a fact about stationary states.

In simpler problems that do not require frame shifting, we find one difficulty which exhibit displacement error (Table III).

VI. CONTENT ERROR

A third kind of error occurs when students are in the appropriate frame intended by the problem statement, but have not activated enough of (or the correct) resources to complete the problem. We term this kind of error “content error”. In this section, we illustrate content error with one example difficulty, then tabulate content errors.
TABLE II. Difficulties which exhibit displacement error in problems that require frame shifting. These difficulties are labeled “D” for displacement errors and “s” because their problems require shifting; the ordering of the difficulties in the table is for labeling purposes only and does not represent a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ds1</td>
<td>Incorrect belief that $H\psi = E\psi$ holds for any possible wave function $\psi$</td>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds2</td>
<td>Confusion between the time dependence of wave functions and probability density</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds3</td>
<td>Belief that for a time-independent Hamiltonian, the wave function does not depend on time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds4</td>
<td>Tendency to associate the time dependence of energy measurements with properties of stationary states</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds5</td>
<td>Tendency to treat superposition as having a multiple distinct phases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III. Difficulties that exhibit only displacement error in simpler problems which do not require frame shifting; and “n” because their problems require no shifting. These difficulties are labeled “D” for displacement errors; the ordering of the difficulties in the table is for labeling purposes only and does not represent a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dn1</td>
<td>Difficulties related to outside knowledge in energy measurements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Content error example

To illustrate content error, we draw an example from Singh’s study (Figure 6)\textsuperscript{27}. This example comes from the interview data of first-year graduate students. For this problem, students are given the problem in Figure 6, which asks them to calculate expectation value of the superposition of the ground state and the first excited stationary state of the system.

Although 67\% of the students were able to answer part (2) correctly, only 39\% were able to answer part (3) correctly, and many of the students were not able to use the information to apply in part (3). Instead, students explicitly calculated the integrals of the expectation value.

We analyze their description of a student’s response to part (3). The problem statement starts students in an algorithmic frame (directing them to “calculate”). The frame is algorithmic physics, rather than algorithmic math, because the students must first start by recalling some facts and equations about expectation values and wave functions.

The student writes down the TISE as $\hat{H}\phi_n = E_n$ without $\phi_n$ on the right hand side of the equation, but correctly writes $\phi_n$ as the sum of $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ on the left hand side. This is an appropriate initial framing to this problem, but it’s missing a key piece of content. This mistake results in an incorrect answer in terms of $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$. At this point, the student is not confused that his answer does not make sense because he is unaware of his error. The interviewer points to the part of the solution with the missing element, but the student is still unable to find his mistake. Finally, the interviewer explicitly gives the right TISE, $\hat{H}\phi_n = E_n\phi_n$ to the student.

The student can then review the math conceptually in his solution by applying the orthonormality properties of the eigenstates, simplify the integration, and get a corrected answer. It seems that all he needs is a correct TISE, and he is able to frame the problem appropriately and continue to a successful solution. We do not consider this example as a case of a simple typographic error on the student’s part, because the instructor several times notifies the student about his error, but the student believes that his written TISE is fine. After finding the correct answer. The wave function of an electron in a one dimensional infinite square well of width $a$ at time $t=0$ is given by $\Psi(x,0) = \sqrt{2/\pi} \phi_1(x) + \sqrt{5/7} \phi_2(x)$ where $\phi_1(x)$ and $\phi_2(x)$ are the ground state and first excited stationary state of the system. $(\phi_n(x) = \sqrt{2/a} \sin(n\pi x/a), E_n = n^2\pi^2\hbar^2/(2ma^2)$ where $n=1,2,3,\ldots$)

FIG. 6. Calculate the expectation value of the energy in the state $\psi(x,t)$. On this problem, student difficulties display content error. Figure originally from\textsuperscript{27}.

1. Write down the time dependent wave function.
2. You measure the energy of an electron at time $t = 0$. Write down the possible values of the energy and the probability of measuring each.
3. Calculate the expectation value of the energy in the state $(x,t)$ above.

\begin{align*}
\text{FIG. 6. Calculate the expectation value of the energy in the state } \psi(x,t). \text{ On this problem, student difficulties display content error. Figure originally from}^{27}. \\
1. \text{Write down the time dependent wave function.} \\
2. \text{You measure the energy of an electron at time } t = 0. \text{ Write down the possible values of the energy and the probability of measuring each.} \\
3. \text{Calculate the expectation value of the energy in the state } (x,t) \text{ above.}
\end{align*}
answer, the student is able to reflect on his answer, and even conceptually reason about the expectation value.

The interviewer continues: she asks the student if he can think of the response to part (3) in terms of the response of part (2). The student responds “Oh yes . . . I never thought of it this way . . . I can just multiply the probability of measuring a particular energy with that energy and add them up to get the expectation value because expectation value is the average value.” The interviewer’s intervention to explicitly connect parts (2) and (3) prompts the student to think more physically in terms of the underlying concept of expectation value. He can relate the concept of expectation value to the parameter of the physical system such as energy eigenvalues, and probability of measuring each.

We categorized this difficulty as a content error because the student is in the right frame intended by the problem but is not able to find the correct answer until the interviewer provides more content.

### B. Difficulties which exhibit content error

Among problems which require transitions, we classified three difficulties as content error only (Table IV).

For Cs2, the authors provided a student’s reasoning:

**Student:** Since the wave equation will gain a $e^{-E_{2}t}$ term to represent its evolution as time goes on, the probability of finding the particle in the marked area will decrease [ . . . ] since the square of its wave equation will decrease as well.

This student is in the same problem statement frame (Figure 5), which is conceptual physics, as discussed in section IV A. The only difference is that the student’s response is with regard to the stationary state wave function. The student has determined the energy of the stationary state $E_{2}$, and knows how to perform the appropriate calculations to find the probability density. However, his exponential term has a (negative) real power instead of an imaginary one. We interpret this as a content error: he has activated incorrect resources and reasoned from them.

In simpler problems that do not require transition, we found an additional nine difficulties (Table V), which exhibit content error. The difficulty that the time evolution of a wave function is always via an overall phase factor of the type $e^{iE_{n}t}/\hbar$ (Cn1) in table V shows that students are performing content error. The problem (Figure 6) asks students to find the time dependent wave function $\Psi(x,t)$ for a system in an initial state of superpositions of the ground state and first excited states, $\Psi(x,t = 0) = \sqrt{2/7}\phi_{1}(x) + \sqrt{5/7}\phi_{2}(x)$. The equations of the eigenfunctions and the eigenvalues are given in the problem statement. We frame this problem as algorithmic physics. The problem statement asks to write down the wave function as opposed to figure out the wave function. The frame of the problem requires to recall the time phase factor and follow simple algorithmic steps to assign the readout energy eigenvalues from the problem statement into the time phase factor for each term and write the time dependent wave function in terms of $\phi_{1}$ and $\phi_{2}$. About one third of the students ($N = 202$) in this study wrote:

**Student:** $\Psi(x,t) = \psi(x,0)e^{-E_{1}/\hbar}$

This partial response suggests that the student is not in the frame of the problem statement. The student does not read the information regarding the energy eigenvalues from the given equations in the problem statement, and does not attempt to write the answer in terms of $\phi_{1}$ and $\phi_{2}$. The frame of the student is algorithmic physics and thus we categorized this difficulty as a content error, because this student is not reading enough content from the problem statement.

The first difficulty, differentiating between the Hamiltonian and energy (Cn8, Table IV), occurs when students misapply the energy eigenstate instead of the Hamiltonian operator in the time evolution operator. The problem asks students to find the time dependent wave function $\Psi(x,t)$ for a system in an initial state of superpositions of the ground state and first excited states, $\Psi(x,t = 0) = \sqrt{2/7}\phi_{1}(x) + \sqrt{5/7}\phi_{2}(x)$. The equations of the eigenfunctions and the eigenvalues are given in the problem statement. We frame this problem as algorithmic physics as it requires to recall the time phase factor and follow simple algorithmic steps to assign the readout energy eigenvalues from the problem statement into the time phase factor for each term and write the time dependent wave function in terms of $\phi_{1}$ and $\phi_{2}$. The authors mention that students write an intermediate state for $\Psi(x,t)$:

$$\Psi(x,t) = \psi(x,0)e^{-iE_{1}t/\hbar} = \sqrt{2/7}\phi_{1}(x)e^{-iE_{1}t/\hbar} + \sqrt{5/7}\phi_{2}(x)e^{-iE_{2}t/\hbar}$$

Since the student proceeded from an intermediate state, we presume that the student does not attempt to re-derive the relationship between a space portion and time portion of a wave function. This student is in the frame of the problem by reading out the energy eigenvalues $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ and assigning each energy into the time phase factors. However, the intermediate step does not convey any algorithmic process or physical meaning and can not lead to the final step.

We classify this problem as a content error, since the student uses the wrong idea, that the symbol $H$ as the Hamiltonian operator, and the symbol $E$ as the energy eigenvalue of the system are the same. This is evidenced from the data that further probe by the interviewer revealed the difficulty differentiating between the Hamiltonian operator and its eigenvalue.
TABLE IV. Difficulties that exhibit only content error in problems which require shifting frames. These difficulties are labeled “C” for content errors; and “s” because their problems require shifting; the ordering of the difficulties in the table is for labeling purposes only and does not represent a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cs1</td>
<td>Tendency to treat wave function for bound systems as traveling waves</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs2</td>
<td>Tendency to treat time-dependent phase factors as decaying exponentials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs3</td>
<td>Difficulties related to outside knowledge in energy measurements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difficulty vectors in real space - Hilbert space (Cn7) in Table II indicates that students have difficulty differentiating vectors in real 3D space from vectors in Hilbert space, such that students may not be able to distinguish between the 3D space describing the gradient of the magnetic field in the z direction, and the 2D Hilbert space for describing a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particle. The question is about the Stern-Gerlach experiment: “a beam of electrons propagates along the y direction into the page, and are in the spin state of: $\frac{1}{2}(|\uparrow_z\rangle + |\downarrow_z\rangle).$ The beam is sent through a Stern-Gerlach apparatus (SGA) with a vertical magnetic field gradient. Sketch the electron cloud pattern that you expect to see on a distant phosphor screen in the x-z plane. Explain your reasoning.” Due to the magnetic field gradient in the z direction, the beam of electrons will experience a force and become deviated. However, electrons due to having an intrinsic angular momentum, which is their spins, split only into two directions along the z axis and form two spots on the screen. The frame of this conceptual physics, because it encourages students to think about “what’s going on” in this physical apparatus. The problem statement requires different readouts about the direction of the magnetic field gradient, or the direction of the electron beam. Students are asked to use graphical representation and justify their reasoning. Only 41% of the students (N = 202) answered correctly and the rest of the students predicted that there will be only a single spot on the screen. A typical response of a student looks like:

**Student:** All of the electrons that come out of the SGA will be spin down with expectation value $\frac{\hbar}{2}$ because the field gradient is in $-z$ direction.

This student is thinking conceptually by reading out information about the direction of the magnetic field from the problem statement and connecting that to the idea about spin $-\frac{1}{2}$ and thinking that this measurement has only one outcome and thus the expectation value is $\frac{\hbar}{2}$. However, the student needs to more carefully read out from the problem statement that the state of the system before the measurement is in the combination of two sates of spin up $|\uparrow_z\rangle$, and spin down $|\downarrow_z\rangle$, and the state of the system is not just prepared in one state of down $|\downarrow_z\rangle$ to stay unchanged after the measurement. We categorize this problem as a content error since the student’s reasoning is missing some content that blocks a correct answer. However, the description of the student in not enough for us to identify which exact content is missing from this piece of reasoning. It could be helpful to think about what does it mean for a beam of electrons before passing through an SGA to be in the combination of states spin up and spin down, or to think what does it mean for an electron to have an intrinsic angular momentum which is the spin.

The difficulty interpretation of a subsequent energy measurement (Cn1 and Cn2) is mostly limited to a content error. Students are able to use the ideas of the problem statement and operate in the frame of the question, but are activating the wrong resources to productively and correctly solve the problem.

For example, a student is asked about the outcomes of an energy measurement after a following measurement on the system of a particle in an infinite square well in an initial state $\Psi(x, 0) = 0.6\Psi_1(x, 0) + 0.8\Psi_2(x, 0)$. Part A of the question asks “What value or values would a measurement of the energy yield?” Part B of the question asks what would be the result of the second energy measurement after time $t_2$. The student in response to part B states:

**Student:** The particle is described by a wave function with elements in both eigenstates. Although a measurement of energy collapses it to one, the possibility of the other still exists, so a second measurement could get the other $E$.

The frame of this question is conceptual physics, which requires students to think about the idea that repeating an energy measurement does not change the state of the system and yields the same result as the first measurement, since the system is already collapsed to one of the energy eigenstate and is isolated from its surroundings.

The student has activated several ideas about energy measurement on a physical system in a superposition wave function. In the first part of the response, the student acknowledges that a particle “is described by a wave function with elements in both eigenstates”, and also “a measurement of energy collapses it to one”. These ideas are both correct. With this being the case, it may be difficult to understand why the student arrives at the wrong answer despite seeming to have all correct ideas about the system. For us, the key is in the student’s usage of the word “although”.

This student acknowledges the fact, that when a system collapses it has only one energy, but the probability
of other energy, “$E$”, “still exists” and associates this possibility with the second measurement on the system. Whereas, this is only true before doing any measurement on the system. For a system in a superposition state, if we prepare a system $n$ times in the exact same way and each time make a measurement on the system, we would exactly know how many times the energy measurement yields $E_1$, and how many times the energy measurement yields $E_2$. But, as soon as we make an energy measurement the system collapses into one of the energy eigenstates and repeating an energy measurement yields the same result as the first measurement.

This student uses the word “although” to put these two ideas in opposition to each other. The student somehow decides that his knowledge of state collapse is not applicable here and a measurement possibly yields multiple possible energy values. This student needs to activate more content regarding what information the problem statement provides about the system before and after an energy measurement and repeating an energy measurement on the system.

In the study by Singh et al.\textsuperscript{2,27} they showed that students have difficulty with the time development of the wave function after measurement of an observable (Cu6). Students were asked about the wave function a long time after measurement of energy $E_2$ for an electron in an infinite square well. Some of the students stated similar responses that “If you are talking about what happens at the instant you measure the energy, the wave function will be $\phi_2$, but if you wait long enough it will go back to the state before the measurement.” The first part of the response suggests that the student is able to correctly relate the measured energy eigenvalue to the associated eigenstate of the system $\phi_2$, by activating the resources of an instant measurement. However, the student does not further investigate the idea that long after the measurement a phase will be added to the eigenstate, which does not change the state of the system to any other combination of eigenstates, or the system will not “go back to the state before the measurement.”

VII. DIFFICULTIES WHERE MORE THAN ONE ERROR TYPE IS POSSIBLE

For some difficulties, multiple error types are possible. Additional details of student reasoning could resolve these ambiguities, but these details are either not gathered (survey data) or not available to us (interview data) as secondary analysts.

The first difficulty with the energy measurement probability - time dependence (DCs1) in table VI indicates that students could exhibit either displacement or content error. The task asks about the time dependence aspect of energy probability measurements of a particle in a QM harmonics oscillator system in the initial state, $\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \psi_0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \psi_1$. Displacement error occurs when students associate the time dependence aspect of the probabilities of energy measurements to the time independent properties of the “probability density” or the “wave function”. In this type of answer students usually recall some properties of the physical quantities without any justification, since students think their reasoning is correct in the way they are.

**Student:** It [the energy probability] depends on the probability density. If it’s time independent then no, if time dependent then yes.

The content error occurs when students are able to determine some of the features of the physical system by being in the right frame intended by the problem; however, they are not considering all aspects of the problem context. As in the example mentioned in the study by Emigh et al.\textsuperscript{3}, the student by stating, that “A linear combo of stationary states is not stationary” is mindful that a superposition of eigenstates is not a stationary state. The student is also able to differentiate between the energy levels of each eigenstate and gives a presentation of the system by stating “The system will oscillate around $E_0$ and $E_1$”. This response was also provided to the same task as mentioned above.

Table VII indicates, that students’ difficulties with considering just a single phase wave function (DTs1) can be mapped as a displacement error or a transition error. A displacement error indicates that student has not attended to the frame of the question to blend the information effectively with the corresponding concepts in the task. This is similar to the described example in section V from the Emigh et al. study\textsuperscript{3}. The other possible error is when students frame the task properly and are able to coordinate between frames; however, they fail to productively transition between frames to remove all the barriers (Section IV A).

The the real and imaginary parts of the wave function (CTs1 in table VIII) difficulty shows that some students establish a conceptual discussion in a math frame to relate the real and imaginary parts of the wave function in the complex plane. However, viewing the problem as purely conceptual (e.g. in the conceptual math frame) prevents students to note other related ideas in the problem statement. Shifting to the algorithmic math frame could help the student to recall other related facts to successfully solve the problem. Alternately, moving to the conceptual physics frame may help the students to reframe the unrelated ideas of their framed representation consistent with the goal of the problem.

Table IX, shows that students’ can exhibit different types of errors in interpreting the meaning of the expectation value (DCT1). As been discussed in the third example (Section VI), the task required students to start with recalling physics relations to calculate the expectation value. The student experiencing content error will activate an unstructured piece of his knowledge related to the TISE, which will be corrected by the interviewer\textsuperscript{27}, we already discussed this example in section VI. The displacement error occurs when the student is outside of
TABLE V. Difficulties that exhibit content error in simpler problems. These difficulties are labeled “C” for content errors; and “n” because their problems require no shifting. The ordering of the difficulties in the table is for labeling purposes only and does not represent a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cn1</td>
<td>Incorrect belief that the time evolution of a wave function is always via an overall phase factor of the type $e^{-\frac{i\Delta t}{\hbar}}$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn2</td>
<td>Determining the outcomes of a subsequent energy measurement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn3</td>
<td>Difficulties with the possible outcomes of a measurement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn4</td>
<td>Failure to recognize that the time evolution of an isolated system is determined by the Schrödinger equation: “Decaying reasoning”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn5</td>
<td>Belief that the wave function will return to its initial state</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn6</td>
<td>Failure to recognize that the time evolution of an isolated system is determined by the Schrödinger equation: “Diffusion reasoning”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn7</td>
<td>Difficulties with time development of the wave function after measurement of an observable</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn8</td>
<td>Difficulties in distinguishing between vectors in real space and Hilbert space</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn9</td>
<td>Inability to differentiate between $e^{-\frac{i\hat{H}t}{\hbar}}$ and $e^{-\frac{i\hat{E}t}{\hbar}}$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VI. Difficulties that exhibit both displacement and content error in problems which require transitions. These difficulties are labeled “DC” for displacement and content errors; and “s” because their problems require shifting. The ordering of the difficulties in the table is for labeling purposes only and does not represent a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCs1</td>
<td>Confusion between the time dependence of energy measurements and other quantities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs2</td>
<td>Belief that the wave function will spread out over time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the problem statement frame (algorithmic physics), and writes down just a mathematical expression $\langle \Psi | \hat{H} | \Psi \rangle$, which lacks blended information from the physical space.

An example of transition error is when the student is able to blend the physical meaning of the probability of the energy values with the related coefficients, and translate the problem into procedural steps. However, the student might leave an extra coefficient ($\frac{1}{2}$) in the final answer, $\frac{1}{2}E_1 + \frac{1}{2}E_2$, which can be removed by reviewing the solution and thinking purely conceptually about the quantity of the expectation value$^{27}$. For this example only the final answer of the student was provided in the paper and no further narration by the student was available which leaves uncertainty in our analysis.

Table X shows students’ difficulties with calculation of time dependence expectation value in the context of Larmor precession for problems that does not require transition between frames. Difficulties with recognizing the special properties of stationary states could result in a content error, as students similar to this case state, that for a stationary state the commutation of the Hamiltonian and the operator $\hat{Q}$ is nonzero, thus “its expectation value must depend on time”$^{2}$.  

**Student:** Since $\hat{S}_x$ does not commute with $\hat{H}$, its expectation value must depend on time.

Although the student is able to apply the Ehrenfest’s theorem correctly, the student does not note that being in a stationary state changes the Hamiltonian in the time dependence phase factor from an operator to a number, which commutes with the operator $\hat{Q}$. In addition, difficulties with distinguishing between stationary states and eigenstates of operators other than energy could result to a displacement error as students think that “if a system is initially in an eigenstate of $\hat{S}_x$, then only the expectation value of $S_x$ will not depend on time.”$^{2}$

**VIII. ERROR RATES**

Figure 7 shows all the possible ways that descriptions of published difficulties can be mapped into errors in framing and resource use. Each number refers to the number of difficulties in that error category, not the number of students in that category.

This figure shows that all of the error categories and combinations of them are populated. Given our set of math-in-physics frames we can predict the kinds of difficulties that will emerge for a given problem in quantum mechanics, which can provide a possible deeper structure to student’s cognitive process.

For a problem that requires a transition, we expect to see a breakdown to displacement, content, and transition errors. If a problem doesn’t require a transition we expect to see a breakdown to displacement and content error. For example, when a problem requires transition we expect to see more displacement error possibly because...
TABLE VII. Difficulties that exhibit both displacement and transition errors in problems which require frame shifting. These difficulties are labeled “DT” for displacement and transition errors; and “s” because their problems require shifting. The ordering of the difficulties in the table is for labeling purposes only and does not represent a hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTs1</td>
<td>Tendency to treat all the wave functions as having a single phase</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTs2</td>
<td>Finding the probability of an energy measurement from the wave function</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VIII. Difficulty that exhibits both content and transition errors in a problem which requires frame shifting. This difficulty is labeled “CT” for content and transition errors, and “s” because its problem requires shifting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTs1</td>
<td>Tendency to misinterpret the real and imaginary components of the wave function</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 7. The number of difficulties mapped to error categories, a) for questions that require transition, b) for questions that do not require transition.

the transition inherent in the problem means students are more likely to be confused to which frames to be started with.

Figure 8 and Figure 9 give an overview of the occurrence of the three error types – displacement, transition, and content – among all the topics. Figure 8 shows that displacement error is the most frequent among problem statements which require transition. By most frequent, we do not mean to imply that more students do that error; we mean that displacement error category has more difficulties in it. This distinction is important because the underlying rates of each difficulty differ in the population of students. It could be that displacement difficulties are more common among problems that require transition because those problems are harder (overall high rate of difficulties), or it could be that there are simply more possible ways in which students displayed regular wrong responses to those problems. A great deal of effort goes into designing and testing questions which will reveal or cause student difficulties, so it’s possible that these error rates are an artifact of the kinds of questions most likely to produce difficulty-like responses.

FIG. 8. Displacement, transition and content error categories of difficulty topics for questions that require transition. The total percentage is not 100 due to rounding error.

 IX. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The goal of this paper is to reinterpret research on student difficulties in quantum mechanics through the lens of epistemological framing, particularly using the set of four math-in-physics frames previously applied to our observational classroom data of upper-division student problem solving. We seek an underlying structure to the kinds of difficulties other researchers have identified.

This framework splits the underlying thought processes of student into three different categories as displacement error, transition error, and content error. The displacement error reveals students’ unproductive frame of the situation. Content error shows what pieces of knowledge have to be activated to understand all the ideas incorporated in the problem frame. Transition error shows that students are able to activate resources in one frame, but cannot shift to another frame to continue
TABLE IX. Difficulties that exhibit all types of error in problems which require frame shifting. This difficulties is labeled “DCT” because it may involve all three types of error, and “s” because the problem require shifting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCTs1</td>
<td>Interpreting the meaning of expectation value</td>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE X. Difficulties that exhibit both displacement and content errors in simpler problems. This difficulty is labeled “DC” for displacement and content errors and “n” because the problem does not require shifting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCn1</td>
<td>Time dependence of expectation values-distinguishing between stationary states and other eigenstates, and recognizing their properties</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 9. Displacement and content error categories of difficulty topics for questions that do not require transition.

This framework suggests different kinds of cognitive processes for students’ thinking. Instructors’ awareness of student error categories may help them scaffold students’ reasoning better, as instructors can tip students into different frames or gently nudge students to use additional resources to resolve content errors.

Our analysis of secondary data is hampered by the very nature of that data: we don’t have access to full student reasoning because sometimes primary sources don’t report it, and sometimes the nature of their survey data precludes them from collecting it. We expect that, were sufficiently detailed data available, all of the student reasoning attributed to difficulties in quantum mechanics could be analyzed using these frames. We excluded nine difficulties from further analysis due to not having enough information to figure out what the framing could have been.

This work has implications for both future research and for instruction. For research, it is an open question as to whether these four frames – conceptual physics, conceptual math, algorithmic physics, and algorithmic math – constitute the optimal basis set for epistemological frames in student understanding of quantum mechanics. However, they form a more compact basis set than is possible (let alone extant) with difficulties.

For instruction, epistemologically-aware tutorials at the introductory level has been shown to outperform difficulties-based tutorials in student understanding of Newton’s Third Law. More broadly, supporting students’ epistemologies in the classroom may have far-reaching implications for retention and persistence. Development work in quantum mechanics at the upper-division is exclusively in a difficulties-based mode, though some epistemologically-aware work has occurred at the introductory level in quantum mechanics. Curriculum developers could take up framing as a guiding theoretical framework for development at the upper-division. This is particularly interesting for quantum mechanics because the conceptual content is epistemologically difficult – yet conceptually fascinating – for students.
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