

2017

Developing learning progressions to support mathematical reasoning in the middle years - algebraic reasoning

L Day

The University of Notre Dame Australia, lorraine.day@nd.edu.au

M Stephens

M Horne

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/edu_conference




Part of the Education Commons

This conference paper was originally published as:

Day, L., Stephens, M., & Horne, M. (2017). Developing learning progressions to support mathematical reasoning in the middle years - algebraic reasoning. *MERGA 40*.

This conference paper is posted on ResearchOnline@ND at https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/edu_conference/104. For more information, please contact researchonline@nd.edu.au.





40 years on: We are still learning!

Proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference of the
Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia

Edited by Ann Downton, Sharyn Livy, & Jennifer Hall



40 years on: We are still learning!
Proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference of the
Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia

Edited by Ann Downton, Sharyn Livy, & Jennifer Hall
© MERGA Inc., 2017 ISBN 978-1-920846-30-5

Published by
The Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia Inc.
GPO Box 2747
Adelaide, SA 5001 www.merga.net.au



Monash MERGA40 Local Organising Committee

Helen Forgasz (co-convener)
Ann Gervasoni (co-convener)
Jill Cheeseman
Barbara Clarke
Aylie Davidson
Ann Downton
Jennifer Hall
Sarah Hopkins
Penelope Kalogeropoulos

Gilah Leder
Sharyn Livy
Anne Roche
Carly Sawatzki
Hazel Tan
Karina Wilkie
Simone Zmood (Conference administrator)
Helen Kaminski (Event co-ordinator)

Preface

This publication is a record of the proceedings of the celebratory 40th conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia (MERGA), which, like the inaugural MERGA conference, was held at Monash University in Clayton, Melbourne. The proceedings are made available to conference delegates on a USB and are also published on the MERGA website at www.merga.edu.au.

The theme of this 40th anniversary conference was *40 years on: We are still learning!* This theme was chosen to acknowledge the significant contributions of Australasian researchers over the past 40 years, was inspired by a group of currently active researchers who attended both MERGA1 and MERGA40, and is linked to the Monash University motto, *Ancora Imparo* (We are still learning). The theme also highlights the impact and importance of our collective research for enabling new learning, innovation, and critique of mathematics education for those in our region and beyond.

MERGA40 conference participants presented research papers, symposia, round table discussions, and short communications that covered a broad range of topics relevant to mathematics education across all countries, with a particular focus on the Australasian region. The MERGA40 conference also included a series of nine workshops focused on research-related issues and 15 Research Interest Area (RIA) discussion groups aligned with chapter themes in the most recent four-yearly review of mathematics education research in Australasia (Makar et al., 2016). All workshops and RIA discussion groups were led by MERGA members who are acknowledged in the proceedings and conference program. We thank these members for their important contribution, leadership, and generosity.

In accordance with established MERGA procedures, all research papers were blind peer-reviewed by panels of mathematics education researchers with appropriate expertise in the field. Papers were accepted for presentation only, or for both presentation and publication in the conference proceedings. Only those research papers accepted for presentation and publication are published in full in these proceedings. Symposia papers and the abstracts of all short communications and round tables were also peer-reviewed. The published proceedings include the keynote papers; the Beth Southwell Practical Implications Award paper; symposia papers; abstracts for round tables, short communications, and research papers accepted for presentation; and the titles of all workshops and Research Interest Area discussion groups.

We acknowledge, with gratitude, the efforts of the MERGA40 review panel chairs, reviewers, and the Monash editorial team, in reading and providing constructive feedback to presenters in a short timeframe. Ensuring that the published papers are of a high academic quality is an important responsibility of the MERGA community. We thank the proceedings editors, Ann Downton, Sharyn Livy, and Jennifer Hall, for their hard work and care in preparing these proceedings for publication.

Ann Gervasoni and Helen Forgasz

(Co-Conveners of the MERGA40 conference on behalf of the MERGA40 Monash organising committee)

Reference

Makar, K., Dole, S., Visnovska, J., Goos, M., Bennison, A., & Fry, K. (Eds.). (2016). *Research in mathematics education in Australasia 2012–2015*. Singapore: Springer.

MERGA40 Reviewers

Janeen Anderson	Kym Fry	Joanne Mulligan
Judy Anderson*	Robyn Gandell	Carol Murphy
Glenda Anthony	Vince Geiger	Greg Oates
Catherine Attard	Merrilyn Goos	Bilinda Offen
Robin Averill*	Peter Grootenboer	Lisa O'Keeffe
Judy Bailey	Ngarewa Hawera	Christine Ormond
Caroline Bardini	Joanna Higgins	Catherine Pearn
Anne Bennison	Gregory Hine	Tim Perkins
Kim Beswick	Kai Fai Ho	Pamela Perger*
Brenda Bicknell*	Kath Holmes	Bob Perry
Susan Blackley	Siri-Malen Høynes	Robyn Pierce
Janette Bobis*	Jodi Hunter	Anne Prescott
Leicha Bragg	Roberta Hunter	Elena Prieto
Helen Brown	Robert Hunting	Maria Quigley
Paul Brown	Derek Hurrell	Iresha Ratnagroo
Ray Brown	Chris Hurst*	Peter Rawlins
Nigel Calder	Lorraine Jacob	Robyn Reaburn
Rosemary Callingham	Michael Jennings	Anna Rogers
Scott Cameron	Jyoti Jhagroo	Wee Tiong Seah*
Jeanne Carroll	Jo Knox	Yvette Semler
Michael Cavanagh	Mun Yee Lai	Pep Serow
Helen Chick	Janeen Lamb	Sashi Sharma
Sze Looi Chil	Kevin Larkin	Anne-Marie Simpson
Mohan Chinnappan	Generosa Leach	Kaye Stacey
Julie Clark	Gail Ledger	Vicki Steinle
Phil Clarkson	Chris Linsell	Duncan Symons
Megan Clune	Esther Loong	Kaye Treacy
Audrey Cooke	Karen Major	Andy Yeh
Chelsea Cutting	Katie Makar	Jenny Young-Loveridge
Lorraine Day	Margaret Marshman	Jana Visnovska
Melinda Dixon	Alasdair McAndrew	Margaret Walshaw
Michael Drake	Jane McChesney	Roger Wander
Shelley Dole	Catherine McCluskey	Jane Watson
Bruce Duncan	Heather McMaster	Wanty Widjaja
Raewyn Eden	Carmel Mesiti	Sue Wilson
Fiona Ell	Paula Mildenhall	Tiffany Winn
Trevor Feder	Jodie Miller*	Bruce White*
Jill Fielding-Wells	Judith Mills	Monica Wong
Noleine Fitzallen*	Chrissy Monteleone	Xin Zhao
Tricia Forrester	Tracey Muir	

* Review Panel Chairs

Reframing Mathematical Futures: Using Learning Progressions to Support Mathematical Thinking in the Middle Years

Dianne Siemon

RMIT University

< dianne.siemon@rmit.edu.au >

Max Stephens

The University of Melbourne

< m.stephens@unimelb.edu.au >

Rosemary Callingham

University of Tasmania

< Rosemary.Callingham@utas.edu.au >

Lorraine Day

The University of Notre Dame Australia

< Lorraine.Day@nd.edu.au >

Marj Horne

Australian Catholic University

< Marj.Horne@acu.edu.au >

Jane Watson

University of Tasmania

< Jane.Watson@utas.edu.au >

Rebecca Seah

The University of Melbourne

< rebecca.seah@rmit.edu.au >

The Australian Curriculum: Mathematics calls for the concurrent development of mathematical skills and mathematical reasoning. What are the big ideas of mathematical reasoning and is it possible to map their learning trajectories? Using rich assessment tasks designed for middle-years students of mathematics, this symposium reports on the preliminary phase of a large national study designed to move beyond the hypothetical and to provide an evidence-based foundation for learning progressions in mathematical reasoning in three key areas of the curriculum: Algebraic Reasoning, Geometrical and Spatial Reasoning, and Statistical Reasoning.

Paper 1: Dianne Siemon. *Developing Learning Progressions to Support Mathematical Reasoning in the Middle Years – Introducing the Reframing Mathematical Futures II Project*

This paper presents an overview of the project and discusses the importance of mathematical reasoning.

Paper 2: Lorraine Day, Max Stephens, & Marj Horne. *Developing Learning Progressions to Support Mathematical Reasoning in the Middle Years – Algebraic Reasoning*

The results of the initial trialling of a set of items designed to identify algebraic reasoning, and the big ideas of algebra will be discussed.

Paper 3: Marj Horne & Rebecca Seah. *Developing Learning Progressions to Support Mathematical Reasoning in the Middle Years – Geometric Reasoning*

Little recent research addresses geometrical and spatial reasoning. This paper reports on a hypothesised learning hierarchy and the results from the trial process.

Paper 4: Jane Watson & Rosemary Callingham: *Developing Learning Progressions to Support Mathematical Reasoning in the Middle Years – Statistical Reasoning*

Using an existing research base, and the outcomes from trial tests, this paper describes a learning hierarchy of statistical reasoning.

Developing Learning Progressions to Support Mathematical Reasoning in the Middle Years: Algebraic Reasoning

Lorraine Day

The University of Notre Dame Australia
<Lorraine.Day@nd.edu.au>

Max Stephens

The University of Melbourne
<m.stephens@unimelb.edu.au>

Marj Horne

RMIT University
<marj.horne@rmit.edu.au>

As part of the Reframing Mathematical Futures II Project on Mathematical Reasoning, algebraic reasoning was identified as one of the three areas to be investigated. This involved developing a hypothetical learning progression for algebra to inform the design of assessment tasks to test the progression. The assessment forms were then sent to trial schools and the data was analysed using Rasch Analysis. This paper reports on the analysis of the preliminary data received and outlines some implications for teaching.

The Australian Curriculum: Mathematics (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2016) has combined Number and Algebra in a single strand to allow both to be developed together. Developing both numerical and algebraic reasoning together provides students with the opportunity to notice structure and powerful schemes for thinking about number patterns and relationships (Carpenter, Franke, & Levi, 2003). This implies that classroom practices need to adapt to build a more robust understanding of mathematics as a process of generalisation and formalisation, or as Kaput (1998) expressed it, ‘algebrafying’ the process. This transformation could be viewed as moving classroom practice from one of following rules and memorisation to one of sense-making (Flewelling, Kepner, & Ewing, 2007; Schoenfeld, 2008).

In order to identify a hypothetical learning progression for algebraic reasoning a review of the literature was conducted to identify the big ideas of algebra. Although the focus was to be on algebraic reasoning, it was considered appropriate to identify algebraic content, as students, at different levels, need content about which to reason. Underpinning this content focus was the understanding that in order to reason algebraically at the highest level involves visualisation, being able to move fluidly between multiple representations and having the language and discourse to reason mathematically.

Initially, hypothetical learning progressions were developed for five big ideas in algebra identified as: Pattern and Sequence, Generalisation, Function, Equivalence, and Equation Solving (Blanton, & Kaput, 2011; Blanton et al., 2015; Carraher, Schliemann, Brizuela, & Earnest, 2006; Fujii & Stephens, 2001; Mason, Stephens, & Watson, 2009; Panorkou, Maloney, & Confrey, 2013; Perso, 2003; Stephens & Armanto, 2010; Watson, 2009). However, as there was considerable overlap in the descriptors at this stage, it was decided to re-organise these in terms of: Pattern and Function, Equivalence, and Generalisation. An example of the hypothetical learning progression developed for Generalisation is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

The Hypothetical Learning Progression for Generalisation

Zone	Descriptor
1	Explain a generalisation of a simple physical situation.

- 2 Explore and conjecture about patterns in the structure of number, identifying numbers that change and numbers that can vary.
- 3 Explain generalisations by telling stories in words, with materials and using symbols.
- 4 Explain generalisations using symbols and explore relationships using technology.
- 5 Follow, compare and explain rules for linking successive terms in a sequence or pair quantities using one or two operations.
- 6 Use and interpret basic algebraic conventions for representing situations involving a variable quantity.
- 7 Use and interpret algebraic conventions for representing generality and relationships between variables and establish equivalence using the distributive property and inverses of addition and multiplication.
- 8 Combine facility with symbolic representation and understanding of algebraic concepts to represent and explain mathematical situations.

Once the hypothetical learning progressions were identified on the basis of prior research, assessment tasks containing one or more items were compiled into forms that were designed to evaluate the three big ideas across Zones. Some tasks/items addressed a particular big idea while others assessed several of the big ideas in a single task. For instance, the seven-item Relational Thinking task was designed to evaluate key aspects of the hypothetical learning progressions for the two big ideas of Equivalence and Generalisation (see Table 2).

Table 2
The Relational Thinking Items and Rubrics

Item No.	Item	Rubric
1	What numbers would replace the ? to make a true number sentence (the numbers may be different). Explain your reasoning $? + 521 = 527 + ?$	0 No response or irrelevant response
		1 Incorrect response but with correct reasoning based on the relationship between 521 and 527
		2 Two correct numbers given but little/no reasoning
		3 Two correct numbers given where the number on the left is 6 more than the number on the right with reasoning that reflects relationship between 521 and 527
2	Find a different pair of numbers that would make the number sentence above true	0 No response or irrelevant response
		1 A different and correct pair
3	Describe how you could find all possible pairs of numbers that would make this a true sentence.	0 No response or irrelevant response
		1 Incorrect attempt at describing based on previous answers
		2 Statement regarding difference of 6 or expression showing difference
4	What numbers would replace the ? to make a true number sentence (the numbers may be different)? $? - 521 = ? - 527$	0 No response or irrelevant response
		1 Incorrect response but with correct reasoning based on the relationship between 521 and 527
		2 Two correct numbers given but little/no reasoning, may include some calculations
		3 Two correct numbers given where the number on the right is 6 more than the number on the left, with reasoning that

			reflects the relationship between 521 and 527
5	Find another set of numbers that would make the number sentence in 4 true.	0 1	No response or irrelevant response A different and correct pair
6	Describe how you could find all possible pairs of numbers that would make this a true number sentence	0 1 2	No response or irrelevant response Incorrect attempt at describing based on previous answers Statement regarding difference of 6 or expression showing the difference
7	What can you say about the relationship between c and d in this equation? $c \times 2 = d \times 14$	0	No response or irrelevant response Specific solution provided ($c = 7$ and $d = 1$) or a general statement (c is 7 times the number d) Statement correctly describes the relationship (c is 7 times the number d)

Results

Rasch analysis was used to rank student responses to the algebraic reasoning tasks and create a Draft Learning Progression for Algebra. From this it was possible to identify where different student responses to each of the Relational Thinking items were located on the progression. For instance, a score of 2 on RT1 (indicated by RT1.2 in Table 3 below) was located in Zone 3 while a score of 3 on RT1 (RT1.3) was located in Zone 6. Table 2 shows a range of responses to the RT items and their relationship to the big ideas of Equivalence (Equiv) or Generalisation (Gen).

Table 3
Results of Rasch Analysis on the Relational Thinking Items

RT1.2	RT1.3	RT2.1	RT3.1	RT3.2	RT4.2	RT4.3	RT5.1	RT6.2	RT7.1	RT7.2
Zone 3	Zone 6	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 5	Zone 7	Zone 5	Zone 7	Zone 4	Zone 6
Equiv	Gen	Equiv	Equiv	Gen	Equiv	Gen	Equiv	Gen	Equiv	Gen

The different student responses indicated by the scores for each item in Table 2 range from Zone 3 to Zone 7. Those that relate to Equivalence range from Zone 3 to Zone 5. Finding a correct pair of numbers to make a correct number sentence (RT1.2) was the easiest at Zone 3. Finding another correct pair of numbers to the same question (RT2.1) was at Zone 4. Whereas, finding two correct pairs of numbers that satisfied the subtraction number sentence (RT4.4) was scaled higher at Zone 5. Components that required students to give a general explanation of a relationship were scaled at Zone 6 or Zone 7. Generalisation items were typically more difficult than Equivalence items; and among Generalisation items, as Table 2 shows, explanations involving subtraction or difference tended to be more difficult than those involving addition relationships. This confirms research findings by Stephens and Armanto (2010), Mason et al. (2009), and Carpenter et al. (2003).

In most cases incorrect responses to items in the Relational Thinking task were located in the lower Zones of the progression. For example, giving an incorrect response to the missing numbers in item 1 was scaled at Zone 1. However, an incorrect attempt at describing the relationship between the two missing numbers based on previous answers for item 2 was at Zone 4; and an incorrect attempt at describing the relationship based on

previous answers for item 6 was scaled at Zone 5. These latter two results which embody incorrect or incomplete generalisations show that, for our upper primary and junior secondary students, generalisation and explanation of algebraic thinking remains quite difficult. As the research of Kaput et al. (1998), Carraher et al. (1996), and Blanton et al. (2015) demonstrated, helping students to articulate and refine their algebraic thinking, especially their algebraic reasoning and justification, are complex and challenging tasks even for capable teachers. These abilities require constant and supportive cultivation if they are to be achieved by most students. The preliminary data presented above show that they have been achieved by some students. Expanding the range of achievement, especially with respect to the development of reasoning, remains our challenge as this project moves into its next phase.

References

- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2016). *Australian curriculum: Mathematics*. Retrieved from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/mathematics/curriculum/f-10?layout=1>
- Blanton, M., & Kaput, J. (2011). Functional thinking as a route into algebra in the elementary grades. In J. Cai & E. Knuth (Eds.), *Early algebraization: Advances in mathematics education* (pp. 5-23). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Blanton, M., Stephens, A., Knuth, E., Gardiner, A.M., Isler, I., & Kim, J. (2015). The development of children's algebraic thinking: The impact of a comprehensive early algebra intervention in third grade. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 46(1), 39-87.
- Carpenter, T., Franke, M., & Levi, L. (2003). *Thinking mathematically: Integrating arithmetic and algebra in the elementary school*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Carraher, D., Schliemann, A., Brizuela, B., & Earnest, D. (2006). Arithmetic and algebra in early mathematics education. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 37(2), 87-115.
- Flewelling, G., Kepner, H., & Ewing, B. (2007). *Rich learning tasks*. Paper presented at the Mathematics Education into the 21st Century Project Conference, Charlotte, NC.
- Fujii, T., & Stephens, M. (2001). Fostering an understanding of algebraic generalisation through numerical expressions. In H. Chick, K. Stacey, J. Vincent, & J. Vincent (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th conference of the International Commission on Mathematics Instruction* (Vol. 1, pp. 258-264). Melbourne: ICMI.
- Kaput, J. (1998). Transforming algebra from an engine of inequality to an engine of mathematical power by "algebrafying" the K-12 curriculum. In S. Fennell (Ed.), *The nature and role of algebra in the K-14 curriculum: Proceedings of a national symposium* (pp. 25-26). Washington, DC: National Research Council, National Academy Press.
- Mason, J., Stephens, M., & Watson, A. (2009). Appreciating mathematical structure for all. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 21(2), 10-32.
- Panorkou, N., Maloney, A., & Confrey, J. (2013). A learning trajectory for early equations and expressions for the common core standards. In M. Martinez, & A. Castro Superfine (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (pp. 417-424). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Perso, T. (2003). *Everything you want to know about algebra outcomes for your class, K-9*. Perth: Mathematical Association of Western Australia.
- Stephens, M., & Armanto, D. (2010). How to build powerful learning trajectories for relational thinking in the primary school years. In L. Sparrow, B. Kissane, & C. Hurst (Eds.), *Shaping the future of mathematics education: Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia* (pp. 523-530). Fremantle, WA: MERGA.
- Watson, A. (2009). *Key understandings in mathematics learning, Paper 6: Algebraic reasoning*. London, England: Nuffield Foundation.