ED 229 700   CG 016 671

AUTHOR   Sinnott, Jan D.
TITLE   Do Adults Use a Post-Formal "Theory of Relativity" to
                  Solve Everyday Logical Problems?
SPONS AGENCY   National Inst. on Aging (DHHS/NIH), Bethesda, MD.
PUB DATE   Nov 82
NOTE   24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Scientific
                  Meeting of the Gerontological Society (35th, Boston,
                  MA, November 19-23, 1982).
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses (070) -- Reports -
                  Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference
                  Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Adults; *Cognitive Development; Cognitive
                  Measurement; *Cognitive Processes; *Cognitive Style;
                  Interpersonal Relationship; *Logical Thinking;
                  Maturity (Individuals); *Problem Solving; Social
                  Cognition; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS   Piagetian Theory

ABSTRACT
                  A new concept, relativistic operations, seems to
provide a link between Piagetian theory, information processing
theory, logical thought in the new physics, and the nature of adults'
problem solving in everyday social situations. Relativistic
operations are logical, cognitive operations which can be used as a
system to relate, order, and select as more useful one of the many
mutually contradictory but "true" formal operational systems. In
terms of Piagetian theory they are a post-formal level of thought
processing; in information processing terms these operations mainly
determine what is included or excluded in "problem-space" by the
problem solver. Relativistic operations make possible the analysis of
such complex relations as interpersonal relations. To test the
assumption that these operations are present in the thinking of
mature adults, male and female volunteers (N=79) aged 26-89 responded
to written stimulus problems which demanded combinatorial reasoning
with 2 or 3 variables. Responses were scored for the presence or
absence of real-life formal operations as well as the presence or
absence of relativistic operations. The results supported the
assumption that relativistic operations seem to be used by many
mature adults in logical problem solving. (WAS)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

Do Adults Use a Post-Formal

"Theory of Relativity" to Solve Everyday

Logical Problems?

Jan D. Sinnott, Ph. D.[1]

Psychology Dept., Towson State

University, Baltimore

and

Gerontology Research Center, NIA/NIH

Baltimore City Hospital

2

In this symposium we have promised to search for
"missing links" between cognitive research and everyday
adult problem solving. Sometimes a missing link can be
found if familiar questions are posed in different ways.
In so many areas of science, as Kuhn points out, the
missing piece, the one that gives a whole new interpre-
tation to the issue, is right there all the time, but is
overlooked. Then a conscious reconceptualization takes
place, sometimes a sudden one, and the whole system
changes. The missing link is discovered through conscious
reconceptualization. I would like to suggest today that
the missing link between cognitive research and everyday
problem solving may _involve_ examination of the act of
reconceptualization itself.

Today I'll ask you to do a reconceptualization of
your own, and to think about the act of reconceptualization
itself. When a problem is being solved, how does reconcep-
tualization take place at all? What leads to the decision
to reconceptualize a problem? What kinds of skills make
it possible for us to, so to speak, "jump out" of a mode
of processing, make processing decisions (i.e., reconcep-
tualizations), and "jump back" to continue processing in
a reconceptualized way? What kinds of rules do we use to
make decisions about which of the possible reconceptual-
izations to use or how to "jump in" or "out" of the system?
What kinds of rules do we use to make decisions about
which decision rules are permissible in reconceptualizing?

And, does the process involved in all this reconceptualization constitute some unique organization of information processing skills or logical operations that does link cognitive research and everyday problem solving in a new way? The answer to this last question appears to be a tentative "yes". There appears to be a unique organization of logical operations and information processing skills that link cognitive research and everyday problem solving in a new way. These operations and skills are very much involved with the reconceptualization process which takes place before or while a problem is being solved.

In this paper I would like to make only three points. First, a qualitatively unique set of skills and operations for reconceptualization--which I will call "relativistic operations"--seems to provide many of the missing links for which we are looking. Second, adults do use these skills to solve everyday logical problems, especially problems involving social settings. Third, in information processing terms, these operations mainly determine what is included or excluded in so-called "problem space" by the problem solver. These ideas also are more fully expressed in an article (Sinnott, 1981), and in a chapter to be published this year by Praeger in a book on the proceedings of the Harvard Symposium on Postformal Operations (Sinnott, in press).

What Led to the Idea of Relativistic Operations?

Relativistic operations is my term for a unique set of information processing skills and logical operations. They

appear postformal in Piagetian terms. I was led to examine these abilities by a number of ideas, some of which were theory-based and some data-based. For example, Piaget's theory of intellectual development had little to say pro or con about the existence of a postformal stage of development. There was no reason to assume that structures more complex than formal operations would not be found, if we looked. I had to ask myself, what would fill this theoretical gap? My brainstorming and reasoning was as follows. If Piaget's formal operations stage is an analog of scientific thought, and of the logical positivism and propositional reasoning that underlies scientific inquiry in chemistry or Newtonian physics, what sort of analog would reach beyond that to describe even more complex reasoning? The "new" physics of Einstein and quantum theory came next in the realm of physics and provided a more complex logical analog that subsumed the logic of Newtonian physics. The kind of logical thought which permits understanding of "new physics" concepts is a relativistic, self-referential logic. So, what might a postformal Piagetian stage contain? Relativistic, self-referential operations which could organize formal operations, as the general laws of the "new" physics subsume and organize the limited-case laws of Newtonian physics. These operations would be expected in adults who go beyond formal operations.

While that theory-based thinking about the nature of postformal operations was pointing toward the existence

of relativistic operations, another line of thought was
also forming for me. Piaget's theory is rather deficient
in describing the development of interpersonal understanding,
i.e., how we know the nature of relations that exist between
ourselves and others. For a long time I'd been curious
about this particular cognitive development since social
understanding seems to be one type of cognitive process that
increases in adulthood and old age. "Knowing other persons
and interpersonal relations" are also skills mentioned by
adults when one asks them "what is intelligent behavior for
a mature adult?"---data that increased my interest. As I
probed childrens' and adults' explanations of how they come
to know interpersonal relations I began to see orderly
stages (which I will not discuss today) in the growth of
that knowledge and a final stage which was once again
amazingly like relativistic operations---more data for my
perusal.

While that thinking and data-gathering was taking
place, my interest in group dynamics, as expressed in
dialogues among group members, led to additional exploratory
data. These data supported the existence of relativistic
operations and pointed to cognitive effects on group devel-
opment, on shared interpersonal understanding, and even
on group change.

My curiosity having been stimulated by this apparent
convergence of Piagetian theory, ideas in the "new" physics,
and social cognitive data, I reexamined some older problem-
solving data and I presented some problems demanding

combinatorial reasoning to adults. I then performed both qualitative and quantitative analyses on their reasoning. I wanted to explore whether the success rates, strategies, and styles used on these problems differed between age groups and individuals or demonstrated operations forming a pattern other than a concrete or formal one. If a new pattern appeared, was it like relativistic operations? One of the things I found was a tendency for adults to use what I was calling relativistic operations in solving these complex, potentially formal operations problems, especially for social problems. This constituted further support.

So, I found a number of lines of thinking and a number of sources of data leading me to the same place. Questions about Piagetian theory and ecologically valid aging research and adult development might all have an answer in the skills involved in a reconceptualization called "relativistic operations" which permits complex reconceptualizations to take place.

Upon examining some work in information processing (especially that of Newell & Simon, 1972), it became clear that what I was examining was "how respondents made decisions about which knowledge elements and processes in the task environment (that is, the potential set, in the problem solver's view, of admissible information) to admit to official consideration in problem space (that is, the actual set of admissible information used) before solving a problem." This was an aspect of problem solving which had received little attention in Newell and Simon's model because their

problems were highly structured and the choice of elements
to include in problem space was a foregone conclusion. With
everyday problems, the potentially-usable elements in the
task environment are much more numerous, and selection is
an important factor in creation of multiple effective
solutions. So I began thinking of my "relativistic operations"
using the concepts of Piagetian theory and the information
processing approach of Newell & Simon.

Definition of Relativistic Operations

Relativistic operations are logical operations which
can be used as a system to relate, order, and select as more
useful one of many mutually contradictory but "true" formal
operational systems. Therefore they are a higher level of
processing and are post-formal. They include an element
of necessary subjectivity or self-reference. They permit
the kind of logical thinking that characterizes the "new"
physics. They permit the kind of logical thinking that
makes it possible to analyze complex relations like inter-
personal relations, relations which we are bringing into
existence from moment to moment as we interact with
others.

The truth of any proposition is usually decided by
moving one step back in systems, "jumping out", so that,
from the far reference point, one can judge the truth or
falsity of a statement. Human knowing is limited by
definition; no system can know itself (Hofstadter, 1979).
Relativistic operations permit logical thinking in the

situations (which mature adults face daily) where one can
go no further back (interms of reference points) in
creating criteria for truth or falsity (Tarski;see Popper, 1972).
Your decision about higher-level truth rules is ultimately
a function of your lower-level decisions which are based
on these rules (within the limits of real feedback
maximizing true outcomes--Popper, 1972). Relativistic
operations permit us to logically maximize "true" outcomes
in a situation of truth criterion uncertainty by allowing
for self-referential higher-order logical decisions (Heisenberg,
1958). The outcomes of these higher-level metatheoretical-
system self-referential truth criteria decisions can then
be tested by lower-level formal operations using the
scientific method.

Relativistic operations seem to be involved in conscious
reconceptualizations that let us select a new set of rules
for interpreting a problem. Therefore they permit
multiple-formal-operations solutions of a problem based
on general case, overriding, self-referential rules.
Some of the mechanisms involved seem to be these:

Insert Table 1 about here

In order to test the assumption that relativistic

post-formal operations are present in the thinking of mature
adults who respond to the demand to "make all possible
combinations," male and female volunteers in the Baltimore
Longitudinal Study of Aging between the ages of 26 and 89
(Table 2) were interviewed. A modified clinical method was
used in which standard problems were followed by probes
to clarify responses (Table 3).

The focus of the interviews was problem solving. Six
stimulus problems were presented in written form in random
order; the two to be discussed here appear in Table 3.

Insert Tables 2 & 3 about here

Operational Definitions and Scoring of Relativistic Operations

Relativistic operations construct <u>systems</u> of formal
operational systems to permit selection of one formal system
among many where several could apply. Relativistic
operations include the processes in Table 1, and are nec-
essarily both logical (since they imply formal operations)
and subjective (since they imply choice of a formal system).

Respondents are scored on abstract formal operations,
alternative systems of formal operations (if appropriate),
and, most important, relativistic operations in Table 1.
Problems demand combinatorial reasoning with either 2 or
3 variables involved. Problems include totally abstract
demands, like making pairs of letters, and fairly real-
istic scenarios with embedded abstract demands.

A subject is considered "abstract formal operational" on a problem if the following conditions are present: the correct numerical or verbal answer is given to the abstract problem (e.g., "15 pairs"), and the subject correctly describes how the answer was obtained, outlining the variables manipulated and the strategy used to make exhaustive combinations.

A subject might pass the abstract formal demands and also give an alternative formal logical solution to the same problem considered from a different point of view. For example, after passing the bedroom problem on an abstract level the subject might go on to point out that in real life "the grandfather must live with someone," and, "under those conditions, two of the 6 possible combinations would not be logical in real life." Alternative real-life solutions like these are scored for formal operations. If the variables and strategy are outlined and the correct logical answer in terms of the variables at hand is given, the subject passes. In the example above, the logically correct answer would now be 4 combinations because the additional variable of "grandfather must have a companion." is introduced.

In addition to scoring the responses for presence or absence of abstract or real-life formal operations, they are scored for presence or absence of relativistic operations listed in Table 1. The occurrence of more complex processing may be a function of age and problem

characteristics. Evidence that many respondents examine more than one formal system is in Figure 1 which describes approaches to the BR problem.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Operations

Evidence for use of relativistic operations is in Table 4 by age, sex, and problem. For BR, many respondents use relativistic operations especially problem definition, parameter setting, and pragmatic metatheory choice, though no one uses them all and articulates that process to us. The ABC problem is much less likely to elicit use of operations in Table 1, as seen in Table 4. (Another study using more demanding social formal operational problems is producing results like those for BR).

Insert Table 4 about here

Styles

Individuals had definite styles in terms of use/nonuse of relativistic operations, of formal operations, and of individual relativistic operations. For example, some never reconceptualized by using a second set of a priori's; others always did. Some acknowledged a large task environment and used it in their problem space; others examined only one or two items of knowledge or processes and seemed aware of no more; still others saw a large number of possibilities but did not use them effectively. Problems involving people and interpersonal relations were more often the occasion for relativistic operations use. The respondent

approaching the problem might see it as an occasion for categorization, or for hypothetical deductive reasoning, or for application of a well-known algorithm, or for use of relativistic operations.

It has never been clear how individuals decide what to include in problem space (that is, which knowledge elements or processes to admit to consideration) when processing information (Newell and Simon, 1972). In my data I see some clues. Several characteristics could routinely be found in the task environment (that is, among the potential [in the view of the problem solver] knowledge or processes useful for solving the problem) or in the respondent when problem space was large, when relativistic operations were used, or when several valid or "true" solutions were accepted.

Insert Table 5 about here

These other characteristics were usually present when respondents selected one and only one formal solution as better (more "true") than others and rejected other solutions, thereby constricting the task environment into smaller problem space:

Insert Table 6 about here

"Thinking out loud" procedures recommended by Giambra and Arenberg (1980) are now being used to describe each of

the considerations made by problem solving respondents with
qualitatively differing "strategies" for processing problem
information. Of course more work is being done on all
aspects of the ideas I've raised.

Summing Up

I promised to assist in the search for missing links
between cognition and everyday problem solving. I proposed
that an area that should be examined (one I was examining)
concerned mechanisms for complex cognitive reconceptual-
izations. I suggested that seldom-examined complex processes
for major reconceptualizations---processes I called relativ-
istic operations---could be the link between Piagetian
theory, information processing theory, logical thought in
the new physics, and mature adults' problem solving in
everyday social situations.

I would like to recapitulate my three main points.
First, a qualitatively different set of thinking skills or
operations---an everyday sort of "theory of relativity"---
that I call "relativistic operations" seems to be used by
many mature adults to solve everyday logical problems.
Second, examining these skills may provide us with missing
links and with interesting developments for at least two
cognitive models---Piagetian theory and information
processing. Third, using an information processing model,
these relativistic operations are expressed at the point
at which an individual decides which information and
decision rules to include or exclude from problem space.

References

Giambra, L. & Arenberg, D. Problem solving, concept learning, and aging. In L. Poon (Ed.), <u>Aging in the 1980's: Psychological issues</u>. Washington, D.C.: A.P.A., 1980.

Heisenberg, W. <u>Physics and philosophy</u>. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

Hofstadter, D. <u>Godel, Escher, Bach: An eternal golden braid</u>. New York: Random House, 1979.

Newell, A. & Simon, H. <u>Human problem solving</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Popper, K. <u>Objective knowledge</u>. Oxford: Claredon, 1972.

Sinnott, J. D. Postformal reasoning: The relativistic stage. In M. Commons (Ed.), <u>Beyond formal operations</u>. New York: Praeger, 1982.

Sinnott, J. D. The theory of relativity: A metatheory for development? <u>Human Development</u>, 1981, <u>24</u>, 293-311.

Table 1

Some Relativistic Operations

1. Metatheory shift: changing a priori consid-
                           erations from one set to a
                           conflicting set

2. Problem definition: focusing on defining the
                           problem

3. Process/product shift: deciding to solve for a
                           dynamic or for a particular
                           content solution

4. Parameter setting: defining the limits of the
                           problem factors

5. Pragmatism: evaluating abstract solutions
                           and practical solutions sep-
                           arately in terms of useful-
                           ness, difficulty

6. Multiple solutions: being aware that a multi-
                           caused problem most likely
                           has several "correct" solutions

7. Multiple causality: utilizing multifactorial
                           explanations and probablistic
                           predictions

8. Paradox: being aware that a problem
                           can be read in two conflicting
                           ways

Table 2

Age and Sex of Participants

	Male	Female	
Age (at last birthday)			
Young: 20-39	8 (10%)	7 (9%)	Total = 15 (19%)
Middle aged: 40-59	13 (16%)	10 (12%)	Total = 23 (29%)
Young old: 60-69	15 (19%)	5 (6%)	Total = 20 (25%)
Old old: 70 or older	15 (19%)	6 (7%)	Total = 21 (26%)
	51 (64%)	28 (35%)	79 (100%)

Table 3

Problems

PROBLEM ABC

Six letters of the twenty-six letters of the alphabet appear below. Imagine that you are making pairs of the letters, writing down all the possible ways of putting two _different_ letters together. How many pairs will you have when you make all possible pairs of the six letters? (Remember, although any letter will appear several times in different pairs the same letter should not appear twice in the same pair: ~~BB~~ BC BD). Use these letters: A B C D E F

PROBLEM BR

A small family consisting of a mother in her 40's and a ten-year old girl live in a small two-bedroom house in Detroit. The mother occupies a large well-decorated bedroom (that sleeps one) and the child uses a smaller bedroom (that sleeps one). This summer the family learns that a grandfather who lives alone in a one-bedroom (sleeps one) apartment two blocks away can no longer live alone. He might move in with the family. Under the circumstances, _what are all the possible ways_ that three persons can use the three available bedrooms in the house and apartment?

Table 4

Percentage of Respondents Giving Evidence of Post-Formal Operations, BR Problem, by Age and Sex

Operation Element	Total BR (N=79)	Young		Middle Aged		Young Old		Old Old	
		F(N=7)	M(N=8)	F(N=10)	M(N=13)	F(N=5)	M(N=15)	F(N=6)	M(N=15)
1. Metatheory choice	35%	57%	75%	20%	23%	---	40%	16%	40%
2. Problem definition	93%	85%	100%	100%	84%	100%	93%	83%	100%
3. Process/product shift	20%	---	25%	10%	7%	60%	40%	16%	13%
4. Parameter setting	92%	100%	100%	100%	76%	100%	93%	83%	93%
5. Pragmatism	73%	100%	87%	50%	61%	40%	86%	33%	93%
6. Multiple solutions	37%	71%	62%	40%	23%	40%	33%	16%	33%
7. Multiple Causality	31%	14%	12%	20%	46%	80%	40%	16%	26%
8. Paradox	13%	14%	12%	10%	7%	---	13%	33%	20%

19

20

Table 5

Some Characteristics of Task Environment

Defined by Subject, or of Respondent per se

When Problem Space Effectively Used by Subject Was Large

1. Multiple interpretations of context

2. Large memory capacity

3. Problem interpreted as social

4. Problem considered important

5. Previous use of relativistic operations in
    other problems

6. Evaluation that several solutions are
    "workable"

7. Multiple goals expressed

8. Can "jump out of system" in hierarchy of
    nested concepts

9. Several solutions are mutually mappable

10. Respondent separates process and state
    considerations

11. Search for general laws which hold true
    across multiple contradictory contexts

Table 6

Some Characteristics of Task Environment Defined by

Subject, or of Respondent, per se When Problem Space

Is Large But Portion Effectively Used is Small

1. Judgement that some information or process is
   not usable due to higher-level cognitive
   considerations

2. Problem judged unimportant

3. Judgement that only one solution is ever correct

4. Previous use of only this portion of information

5. Rejection of other information on emotional
   grounds (e.g., one is too hard to consider)

6. One goal

7. Previous experience used only limited information

8. Some alternative information or processes are
   better mapped to first choice than others

Figure 1 Caption

Varieties of Formal Solutions Used on BR, by Age.