**Research in Mathematics Education** Series Editors: Jinfa Cai · James A. Middleton

Patricio Felmer Peter Liljedahl Boris Koichu *Editors* 

Problem Solving in Mathematics Instruction and Teacher Professional Development



# **Research in Mathematics Education**

### **Series Editors:**

Jinfa Cai, Newark, DE, USA James A. Middleton, Tempe, AZ, USA This series is designed to produce thematic volumes, allowing researchers to access numerous studies on a theme in a single, peer-reviewed source. Our intent for this series is to publish the latest research in the field in a timely fashion. This design is particularly geared toward highlighting the work of promising graduate students and junior faculty working in conjunction with senior scholars. The audience for this monograph series consists of those in the intersection between researchers and mathematics education leaders—people who need the highest quality research, methodological rigor, and potentially transformative implications ready at hand to help them make decisions regarding the improvement of teaching, learning, policy, and practice. With this vision, our mission of this book series is:

- 1. To support the sharing of critical research findings among members of the mathematics education community;
- 2. To support graduate students and junior faculty and induct them into the research community by pairing them with senior faculty in the production of the highest quality peer-reviewed research papers; and
- 3. To support the usefulness and widespread adoption of research-based innovation.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/13030

Patricio Felmer • Peter Liljedahl • Boris Koichu Editors

# Problem Solving in Mathematics Instruction and Teacher Professional Development



*Editors* Patricio Felmer Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática University of Chile Santiago, Chile

Boris Koichu Department of Science Teaching Weizmann Institute of Science Rehovot, Israel Peter Liljedahl Faculty of Education Simon Fraser University Burnaby, BC, Canada

 ISSN 2570-4729
 ISSN 2570-4737
 (electronic)

 Research in Mathematics Education
 ISBN 978-3-030-29214-0
 ISBN 978-3-030-29215-7
 (eBook)

 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29215-7
 ISBN 978-3-030-29215-7
 (eBook)

#### © Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019, Corrected Publication 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

# Introduction

Problem solving is of fundamental importance in mathematics knowledge construction from the very beginning of our human history. As such, it is widely agreed that problem solving should be a fundamental activity in mathematics classrooms. The ideas around this statement were put into the educational discussion more than 70 years ago by George Pólya with the publication of his famous book *How to Solve It* (1945). Since then, an increasing number of researchers have been developing theories and programs and setting up experiments for the introduction of problem solving in classrooms as part of regular mathematics activity. In parallel, many countries started to include problem solving in their national curricula, in many cases, putting it at the center of the national mathematics education agenda. Despite these enormous efforts and achievements, there is still a long way to go before problem solving would be considered as a regular activity in a regular classroom – so that school children would study mathematics through practicing problem solving. This book provides a contribution with a variety of approaches to move forward in this direction.

The origin of this book is a conference held at the end of 2017 in the Chilean city of Punta Arenas, located in Patagonia. The city, together with the University of Magallanes, offered the participants a wonderful academic environment in which to share their ideas. The magnificent natural scenery of the surrounded areas and the rich history of the city and of the region were perfect complements for the weeklong academic gathering. Since its discovery by Portuguese explorer Ferdinand of Magellan in 1520, until the construction of the Panama Canal, the Magellan Canal was for many centuries the only route connecting Atlantic and Pacific Ocean. Settled on the banks of the Canal, Punta Arenas has become a well-known city for sailor of many nations. Before the city started to grow with the settlement of immigrants from many countries, the region had been inhabited by many indigenous tribes of fishermen. These tribes were eventually exterminated by the outrageous commercial greed of the new settlers. Punta Arenas is also known as a city where Charles Darwin, during his famous trip on board of Beagle, began to develop his ideas about evolution. The natural surroundings of Punta Arenas offer vast sea and tundra, impressive mountains, strong wind, and quickly changing weather, together with an

exotic fauna and flora, whose most popular representatives are penguins, condors, upland gooses, pumas, south Andean deer, and whales, among the animals, and box-leaf barberry, southern beech, fuchsia, and tuft grasses, among the plants.

The conference Problem Solving in Patagonia took place between 27 November and 1 December 2017, which is early summer in Patagonia. The conference was devoted to the recent advances in research in mathematics education with special focus on mathematical problem solving. The conference was organized in the context of a Chilean project to enhance collaboration in mathematics education between Chile and Canada, specifically Simon Fraser University. With additional support from the Center for Advanced Research in Education (CIAE) and the Center for Mathematical Modeling (CMM) from the University of Chile and with the local support of the University of Magallanes, 25 researchers gathered for a week in Punta Arenas. We were fortunate to have the participation of many renowned researchers in the mathematics education area as well as a number of young researchers. Alphabetically, Miriam Amit, Sergio Celis, Eugenio Chandía, Lisa Darragh, Danval Farsani, Patricio Felmer, Frédéric Gourdeau, Patricio Herbst, Gabriele Kaiser, Boris Koichu, Richard Lagos, Roza Leikin, Peter Liljedahl, John Mason, Vilma Mesa, Carmen Oval, Cristián Reyes, Annette Rouleau, Natalia Ruiz, Farzaneh Saadati, Manuel Santos-Trig, Jorge Soto, Peter Taylor, Luz Valoyes, and Claudia Vargas took part in the conference.

After the conference, the participants were invited to prepare a chapter for the current book. We also invited some researchers who did not participate in the conference but were willing to share their research on mathematical problem solving. A particularly salient feature of this book is that it fosters the much needed dialogue between mathematicians and mathematics education researchers by including authors from these two strongly related but separate fields.

We have organized the book in five parts, putting together chapters addressing similar themes. In Part I, we gathered four chapters addressing problem solving in mathematics instruction from theoretical and practical perspectives. In Part II, the design of problem-solving situations is addressed in four chapters. Part III is devoted to the effects of engagement with problem solving in four chapters, and Part IV is dedicated to the role of teachers in problem-solving classrooms also with four chapters. The last part addresses, in three chapters, issues of teacher professional development and problem solving. In what follows, we briefly discuss the content of each part.

Part I. Theoretical and practical perspectives on problem solving in mathematics instruction. The chapter by Peter Taylor opens the book by analyzing some existing curricular constructs and proposing a new one in which problem solving provides students with true mathematical experiences. Then, Frédéric Gourdeau addressed the ongoing dialogue between mathematics and mathematics education through his own experience in problem solving as both a subject and a pedagogical approach. In the next chapter, a discursively oriented conceptualization of mathematical problem solving is offered by Boris Koichu, providing reanalysis of two past studies for illustrating this conceptualization. Finally, Jorge Soto-Andrade and Alexandra Yáñez-Aburto discuss an enactivist and metaphoric approach to problem posing and problem solving which is based on Valera's theory of knowledge.

Part II. Design of powerful problem-solving situations. The opening of the second part of this book is a chapter by John Mason in which he challenges the distinction between play and exploration while enhancing the former. It is followed by Erkki Pehkonen's chapter, proposing an alternative method to promote pupils' mathematical understanding via problem solving. Next, Patricio Herbst revisits the ranking triangles task as a way to both analyze geometric modeling tasks and provide opportunities to learn geometry. Manuel Santos-Trigo, Daniel Aguilar-Magallón, and Isaid Reyes-Martínez offer a chapter on a problem-solving approach based on digital technology and how this provides affordances to represent, explore, and solve problems via geometric reasoning. Part II ends with a chapter by Roza Leikin, discussing varying mathematical challenges related to teaching mathematics in a heterogeneous classroom and how "stepped tasks" can be used for the sake of students' self-regulated variation of mathematical challenge.

Part III. Effects of engagement with problem solving. Farzaneh Saadati and Cristián Reyes open the third part of the book with a chapter on the use of collaborative learning to improve problem-solving skills and how this is related to students' attitudes toward mathematics. The next two chapters, authored by Annette Rouleau, Natalia Ruiz, Cristián Reyes, and Peter Liljedahl, address teacher beliefs and student self-efficacy and how these change within the context of whole-class problem solving. Finally, Roberta and Jodie Hunter report on the use of culturally embedded problem-solving tasks to promote equity within mathematical inquiry communities.

Part IV. On the role of teachers in problem-solving classrooms. Sergio Celis, Carlos Quiroz, and Valentina Toro-Vidal open the fourth part of the book with a chapter on the influence of teacher-student interactions on group problem-solving capabilities. Markus Hähkiöniemi and John Francisco address teacher guidance in mathematical problem-solving lessons in the context of professional development programs. The chapter authored by José Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis Contreras, and Miguel Montes deals with mathematics teachers' specialized knowledge (MTSK) in managing problem-solving classroom tasks. The last chapter by Angeliki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa is on teacher questioning as a means of supporting problem solving within community college algebra classrooms.

Part V. Teacher professional development and problem solving. The first chapter of this part is authored by Lisa Darragh and Darinka Radovic, who address success and sustainability of professional development programs in which teachers study how to enhance problem solving in their own classrooms. Next, Josefa Perdomo-Díaz, Patricio Felmer, and Cristóbal Rojas present a study on teachers' mathematical tensions surfacing at the beginning of a problem-solving professional development workshop. Finally, Luz Valoyes-Chávez closes the book with a chapter on stereotypes and the education of in-service mathematics teachers in urban schools.

Last but not least, we would like to thank many peoples and organizations for their help in making the conference and this book a reality. We are especially grateful to the reviewers who helped us to improve the chapters in the book. We thank the generous support from the International Cooperation Program (PCI) of CONICYT, the Center for Mathematical Modeling, and the Center for Advanced Research in Education from the University of Chile. We also thank the Universidad de Magallanes for their hospitality and support. Special thanks go to Richard Lagos for the organization of the conference. But above all, we thank Gladys Cavallone for her work on the practical aspect of organizing of the conference and her wonderful job coordinating the work on this book.



Resilient tree in southern extreme weather conditions (Shutterstock)

Santiago, Chile Rehovot, Israel Burnaby, BC, Canada Patricio Felmer Boris Koichu Peter Liljedahl

# Contents

Dout I

1.3.1

1.3.2

1.3.3

1.3.4

1.3.5

1.4

1 ai	ιı	in Mathematics Instruction					
1	Re	forming School Mathematics: Two Levels of Structure					
	Pe	Peter Taylor					
	1.1	Some Brief Historical Comments					
	1.2	My Own Half-Century					
	1.3	The Search for a Curriculum Structure					

The Technical Skills.....

Teacher Preparation .....

What Mathematics? .....

Driving Speed.

Example 2: Counting Trains.

Theoretical and Dreatical Devenantives on Drehlem Calving

	Refe	rences	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	21
2	Prob and	lem Solv the Ong	ving as a Subject and as a Pedagogical Approach, oing Dialogue Between Mathematics	
	and	Mathem	atics Education	23
	Fréde	éric Gou	rdeau	
	2.1	Introdu	action	24
	2.2	Mathe	matical Preparation of Secondary School	
		Mathe	matics Teachers	24
		2.2.1	Students' Preparation and General Considerations	24
		2.2.2	Standard Mathematics Courses	25
		000		00

Example 1: Gas Consumption for Optimal

Conclusions .....

	2.2.3 Standard Mathematics Courses	26
2.3	Engaging Students Fully in the Doing of Mathematics	27
2.4	Culture of the Preservice Teachers' Mathematical	
	Classroom	29

3

4

6

8

11

12

12

13

13

19

.

.

.

	2.5	Mathe	matical Problem Solving for Preservice Teachers	32
		2.5.1	Sample Problems	32
		2.5.2	Visibly Random Groups and Vertical Nonpermanent	
			Surfaces (VNPS)	33
		2.5.3	Facilitation of the Work in Class	35
		2.5.4	Problem-Solving Portfolio	37
	2.6	Conclus	sion	39
	Refe	rences		41
3	A Di	scursive	ly Oriented Conceptualization of Mathematical	
	Prob	olem Sol	ving	43
	Bori	s Koichu	8	
	3.1	Ways o	of Handling the Complexity of Problem Solving	43
	3.2	Theore	etical Background.	45
		3.2.1	Synopsis of the Discursive Perspective on Learning	45
		3.2.2	Synopsis of the Cognitive-Representational	
			Perspective on Mathematical Problem Solving	46
	3.3	Recon	ceptualization of Problem Solving.	48
	3.4	Discur	rsive Aspects of a Study on Teaching	
		Heuris	stic Strategies	49
		3.4.1	In the Classrooms	50
		3.4.2	In the Lab	53
		3.4.3	Rethinking the Results	54
	3.5	Discur	sive Aspects of a Study on Fostering Aesthetic	
		of Pro	blem Solving	56
		3.5.1	In the Classrooms	57
		3.5.2	Rethinking the Results	60
	3.6	Summ	arizing Discussion	61
	Refe	rences	-	63
4	Ack	nowledg	ing the Ouroboros: An Enactivist	
1	and	Metanh	aric Annroach to Problem Posing	
	and	Problem	1 Solving	67
	Iorge	Soto-A	ndrade and Alexandra Yáñez-Aburto	0,
	4 1	Introdu	uction	68
	4.2	Theore	etical Background	70
		4 2 1	Metanhorizing in Cognitive Science	10
			and Mathematics Education	70
		422	The Enactivist Approach in Cognitive Science	10
		1.2.2	and in Mathematical Problem Solving	72
	43	Illustra	ative Examples	72
		4.3.1	Geometry: The Seven-Pointed Star	72
		4.3.2	Elementary Number Theory: Dynamical Systems	, 2
			on the Integers mod <i>m</i>	75
		4.3.3	Probability: The Fly's Perils and the Ant's	
			Random Walk	77

	4.4	Methodology	80
	4.5	Discussion and Open Ends.	81
	Refe	erences	82
Par	t II	Design of Powerful Problem-Solving Situations	
5	Pre-	parative and Post-parative Play as Key Components	
	of N	Iathematical Problem Solving	89
	Johr	n Mason	
	5.1	Introduction	90
	5.2	Play	93
		5.2.1 Play as a Fundamental Form of Emotion	93
		5.2.2 Play, Exploration, and Mathematics	95
		5.2.3 Play and Pedagogic Materials	95
		5.2.4 Paration	96
		5.2.5 Other Manifestations	97
		5.2.6 Becoming Aware of a Dimension of Possible Variation	00
		527 Conjecture	90
		5.2.8 Underpinning the Conjecture	100
		5.2.9 Validating Such a Conjecture	100
	53	Case Studies and Sample Task Domains	101
	5.5	5.3.1 Burning Candles	102
		5.3.2 Overflowing Water	102
		5.3.2 Symple Task Domains	105
	54	Conclusion	107
	Refe	erences.	107
6	<b>A</b>	Alternative Method to Dromete Dunile? Methometical	
0		Alternative Method to Promote Pupils' Mathematical	111
	Frkl	zi Dehkonen	111
	6 1	Introduction	111
	6.2	Main Concents	112
	0.2	6.2.1 Open Problems and Creativity	112
		6.2.7 Teaching via Problem Solving	115
	63	An Example	115
	0.5	6.3.1 Calculation Pyramid	117
		6.3.2 The Role of the Teacher in Problem Solving	118
	64	Find Note	110
	Refe		120
	KUI	ACTICC3	120
7	Geo	metric Modeling Tasks and Opportunity to Learn	
	Geo	metry: The Ranking Triangles Task Revisited	123
	Patr	icio Herbst	
	7.1	Introduction	124
	7.2	The Role of Task Design in the Study of Instruction	124

	7.3	A Modeling Perspective on the Development	100
	7.4	of Geometric Knowledge	126
	7.4	An Example: The Ranking Triangles Task	131
	1.5	The Ranking Triangles Task and Geometric Modeling	135
	7.6	Epistemology and the Management of Instruction	139
	7.7	Conclusion	140
	Refer	ences	141
8	A Ma	athematical Problem-Solving Approach Based on Digital	
	Tech	nology Affordances to Represent, Explore, and Solve	
	prob	lems via Geometric Reasoning	145
	Manu	iel Santos-Trigo, Daniel Aguilar-Magallón,	
	and Is	said Reyes-Martínez	
	8.1	Introduction	146
	8.2	Conceptual Framework	148
	8.3	Problem Solving and the Use of GeoGebra to Extend	
		Geometric and Algebraic Reasoning	150
		8.3.1 The Apollonius Problem.	151
		8.3.2 Algebraic Reasoning	158
	8.4	Final Remarks	163
	Refer	rences	164
9	Stepp	ped Tasks: Top-Down Structure of Varying Mathematical	
	Chal	lenge	167
	Roza	Leikin	
	9.1	Heterogeneity, Challenge, and Mathematical Potential	167
	9.2	Varying Mathematical Challenge in Mathematics	
		Instruction as an Indicator of High-Quality Teaching	169
	9.3	Types of Mathematical Tasks That Allow VMC	171
		9.3.1 Opening Approach to VMC	172
	9.4	Stepped Tasks – Structured Top-Down Approach to VMC	173
	9.5	Top-Down Student-Regulated Versus Bottom-Up	
		Teacher-Directed Implementation of the Stepped Tasks	176
	9.6	Initial Findings	177
	9.7	Big-Theorem Stepped Tasks for Teachers	179
	9.8	A Concluding Note	181
	Refer	rences.	182

# Part III Effects of Engagement with Problem Solving

10	Colla	borative Learning to Improve Problem-Solving Skills:	
	A Re	lation Affecting Through Attitude Toward Mathematics	187
	Farza	neh Saadati and Cristián Reyes	
	10.1	Introduction	188
		10.1.1 Collaborative Non-routine Problem Solving:	
		Skills and Attitudes	189
	10.2	Context of Study	190

#### Contents

		10.2.1 RPAula-Teacher Professional Development	
		Workshop	191
		10.2.2 Participants	192
		10.2.3 Instruments	192
	10.3	Results	193
		10.3.1 Attitude	193
		10.3.2 Changes on Problem-Solving Skills	194
		10.3.3 Difference in the Strategies Used for Solving	
		the Problem Versus the Level of Attitude	197
		10.3.4 Difference in the Evaluation after Solving	
		the Problem Versus the Level of Attitude	198
	10.4	Discussion and Conclusion	198
	Appe	ndix	200
	Refer	ences.	201
11	Cl	The Dallace The Constant Dense Minet	
11	Chan	iging Beners: The Case of First-Person vicarious	202
	Expe	riences	203
	Anne	Reverse General Mulz, Cristian Reyes, and Peter Liljedani	202
	11.1	Some Context.	203
		11.1.1 A New Mandale	204
		11.1.2 The Response	204
	11.2		205
	11.2	Bellers	205
		11.2.1 Changes in Bener.	200
	11.2	11.2.2 Models of Change in Belief and Change in Practice	207
	11.5	11.2.1 Desticionente	208
	11.4	Charges in Deliefe	209
	11.4	Unanges in Belleis	210
		in Mathematics Classes and	210
		11.4.2 Change in Teachang' Deliafe Albert Law Derfamine	210
		11.4.2 Change in Teachers Beners About Low-Performing	212
		11.4.2 Change in Methor's Delief of Her Child's Autonomy	212
	115	11.4.5 Change In Momer's Dener of Her Child's Autonomy	215
	II.J Defer		213
	Refer	ences	210
12	Exan	nining Sources of Self-Efficacy in Whole-Class	
	Prob	lem Solving	219
	Anne	tte Rouleau, Natalia Ruiz, Cristián Reyes, and Peter Liljedahl	
	12.1	Introducing Cristina	219
	12.2	Opening the Loop: The Social Cognitive Theory	
		of Self-Efficacy	220
		12.2.1 The Role of Self-Efficacy	220
		12.2.2 Sources of Self-Efficacy	221

		12.2.3	Self-Efficacy and Students with Special Education	
			Needs	222
		12.2.4	Self-Efficacy and School Mathematics	223
	12.3	Examir	ning the Loop: Context and Method of the Study	224
		12.3.1	ARPA (Activando la Resolución de Problemas	
			en las Aulas/Activating Problem Solving	
			in Classrooms)	224
		12.3.2	Nonroutine Problems and Random Groups	225
		12.3.3	Cristina's Classroom	226
		12.3.4	Nature of the Data	226
		12.3.5	Method	227
	12.4	Interru	pting the Loop: Examining Cristina's Improved	
		Self-Ef	ficacy	228
		12.4.1	Mastery Experiences	228
		12.4.2	Vicarious Experiences	230
		12.4.3	Social Persuasion	231
		12.4.4	Emotional/Physiological Reactions	233
	12.5	Strengt	thening the Loop: Emergent Theme	235
		12.5.1	Mastery Experiences: Individual Versus Public	235
		12.5.2	Social Persuasion: Individual Versus Public	236
		12.5.3	Implications of Individual Versus Public Sources	
		121010	of Self-Efficacy	236
	12.6	Conclu	sion	237
	Refer	ences.		238
13	Using	g Cultur	ally Embedded Problem-Solving Tasks to	
	Prom	iote Equ	ity Within Mathematical Inquiry Communities	241
	Robe	rta Hunte	er and Jodie Hunter	
	13.1	Introdu	iction	242
	13.2	The Ef	fects of Cultural and Ethnic Heterogeneity of Schools	242
	13.3	Taking	a Strength-Based Approach	244
	13.4	Comple	ex and Challenging Problem-Solving Tasks	246
	13.5	Contex	tual Tasks	246
	13.6	Mather	matical Practices	251
	13.7	Conclu	sion	255
	Refer	ences	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	255
Dor	4 TN/	On the l	Pole of Teachars in Problem Solving Classrooms	
1 a1	111	On the l	Role of Teacher's in Troblem-Solving Classicoonis	
14	Do N	ot Interi	rupt Students' Work: How Teacher Interactions	261
	Serai	o Celia 4	Carlos Ouiroz and Valentina Toro Vidal	201
	1/ 1	Introdu		262
	14.1	Concer	tull Framework	202
	14.2	Study	Mathada	204
	14.3		Deuticinents and the Ducfassional Davalancest	200
		14.3.1	Farucipants and the Professional Development	∠00

		14.3.2 Interactions Among Students and Between	
		Teachers and Student Groups	267
		14.3.3 Data Collection and Data Analysis.	267
	14.4	Results	271
	14.5	Discussion and Conclusion	273
	Anne	x 14.1: Examples of Problems	275
	Refer	ences	276
15	Teacl	her Guidance in Mathematical Problem-Solving Lessons:	
	Insig	hts from Two Professional Development Programs	279
	Mark	us Hähkiöniemi and John Francisco	
	15.1	Introduction	280
	15.2	Problem-Solving Lessons	281
	15.3	Promoting Student Mathematical Thinking	282
	15.4	Research Context	283
		15.4.1 IML Project	283
		15.4.2 IBMT Project	284
		15.4.3 Data Analysis	285
	15.5	Findings	285
		15.5.1 Focusing Students' Thinking	286
		15.5.2 Emphasizing Justification.	291
	15.6	Discussion	294
	Refer	rences	295
16	Math	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing	
16	Math Prob	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing lem-Solving Classroom Tasks	297
16	Math Prob José (	ematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing lem-Solving Classroom Tasks	297
16	Math Prob José ( and M	<b>nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing</b> <b>lem-Solving Classroom Tasks</b> Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras, <i>I</i> iguel Á. Montes	297
16	Math Prob José ( and N 16.1	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         Aiguel Á. Montes         Introduction	297 298
16	Math Prob José ( and N 16.1 16.2	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managinglem-Solving Classroom TasksCarrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,Aiguel Á. MontesIntroductionTeacher Knowledge and Professional Practice	297 298 299
16	Math Prob José ( and N 16.1 16.2 16.3	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managinglem-Solving Classroom TasksCarrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,/liguel Á. MontesIntroductionTeacher Knowledge and Professional PracticeCase Study Analysis	297 298 299 303
16	Math Prob José ( and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managinglem-Solving Classroom TasksCarrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,/liguel Á. MontesIntroductionTeacher Knowledge and Professional PracticeCase Study AnalysisFinal Reflections	297 298 299 303 313
16	Math Prob José C and M 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis         Final Reflections         rences	297 298 299 303 313 315
16	Math Prob José ( and M 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer	hematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         Aiguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis         Final Reflections         rences	297 298 299 303 313 315
<b>16</b>	Math Prob José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer Teacl Colle	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         Aiguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis         Final Reflections         rences         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms	297 298 299 303 313 315 317
<b>16</b> <b>17</b>	Math Prob José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer Teacl Colle	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences.         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullab, and Vilma Mesa	<ul> <li>297</li> <li>298</li> <li>299</li> <li>303</li> <li>313</li> <li>315</li> <li>317</li> </ul>
16 17	Math Probi José C and M 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teach Colle</b> Ange	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         Aiguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences.         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction	<ul> <li>297</li> <li>298</li> <li>299</li> <li>303</li> <li>313</li> <li>315</li> <li>317</li> <li>317</li> </ul>
16 17	Math Prob José C and M 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teacl</b> Colle Ange 17.1 17.2	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis         Final Reflections         rences         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Ouestioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms	<ul> <li>297</li> <li>298</li> <li>299</li> <li>303</li> <li>313</li> <li>315</li> <li>317</li> <li>317</li> <li>319</li> </ul>
<ul><li>16</li><li>17</li></ul>	Math Prob José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teacl</b> Colle Ange 17.1 17.2 17.3	mematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis         Final Reflections         rences         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         ge Algebra Classrooms         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Questioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms         Theoretical Underpinnings	297 298 299 303 313 315 317 317 317 319 321
16	Math Probi José C and M 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teach</b> Colle Ange 17.1 17.2 17.3 17.4	hematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         hem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         Aiguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences.         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Questioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms         Theoretical Underpinnings.	297 298 299 303 313 315 317 317 317 319 321 322
16	Math Prob José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teacl Colle</b> Ange 17.1 17.2 17.3 17.4 17.5	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences.         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Questioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms         Theoretical Underpinnings.         Methods         Findings	297 298 299 303 313 315 317 317 317 317 321 322 325
16	Math Prob José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teacl Colle</b> Ange 17.1 17.2 17.3 17.4 17.5	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences.         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Questioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms         Theoretical Underpinnings.         Methods         Findings         17.5.1	297 298 299 303 313 315 317 317 317 319 321 322 325 325
16	Math Prob José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teacl</b> Colle Ange 17.1 17.2 17.3 17.4 17.5	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         Aiguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences.         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         ge Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Questioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms         Theoretical Underpinnings.         Methods         Findings         17.5.1       Problem 1: Rate of Work         17.5.2       Problem 2: Average Cost	297 298 299 303 313 315 317 317 317 317 321 322 325 325 329
16	Math Prob José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teacl</b> Colle Ange 17.1 17.2 17.3 17.4 17.5	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences.         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         ge Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Questioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms         Theoretical Underpinnings.         Methods         Findings         17.5.1       Problem 1: Rate of Work         17.5.2       Problem 2: Average Cost         Discussion	297 298 299 303 313 315 317 317 317 317 321 322 325 325 325 329 331
16	Math Probi José C and N 16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 Refer <b>Teacl</b> Colle Ange 17.1 17.2 17.3 17.4 17.5	nematics Teachers' Specialised Knowledge in Managing         lem-Solving Classroom Tasks         Carrillo, Nuria Climent, Luis C. Contreras,         /liguel Á. Montes         Introduction         Teacher Knowledge and Professional Practice         Case Study Analysis.         Final Reflections         rences         her Questioning in Problem Solving in Community         rege Algebra Classrooms.         liki Mali, Saba Gerami, Amin Ullah, and Vilma Mesa         Introduction         Questioning in Postsecondary Mathematics Classrooms         Theoretical Underpinnings.         Methods         Findings         17.5.1       Problem 1: Rate of Work         17.5.2       Problem 2: Average Cost         Discussion       Conclusion	297 298 299 303 313 315 317 317 317 317 317 321 322 325 325 329 331 333

18	Chao of Pr	s, Control, and Need: Success and Sustainability	330
	Lisal	Darragh and Darinka Radovic	557
	18 1	Introduction	340
	18.2	Background	341
	10.2	18.2.1 Chilean Context	341
		18.2.1 Childan Context	3/2
		18.2.2 PD and (Identity) Change	342
	183	Methods	344
	10.5	18.3.1 Data Collection	3//
		18.3.2 Analysis of Data	3/15
	18/	Results	345
	10.4	18.4.1 Stories of Constraint	340
		18.4.1 Stories of Constraint	240
		18.4.2 A Story of Change	251
	105	DD and Changes in Identity as a Tasahar (of Mathematics)	251
	10.3 Defen	PD and Change in Identity as a reacher (or Mathematics)	222
	Refer	ences	330
19	Teach	ners' Mathematical Tensions Surfacing During the First	
	Sessi	on of a Problem-Solving Professional Development	
	Work	ishop	359
	Josefa	a Perdomo-Díaz, Patricio Felmer, and Cristóbal Rojas	
	19.1	Introduction	359
	19.2	Conceptual Framework	362
	19.3	Methodology	364
	19.4	Mathematical Tensions Analysis	365
		19.4.1 Developing Abilities Versus Learning	
		About Abilities	366
		19.4.2 Problems for Teachers Versus Problems	
		for Students	366
		19.4.3 Challenging Problems Versus Exercises	
		and Word Problems	367
		19.4.4 I Am Not Able Versus I Should Be Able	369
		19.4.5 Mathematical Ideas Versus Mathematical	
		Formulism	371
	19.5	Discussion and Conclusions	372
	Appe	ndix: Selected Problems	375
	Refer	ences	377
20	Stere	otypes and the Education of In-Service Mathematics	
	Teach	hers in Urban Schools.	379
	Luz V	/aloves-Chávez	
	20.1	Introduction	379
	20.2	Professional Development for Teachers to Teach	
		Mathematics in Urban Schools	382

Contents
----------

20.3	Reflective Practice as a Learning Experience to Confront	
	Stereotypes in Urban School Settings	384
20.4	The Study	385
	20.4.1 High Hills School	387
	20.4.2 Francisco and Juana	388
	20.4.3 Becoming a Reflective Mathematics Teacher:	
	A Learning Experience to Challenge and Confront	
	Mathematics Teachers' Representations	
	of Low-Income Students 3	389
	20.4.4 Data Collection and Analysis 3	392
20.5	Results	393
	20.5.1 Moving Forward Enhancing Juana's Mathematics	
	Participation and Learning 3	393
	20.5.2 And Stepping Backward to Deficit Views	
	and Traditional Mathematics Instruction	395
20.6	Discussion 3	<del>96</del>
Refer	ences	\$97
Correctio	to: Problem Solving in Mathematics Instruction	
and Teach	er Professional Development	<b>C</b> 1
Index	4	101

The original version of this book was revised. The correction is available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29215-7\_21

# Part I Theoretical and Practical Perspectives on Problem Solving in Mathematics Instruction

# Chapter 1 Reforming School Mathematics: Two Levels of Structure



**Peter Taylor** 

**Abstract** Many articles and papers over the past 100 years have suggested that mathematics education has lost its way in a number of critical respects. One indication of this is certainly the hugely destructive debate between discovery and drill, a consequence of which is an emphasis, throughout the school curriculum, on technical routines.

For me, mathematics is the abstract study of structure. The structures that mathematicians choose to work with have sophistication and beauty, and it is remarkable that these same structures arise in art, in nature, and in the physical and even social sciences. So often, it is by following the beauty that we are led to the truth, and mathematics is a powerful showcase for this delightful principle. But in spite of a century-long call that school math attend to this vital aspect of mathematics, an emphasis on structure and beauty, for example, in the choice of material, is notably absent from realized curricula.

My view is that such a curriculum change cannot happen without a change in the very structure of the curriculum. Quite simply, we must put aside our technical wish list and select for our students activities and problems that give them a true mathematical experience, and then build the curriculum from there. Thus this article is about structure at two different levels: The first is the structural richness of the mathematical activities I want to see in the classroom, and the second is a new structure for the curriculum itself.

**Keywords** Secondary school · Curriculum · History · Projects · Papert · Whitehead · Dewey

P. Taylor  $(\boxtimes)$ 

The original version of this chapter was revised. The correction to this chapter is available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29215-7\_21

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada e-mail: peter.taylor@queensu.ca

<sup>©</sup> Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019

P. Felmer et al. (eds.), *Problem Solving in Mathematics Instruction and Teacher Professional Development*, Research in Mathematics Education, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29215-7\_1

### **1.1 Some Brief Historical Comments**

It has been 100 years since the end of the First Great War. The history of secondary school math education reform during that century has been a tangled tale, and I will begin with a summary of some of the main episodes. In this, I will be following two articles, one by Jeremy Kilpatrick (1997) and another by Kate Raymond (2018). The tangled nature of the tale comes from the fact that there were always two forces at work, one narrow and the other wide, but at different times and in different movements, these forces locked horns along different axes. Along one such axis, the narrow view focused on the preparation of students for college and university and ultimately for their participation in technology and the STEM disciplines, while the wider view emphasized the more general humanistic development of informed citizens for a full rich life. Along another axis, the narrow view tended to focus on procedural fluency (back to basics), and the wider on creativity, discovery, and conceptual understanding. As a general rule, as we will see that the wider view tended to have less effect on classroom practice than the narrow view. That's not surprising-narrow, more focused objectives tend to be easier to grasp and implement.

In general, both views make good sense to me, and one would think they could happily coexist. Indeed, the oscillations that appear in the historical record often seem to me to be overreactions to positions that were not as far apart as many seem to have thought. Indeed my, perhaps idealistic, objective in this article is to outline a curriculum structure, one that was long ago elegantly articulated in the philosophical record, which would support both of these viewpoints and be true to the nature of the subject.

Following the first war, there was definitely a flowering of a wide view of "math education for all." Philosophically this can be seen in the writings of both Whitehead and Dewey (and more on this later), but as both Kilpatrick (1997) and Raymond (2018) observe, it was also explicit in the 1923 report of the MAA National Committee on Mathematical Requirements (1923). The report argued that

...the practical aims of school mathematics should be secondary to the mental training and development of skills necessary to the discipline of mathematics and the development of an appreciation for the beauty, power, and logic in mathematics and geometric objects. By focusing on these aims, scholars hoped to avoid school mathematics becoming "a collection of isolated and unrelated details" and instead make mathematics more appealing to a broader range of students. (cited by Raymond, 2018 p. 3.)

Raymond goes on to suggest that these ideas appear to have had little effect on classroom practice. The technological growth emerging from the Second Great War, along with the 1957 "Sputnik" wake-up call, promoted along one axis a narrowing emphasis on student preparedness for future scientific and engineering challenges and along another axis, a widening view of the nature of mathematics, away from procedural fluency toward conceptual understanding (Raymond, 2018 p. 4). A dominant idea was that to succeed, students would need a "proper" treatment of mathematics, often interpreted to mean pure math and abstract structures, and this became known as the "new math."

Of course, there was swift reaction, and Morris Kline's, 1973 book *Why Johnny Can't Add: The Failure of the New Math* became in many ways the face of the reaction. Kilpatrick (1997 p. 956) notes that "Kline ended the book by arguing that the appropriate direction for any reform 'should be diametrically opposite to that taken by the new mathematics' (1973, p. 144), toward mathematics as an integral part of a liberal education, with connections to culture, history, science, and other subjects." But that component of Kline's message did not catch on, and the "back-to-basics" reaction to the new math won the day. Both Kilpatrick (1997 p. 956–957) and Raymond (2018 page 5) argue that the new math movement was far more diverse than is commonly realized and was never properly tested.

In the 1980s, the reform movement returned but this time under the formidable banner of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) *Standards* (1989) which advocated "mathematics for all'—the intention of which was to empower all students with the skills and abilities that would enable them to be active, engaged, and critical members of democratic society. After decades of narrowing the focus of school mathematics to prepare students for technological careers, these documents were the first to push back against the limited view of school mathematics and insist on a broader conceptualization (Raymond, 2018, p. 6).

Of course, there was again strong reaction, strong enough that the term "math wars" was used. The main target of the reaction was the "discovery" approach to learning which, at the elementary level, diverted students from the important task of learning multiplication tables and adding fractions and at the secondary level, with its use of heuristics and diagrams, prepared students badly for a rigorous course in university calculus. Indeed, the debate had an echo at the university level in the reform calculus movement, which in itself has had a huge effect on first-year university calculus courses today. In the early 1980s, there was a suggestion that the coming world of computer technology might be better served by a course in discrete math or linear algebra rather than calculus and, led by Andy Gleason and others, there was a response to make calculus more relevant and mainstream. That movement was successful in that calculus remains today the default (and often required) first-year university math course. Interestingly enough, in a somewhat altered form, the idea, that calculus might not be the best default course, is now coming back, though in altered form, one that features areas of math and stats that are closer to data analysis.

A central figure in the traditionalist camp was H. Wu of Stanford University. To get a sense of the state of the argument at the close of the twentieth century, it is interesting to look at a pair of papers of Kilpatrick (1997) and Wu (1997) which appeared side by side in the *American Math Monthly*, and in fact the last part of Kilpatrick's remarks focused on the Wu paper. Wu makes a number of interesting points—interesting in that they are well worth discussing. He does accept the appropriateness of reform calculus for the typical science and engineering student but fears that it will not well serve the student who is destined for serious university mathematics. Such students "need rigorous mathematical training, and would not be satisfied with a steady diet of persuasive heuristics, graphic displays, and nothing else" (Wu, 1997 p. 947). I go most of the way with this but would phrase it differ-

ently. Students who are destined to study serious mathematics need to be able to make rigorous arguments, but I believe that the opportunity to understand and practice these can be given to them in a course that features persuasive heuristics and graphic displays.

### **1.2 My Own Half-Century**

For the past 50 years, I have been constructing "discovery" problems for high school students. But over that period, there have been a few ways in which my work has changed. At the beginning, I regarded these problems as "after-school" enrichment for motivated students. That possibility still exists, but, for me, the main stage is now the regular classroom. That objective requires tasks that provide a low mathematical floor (requiring minimal prerequisite knowledge) and a high mathematical ceiling (offering opportunities to explore more complex concepts and relationships and more varied representations) (Gadanidis, Borba, Hughes, & Lacerda, 2016 p. 236, Boaler, 2016 p. 115). As I pursue that objective, I find to my surprise that many high-ceiling problems, such as those found in university mathematics, can be engineered to have an invitingly low floor and can work beautifully in high school.

Over the past few years, I have made a deliberate effort to tie my problems to the mandated curriculum, and this has affected my choice of subject matter. For example, for the first few decades, I chose problems that were fun, enticing, and mysterious and worked with areas such as geometry, probability, combinatorics, logic, games, and puzzles. But in Ontario, fully half of the entire high school math curriculum works with properties of functions, and while I believe that this is unbalanced, my basket of activities has moved somewhat in the direction of functions. But here's an interesting anecdote. In my third-year undergraduate course for future math teachers, I take my problems/activities from a balanced set of areas including the analysis of functions. Toward the end of the course, I have group projects, and students can choose the problems they want to work with. In 20 years with that course, no student has ever chosen to work with functions. What that tells me is that their own school experience with functions has hardly ever engaged them in play, in design and construction, or in mathematical thinking.

I have always had an eye on the preparation of our secondary school students for university, but only recently has that become my main focus. I watch carefully to see what my first-year university students struggle with. That can be hard to perceive, but my feeling is that their struggles seem to be more connected with the focus and clarity of their thinking rather than the execution of what are called "the basics." A related aspect of these struggles is their handling of problems with a complex structure. Complexity can be contrived, and I find that to be often the case in problems that the students are given, but there are also complexities that are organic to the structure of the problem. These are more important, in part because they arise naturally and are thereby closely related to structural complexities that the students will encounter in their own future lives, both professional and personal. In university, students frequently encounter structures with this level of sophistication, but I find almost no problems of this kind in high school mathematics.

What do I do with my ever-growing collection of problems? I show them to the teachers that I know or might meet and ask if they want to use them, or if they would invite me into their classroom to try them out, or better still, let me come and watch while *they* work with them. I do get offers, but the teachers that I talk with are often wary. There could be many reasons for that, but the one typically stated is that they are running short of time. They have after all a curriculum to cover, and it can easily require the full 110 hours that the Ministry allocates. Of course, my "wonderful" problems are designed to *be* the curriculum, such that nothing else is needed. If the students can do those, they will surely be ready for my first-year calculus and linear algebra courses. But I can't yet promise that because the problems are a long way from being organized into a complete, coherent, well-supported package. So I certainly understand the teachers' hesitation and am grateful to those wonderful colleagues who have been happy to work with me.

But this brings up the question of the nature and the structure of the curriculum. Certainly the curriculum of problems has quite a different structure from the one we currently find in school mathematics. Is it apt to work? Is there anything to be said for such a curriculum? In fact, the ideas of some of the greatest thinkers of the past 100 years interact well with this question of curriculum structure. I have three of these in mind: Alfred North Whitehead, John Dewey, and Seymour Papert. Having mentioned these, a reviewer suggested I look at C. S. Peirce (1939–1914), an American philosopher and scientist, who is said to have influenced Dewey. Indeed, he held many of Dewey's views on the nature and centrality of experience in education (Strand, 2011) and the pedagogical significance of surprise (Gadanidis et al., 2016) (Fig. 1.1).



Alfred North Whitehead 1861 - 1947

John Dewey 1859 - 1952

Seymour Papert 1928 - 2016

Fig. 1.1 My three intellectual heroes

# **1.3** The Search for a Curriculum Structure

Whitehead's power and beauty of ideas and Dewey's experience of the artist both emphasize the richness of the learning experience and the importance of the training of the mind. I have argued (Taylor, 2018) that the writings of both these philosophers have a lot to offer us today. Raymond (2018) agrees with this but suggests that these ideas might have had little effect on classroom practice.

I start with Whitehead. His *Rhythm of Education* (1929, Chap. 2) effectively provides a structure for the curricula of all disciplines. Here he identifies three stages of learning: Romance, Precision, and Generalization. To some extent, our learning proceeds through these three stages in order, such that, roughly speaking, the child is dominated by Romance, the youth by Precision, and the adult by Generalization. In practice, however, the stages cycle continuously like eddies in the fast-flowing stream of life (and indeed at different times, we can all be children or adults).

The first stage, of Romance, is one of ferment, novelty, and mystery, of hidden possibilities and barely justifiable leaps. This stage, in its fullness, motivates the second stage, of Precision, in which we strive for comprehension and mastery—ideas must be tamed and organized, requiring care, honesty, and restraint. Finally, the third stage, of Generalization, is essentially a return to Romance, but now with the technique acquired at stage two. Our ideas have new power because we have harnessed them. The great fruit of this ultimate stage of learning is wisdom: the capacity to handle knowledge. The central point that Whitehead makes is that the discipline of stage two must not be imposed until the fullness of stage one has properly prepared the student. Failing that, the knowledge that is obtained will be inert and ineffective.

This "rhythm" sets a structure for the entire 12 years of schooling, one which will hopefully sustain us for the remaining years of our learning. For each particular course and indeed for each learning hour, it provides a ritual that we too often fail to observe. I find that it makes a great difference if, when planning a lecture, I remind myself of the precedence of Romance. Certainly, Whitehead's rhythm lays to rest that ridiculous conflict between discovery and basics; the first most often provides the Romance, the second the Precision.

Moving on to John Dewey, his search for a structure is encapsulated in the title "The Need of a Theory of Experience" of Chap. 2 of his 1938 essay *Experience & Education*:

I assume that amid all uncertainties there is one permanent frame of reference: namely, the organic connection between education and personal experience." (1938, page 8)

That "frame of reference" is what defines the structure of Dewey's encounter with education. He had of course already, in 1934, developed that theory in the powerful context of the aesthetic. There, his attention was on the audience much more than on the performer, particularly in his insistence that the heart of the aesthetic experience is found in the response of the viewer.

#### 1 Reforming School Mathematics: Two Levels of Structure

The word "aesthetic" refers, as we have already noted, to experience as appreciative, perceiving and enjoying. It denotes the consumer's rather than the producer's standpoint. It is Gusto, taste; and, as with cooking, overt skillful action is on the side of the cook who prepares, while taste is on the side of the consumer, as in gardening there is a distinction between the gardener who plants and tills and the householder who enjoys the finished product. (Dewey, 1934, p. 37)

In fact, too much emphasis on the "finished product" can detract from the experience. The opening paragraph of *Art as Experience* emphasizes this:

In common conception, the work of art is often identified with the building, book, painting, or statue in its existence apart from human experience. Since the actual work of art is what the product does with and in experience, the result is not favorable to understanding. In addition, the very perfection of some of these products, the prestige they possess because of a long history of unquestioned admiration, creates conventions that get in the way of fresh insight. When an art product once attains classic status, it somehow becomes isolated from the human conditions under which it was brought into being and from the human consequences it engenders in actual life-experience. (Dewey, 1934, p. 1)

Some time ago it was not uncommon to hear teachers proudly proclaim: "I don't teach math; I teach students." I thought at the time that this was a bit silly because of course, we do both. But I'm guessing that the purpose of the phrase was effectively to reinforce Dewey's important insight.

This then brings us to what Dewey calls the central problem of an education based upon experience: "to select the kind of present experiences that can live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences" (Dewey, 1938, p. 9).

The conclusions he draws from that are, on the whole, well understood today, for example, that meaning comes only from the present experience of the student, and that subject matter earned in isolation, put, as it were, in a watertight compartment to be opened only at the time of the exam contributes nothing to the student's future life. But although these conclusions are well understood, they are widely ignored. When I am working in a high school classroom, I put the students in groups either at tables or (preferably) standing at white- or blackboards, and I evaluate the quality of the problem in part on signs of an engaging and even intense experience.

Finally, I add one more layer to this search for the right structure, and that emerges from Seymour Papert's idea of a project as a significant activity that provides meaning to the student's life.

The important difference between the work of a child in an elementary mathematics class and that of a mathematician is not in the subject matter (old fashioned numbers versus groups or categories or whatever) but in the fact that the mathematician is creatively engaged in the pursuit of a personally meaningful project. In this respect a child's work in an art class is often close to that of a grown-up artist. (Papert, 1972, p. 249)

More recently, Jo Boaler makes the same point comparing mathematics to language studies:

When we ask students what math is, they will typically give descriptions that are very different from those given by experts in the field. Students will typically say it is a subject of calculations, procedures, or rules. But when we ask mathematician what math is, they will say it is the study of patterns that is an aesthetic, creative, and beautiful subject. Why are these descriptions so different? When we ask students of English literature what the subject is, they do not give descriptions that are markedly different from what professors of English literature would say. (Boaler, 2016, p. 21–22)

In effect this is an argument by analogy that at the school level, we should be teaching the mathematics that mathematicians do (Taylor, 2018). I draw from that idea when I find myself constructing a new high school problem. If, when I am writing it up, I, as a mathematician, feel the life and energy waning, that's a signal the problem might not after all be right. On the other hand, if the excitement builds, I feel I must be on the right track.

A "project" for Papert is necessarily a sustained endeavor, and that has a number of consequences:

This *project-oriented* approach contrasts with the *problem* approach of most mathematics teaching: a bad feature of the typical problem is that the child does not stay with it long enough to benefit much from success or from failure. Along with time-scale goes structure. A project is long enough to have recognizable phases—such as planning, choosing a strategy of attempting a very simple case first, finding the simple solution, *debugging it* and so on. And if the time scale is long enough, and the structures are clear enough, the child can develop a vocabulary for articulate discussion of the process of working towards his goals. (Papert, 1972, p. 251)

The last idea of this remarkable paragraph is worth highlighting. Math students often have trouble talking about the subject they are studying; they lose the big picture, if they ever had it, and they get lost in the details. Papert suggests that a habit of sustained engagement can foster discussion at the structural level—if the structure is rich, there is more to talk about.

Barabe and Proulx (2017 p. 26) make the important point that Papert's projects emphasize *doing* more than *knowing* and thereby give the students something much more powerful than mathematical knowledge, and that is what Papert calls "mathematical ways of thinking." That's really another way of saying that we should be teaching the mathematics that mathematicians do.

For me this project structure has the power to give us a natural realization of the structures put forward by Whitehead and Dewey. When our curriculum planning is on the level of the project, we seldom need to search for Romance; it is typically already in place as an organic component of the process. In the same way, Dewey's "experience" is typically an integral part of the activity generated by the problem. I find that when I am considering whether or not a problem passes the bar of admission to my classroom, I pay early attention to the student experience (Dewey's "consumer"), looking for aspects such as surprise (Gadanidis et al., 2016), wonder (Sinclair & Watson, 2001), flow (Liljedahl, 2017), beauty (Sinclair, 2006), low floor, or high ceiling (Gadanidis et al., 2016 p. 236, Boaler, 2016 p. 115).

And of course, a project-oriented curriculum structure is much more creative, challenging, and even "humanizing" for the teacher; it can nurture her development as an artist.

Time to sum up and put things together. The more I reflect on the present reality of high school math, the more of a disaster it seems. That's strong language, but it's what comes to mind when I think of the students. Quite simply, they deserve better—they deserve the real thing. That simple truth strikes me most forcefully when I go into the classroom and work with them. For the most part, they are ready to work, and more importantly, they are ready to play.

Of course, as things stand at present, most of them feel that what they are getting in the classroom is what mathematics is; indeed, they simply don't know what they are missing. More than once, after 75 minutes in the classroom, I get the comment, "Why isn't math always like this?" I do note that back in the 1950s we did at least encounter the grandeur of the subject, as in Grade 10 we had a full-year course in Euclidean geometry.

So what *are* they missing?—the best way to answer that is to observe that mathematics is the study of structure and that high school math currently offers no identifiable structures of any sophistication. Papert's projects offer us a way toward a curriculum with genuine mathematics. But how do we get there?

There are difficulties. First of all, projects are harder to work with and often require a level of mathematical and pedagogical experience that many teachers do not yet have. And there is the question of time. The activities take time and patience, and teachers often feel that the job of building a proper technical foundation for their students already takes almost all of the available class hours. And finally, because my visit is effectively an intervention, the activities can seem disconnected and even contrived. I will discuss each of these factors.

## 1.3.1 The Technical Skills

They are important; we can't do mathematics without them. But if we assemble ahead of time all the ones we think we might need, for example, to do calculus, the basket will be too heavy and will divert us from the real goal. To work and play effectively, we need to travel light, and that requires putting that basket aside and having the simple faith that the activities we choose will be comprehensive enough to look after the student's future technical needs. Those who worry that the students might miss some critical skills should spend some time in a first-year university calculus course and find out that many of the skills that were "taught" in high school were not in fact learned in any effective way. Skills need meaningful context; the more powerful the context, the more solid the skill.

What *is* important is that students learn how to master skills. That's well understood by students who play guitar or basketball; they simply have to realize that the same principles apply to mathematics. This idea works so seamlessly in music and sports because they in fact have that powerful context. Well, mathematics has an equally powerful context to offer, but it's one that few students have ever encountered.

The other thing to notice is that universities, professional programs, and employers are increasingly emphasizing a new level of what are often called "secondary" skills, sometimes called the "C-words"—care, creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration. A project-based curriculum can often relate more naturally to these.

## 1.3.2 Teacher Preparation

Even experienced teachers find it a challenge to work with investigative activities. First of all, there are usually different ways tackle the problems, and it helps to be able to anticipate these. That takes more in the way of preparation time and, often, mathematical knowledge as well. And there are balances to be struck—between giving the students ideas and letting them find avenues on their own, between keeping the class together and giving the faster students questions on the side, and between individual work and collaboration within groups.

A project-oriented curriculum can be an enormous challenge for teacher candidates. My colleagues in Faculties of Education well realize that this is an increasingly important part of their job, but there is only so much they can do. The simple fact is that most of our learning about how to teach happens when we ourselves are being taught, and most of today's fledgling teachers have spent too little time in their own mathematics learning exploring and investigating. I will mention three phases of that experience. One of these is their school experience, and that's not surprising as that is of course exactly what we are working to change. Another is the time they spend out of school, and there is evidence that the technological and media explosion has seduced many of them away from much of that experience. The third is their undergraduate learning, and that is an experience that many of the readers of this volume have some control over. I am definitely not happy with the nature of most of the teaching in undergraduate math courses in North American universities, particularly in the "service" courses, and those are often the courses taken by future math teachers. These courses need to purvey less in the way of mathematical knowledge and put much more emphasis on inquiry and mathematical thinking. Students who might actually need considerable mathematical knowledge typically already know that this is the case and respond accordingly.

### 1.3.3 What Mathematics?

I want to briefly return to this question of the dominant place the study of functions plays in the senior school curriculum, certainly in North America. I have observed that the cause of this is almost certainly the role of calculus as the default math course in first-year university and college. Now whether that remains the case or not, my belief is that the current introductory calculus course offered in the senior school curriculum is not the right preparation. It is technical in nature and is very much oriented toward the transfer of mathematical knowledge, with little attention given to mathematical thinking. It also gives the students the misleading impression that they have already covered much of the first semester of university calculus. I would prefer a course with a theme of modeling and optimization, using many different approaches, analytical, geometric, and graphical. It would not follow the logical technical development of the subject, leaving that for university, but would still remain true to the *ideas* of calculus. The few technical pieces such as the arithmetic laws of the derivative could be quickly covered and then employed "in action," thus remaining true to Whitehead's Romance and Dewey's present experience.

I illustrate these remarks with two examples taken from my own body of work (Taylor, 2016). Example 1 is a model for the speed at which a car should be driven to minimize the cost of gas.

# 1.3.4 Example 1: Gas Consumption for Optimal Driving Speed

We need to start with a graph of gas consumption against speed, and there are some simple mainstream kinetic energy principles that lead to a simple equation for this. A senior class that has some acquaintance with Newton's Laws of Motion will enjoy the challenge of finding the algebraic form of the gas consumption graph found in Fig. 1.2a. It gives rise to some interesting questions such as why is it expected to be concave-up. For the various components of the problem, we have the choice of working with the formula we have derived and using algebra or even calculus, working with the geometric form of the graph, or of course both. I will highlight the graphical argument.

To begin we ask for the velocity that minimizes the cost of making a trip of a fixed distance. Now the vertical axis *z* has units in liters consumed per hour at any fixed speed *v*. But to use least gas over a given distance, we want to minimize liters per km (z/v), and that requires us to minimize the slope of a secant line drawn from the origin to the graph. This occurs when the secant is tangent to the graph, and the optimal speed in this case (Fig. 1.2b) is 50 km/h. This is considerably slower than we typically drive on the highway, and the reason for this of course is that we put a value on our time; to account for that, what we really need to minimize is the sum of gas cost and the effective wage we are paying ourselves. This sum is minimized with an elegant generalization of the secant construction of Fig. 1.2b. Putting the cost of 6 liters of gas as the value of an hour of our time (thus with a gas cost of \$1.50/L, this would be \$9/h), Fig. 1.2c gives us the reasonable optimal speed of 90 km/h. This is a rich, multifaceted problem that can be tuned and extended in different ways at different grade levels. It certainly earns the status of a Papert project.

# 1.3.5 Example 2: Counting Trains

Some branches of mathematics lend themselves more readily than others to investigation and what is called "mathematical thinking." In my experience projects involving discrete structures, geometry, simple probability, and strategic thinking (games) are more accessible to students and more naturally investigative than is the