

2017

Proof by mathematical induction: Professional practice for secondary teachers

G Hine

The University of Notre Dame Australia, gregory.hine@nd.edu.au

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:

Hine, G. (2017). Proof by mathematical induction: Professional practice for secondary teachers. *26th Biennial Conference of the Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers*.

This conference paper is posted on ResearchOnline@ND at https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/edu_conference/106. For more information, please contact researchonline@nd.edu.au.





Proceedings of the
26th Biennial Conference
of the Australian Association
of Mathematics Teachers Inc.

Edited by Valerie Barker,
Toby Spencer & Kate Manuel



Capital Maths

Proceedings of the 26th Biennial Conference of the Australian Association of
Mathematics Teachers Inc.

Edited by Valerie Barker, Toby Spencer & Kate Manuel

© The Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers (AAMT) Inc. 2017

ISBN 978-1-875900-80-0

These conference proceedings have been made available as a PDF to all conference delegates and to others who have purchased a copy—who shall be regarded as the “owners” of their copy of the PDF. The PDF may be owned by either an individual or an institution (i.e., a single campus/site of a school, university, TAFE, college, company or organisation). Note: individual or institutional owners do not own the copyright of the material contained in the PDF or printed document.

Individual owners may (for no fee): print a single copy of these proceedings (in part or in their entirety) for inclusion in either their personal or institutional library; copy the PDF to the hard drive of their personal computer for their own use; make back-up copies of the PDF for their own use; transfer their ownership of the PDF to another individual or to an institution by providing a copy of the PDF to the new owner and then deleting or destroying all other hard and electronic copies in their possession.

Institutional owners may (for no fee): print a single copy of these proceedings (in part or in their entirety) for inclusion in their institutional library; make the PDF available via their institutional intranet for viewing (but not printing) by staff and students; make back-up copies of the PDF for their own use; transfer their ownership of the PDF to another individual or to an institution by providing a copy of the PDF to the new owner and then deleting or destroying all other hard and electronic copies in their possession.

No other reproduction (in hard copy, electronic or other form) is permitted without the permission of the copyright holder (AAMT) or appropriate fees being paid (reproduction royalties are collected by the Copyright Agency Limited on behalf of AAMT).

Published by

The Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers Inc

GPO Box 1729

Adelaide SA 5001

08 8363 0288

office@aamt.edu.au

www.aamt.edu.au



CONTENTS

Preface	5
---------------	---

KEYNOTE PAPERS

‘Functional’ mathematics in an electronic age: Implications for classroom practice	8
<i>Rhonda Faragher</i>	
The journey to statistical literacy at the school level: Past, present and future.....	18
<i>Christine Franklin</i>	
Hanna Neumann Memorial Lecture: Inspiring teachers; challenging children.....	25
<i>Peter M. Neumann</i>	
Colour by numbers	33
<i>Chris Wetherell</i>	

PROFESSIONAL PAPERS

The impact of natural language on performance in word problems at lower secondary level	55
<i>Khemduth Singh Angateeah</i>	
Incomprehensible workings followed by ‘correct answers’	64
<i>Meredith Begg, Robyn Pierce & Alasdair McAndrew</i>	
Making the most of multiple-choice items	71
<i>Joan Burfitt</i>	
Technology in external examinations in Queensland.....	80
<i>Theo Clark</i>	
How mathematics teachers can explain multiplication and division in the manner of René Descartes and Isaac Newton	90
<i>Jonathan J. Crabtree</i>	
Generalisation through noticing structure in algebraic reasoning	99
<i>Lorraine Day</i>	
Teaching place value: Concept development, big ideas and activities.....	108
<i>Judy Hartnett</i>	
Proof by mathematical induction: Professional practice for secondary teachers.....	117
<i>Gregory Hine</i>	
Questions to reveal and guide fractional thinking.....	125
<i>Catherine Pearn, Robyn Pierce & Max Stephens</i>	
A classroom scenario for professional learning in statistics	133
<i>Jane Watson</i>	

PREFACE

“Capital Maths” is a simple and striking theme for this 26th Biennial Conference of the Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers, and reflects that the conference is being held in Canberra, the nation’s capital. More than that, however, is that we are in a position to emphasise yet again the importance of mathematics to the building of our nation. Just as Canberra is the capital of Australia, indeed the ‘heart of the nation’ according to the registration plates of ACT’s vehicles, we must continue to assert that mathematics is at the heart of our country’s social, scientific and economic growth—truly a source of capital investment in our future. More than ever, education—particularly STEM education—is at the forefront of the minds of our politicians and the wider community. As passionate educators, we too have the responsibility of asserting that influence, of supporting it, and making the very best mathematics education available to all of our students in all sectors.

Two years ago, the proceedings lead editor identified major and public themes connected to education: national security, financial literacy, environmental change, STEM, the relatively poor performance of Australian students in major international rankings, the professionalism and quality of our teaching force, and the continuing marginalisation of Indigenous Australians. In particular, the editors noted that while schools have a fundamental role to play in dealing with social problems, many of these seemingly endless calls to schools to solve our social ills through the curriculum and the provision of extra programs are made without a genuine understanding of the complexities of education.

Today these words serve just as well; that is, these issues and more—school funding reform, the accountability of the teaching profession as examples—are a continuing source of concern and a challenge to us all as educators, not just in terms of our students but also in the context of our responsibilities to the broader community, none of whom is untouched by the work of our educators, from a local pre-school to primary school and secondary schools, or a university preparing our future teachers. I write today as a practising classroom teacher, a position that I continue to recognise as a great personal privilege. The opportunity to come together at this conference with such a large and diverse group of educators, to share knowledge and innovation, and to assess and confirm best practice from so many colleagues across all sectors, allows me and all of this diverse group to continue to sustain our understandings of mathematics education as being at the heart of education, and an investment in our society and its future. Our conference speakers and presenters, representing the broader community of educators, bring a breadth of interests, affiliations, expertise and experience, new ideas and alternative thinking to

challenge us, to support change and growth, and to affirm the profoundly important work of all in education.

Part of that challenge to me, and I hope to all at the conference, is how we are able to take these ideas and challenges back to our own communities—to lead learning, innovation, influence, change and growth. My hope is that our conference experiences guide us in the leadership that we take to our own communities, allowing us to reflect on and reinvigorate, validate and reappraise, challenge and change our personal and collegial practices. We are a truly supportive community of each other as educators, whether it be as delegates at this conference or in our own workplaces and professional communities. It is appropriate for me to acknowledge with much gratitude the support and guidance I have been given in this editorial role, from many whom I have not met personally, as a particular example. It heartens and encourages me, as I am sure it will for all delegates, that in my everyday practice I am able to influence, lead and be guided by passionate, caring and committed educators; it is we small investors who can play a profound role in mathematics education as a critical component of securing a capital investment in our nation’s future.

As this proceedings’ lead editor, I would particularly like to thank Kate Manuel and Toby Spencer (AAMT) for their support and guidance throughout the editorial process.

Valerie Barker, Proceedings Lead Editor

Review process

Presentations at AAMT 2017 were selected in a variety of ways. Keynote and major presenters were invited to be part of the conference and to have papers published in these proceedings. A call was made for other presentations in the form of either a seminar or workshop. Seminars and workshops were selected as suitable for the conference based on each presenter’s submission of a formal abstract and further explanation of the proposed presentation.

Authors of seminar and workshop proposals were also invited to submit written papers to be included in these proceedings. These written papers were reviewed without any author identification (blind) by at least two reviewers. Reviewers were chosen by the editors to reflect a range of professional settings. Papers that passed the review process have been collected in the ‘Professional Papers’ section of these proceedings.

The panel of people to whom papers were sent for review was extensive and the editors wish to thank them all:

Judy Anderson	Barry Kissane	Monique Russell
Lorraine Day	Kate Manuel	Aimee Shackleton
Suzanne Garvey	Karen McDaid	Matt Skoss
Holly Gyton	Denise Neal	Paul Turner
Theresa Hanel	Robyn Pierce	Jane Watson
Greg Hine	Cath Pearn	Garry Webb
Derek Hurrell	Karen Perkins	Bruce White
Chris Hurst	Kate Quane	
Ann Kilpatrick	Howard Reeves	

PROOF BY MATHEMATICAL INDUCTION: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FOR SECONDARY TEACHERS

GREGORY HINE

The University of Notre Dame Australia

gregory.hine@nd.edu.au

Mathematical induction is a proof technique that can be applied to establish the veracity of mathematical statements. This professional practice paper offers insight into mathematical induction as it pertains to the Australian Curriculum: Mathematics (ACMSM065, ACMSM066) and implications for how secondary teachers might approach this technique with students. In particular, literature on proof—and specifically, mathematical induction—will be presented, and several worked examples will outline the key steps involved in solving problems. After various teaching and learning caveats have been explored, the paper will conclude with some mathematical induction example problems that can be used in the secondary classroom.

Introduction

A significant amount of mathematics involves the examination of patterns. Many of these patterns are concerned with generalisations about sequences and series. Mathematical induction is a method of proof argument that is based in recursion, and it is used for proving conjectures which claim that a certain statement is true for integer values of some variable. One idea that has been used to illustrate this method is to imagine a number of dominoes lined up in a row (Peressini et al., 1998). These authors suggest that for each integer $k \geq 1$, if the k th domino falls over then it will cause the $(k + 1)$ st domino to fall over as well. Furthermore, it could be argued specifically that if the first domino is pushed over, then all remaining dominoes would also fall.

If we suppose that for each positive integer n , $S(n)$ is a statement written in terms of n , then the principle of mathematical induction can be explained generally in two steps:

1. If $S(1)$ is true, and
2. for all integers $k \geq 1$, the assumption that $S(k)$ is true implies that $S(k + 1)$ is true, then $S(n)$ is true for all positive integers n .

In other words, we commence the proof method through a verification of Step 1 (the *initial step*), or by pushing over the first domino. Then, we assume that $S(k)$ is true for a particular but arbitrarily chosen integer $k \geq 1$, known as the inductive assumption. In Step 2 (the *base induction step*) we show that the supposition that $S(k)$ is true implies

that $S(k + 1)$ is true. Compared with the domino line-up, Step 2 corresponds to the assumption that if the k^{th} domino falls then so will the $(k + 1)^{\text{st}}$ domino.

The importance of proof in mathematics education

Mathematical proof involves following a logical way to explain a hypothesis and to offer a cogent explanation of how deductive reasoning has been used to reach a conclusion. (Hanna, 1995; Tall, 1998). During the proving process, proofs require us to create “a sequence of steps, where each step follows logically from an earlier part of the proof where the last line is the statement being proved” (Garnier & Taylor, 2010, p. 50). The concept of proof is considered to be central to the discipline of mathematics, and because of this centrality, scholars have argued that proof should feature prominently in mathematics education (Ball et al., 2002; Baştürk, 2010; Siemon et al., 2015). Specifically, proof is recognised as an essential tool for promoting mathematical understanding in students (Ball et al., 2002; Reid, 2011) and for providing educators with insight about how students learn mathematics (Wilkerson-Jerde & Wilensky, 2011). Güler (2016) proposed that proof is important in mathematics education for various reasons, in that it: improves skills in problem solving, persuasive argumentation, reasoning, creativity and mathematical thinking. Moreover, proof forms the basis of mathematics, enables mathematical communication to transpire, and prevents rote learning of information.

Mathematical induction

Mathematical induction is considered one of the most powerful tools for proving statements in discrete mathematics (Ashkenazi & Itzkovitch, 2014). While there is endless scope for the types of problems mathematical induction can be applied to, three popular ‘types’ of problems are used by teachers when teaching this type of mathematical proof to secondary students. These problem types include: General series, divisibility and implication. Each of these types will now be presented as a worked example.

General series

Let us propose that we are interested in finding a general statement to explain the sum of n consecutive odd integers starting at 1. If we tabulate our findings for the first 10 natural or counting numbers, and their partial sums, we have:

Table 1. Counting numbers and their sums, $1 \leq n \leq 10$.

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
T_n	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19
S_n	1	4	9	16	25	36	49	64	81	100

It should be noted that the row T_n represents the n^{th} odd integer, and the row S_n is the sum of the first n odd integers. One interesting pattern that can be observed is that the last row of the table, S_n , shows all integers n^2 for $n \geq 1$. A cursory comparison between the three rows reveals that the sum of the first n odd numbers appears to be the square of n . In making this statement, we have arrived at a conjecture—which is the

first step in working towards a theorem—but we may not even know if the statement is true! The following worked example provides a precise mathematical statement of the result we are trying to prove.

Worked example 1: General series

Prove by mathematical induction that for all integers $n \geq 1$

$$S(n) : 1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2n - 1) = n^2$$

Worked solution

1. Initial step: We need to show that the conjecture is true for a small value of n , e.g., $n = 1$. Substituting this value into the series we have:

$$1 = 1^2$$

which is clearly true

\therefore we have shown that $S(1)$ is true

2. Inductive Step: Here we assume the statement (inductive hypothesis)

$$S(k) : 1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2k - 1) = k^2 \quad (1)$$

is true for a fixed but arbitrary value of $k \geq 1$ and verify that the statement

$$S(k + 1) : 1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2k - 1) + [2(k + 1) - 1] = (k + 1)^2 \quad (2)$$

Looking back at (1), we can see that the series $1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2k - 1)$ exists in (2).

We therefore substitute k^2 into (2) for $1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2k - 1)$, and algebraically rewrite the Left Hand Side (LHS) until it equals the Right Hand Side (RHS).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &= 1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2k - 1) + [2(k + 1) - 1] \\ &= 1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2k - 1) + (2k + 1) \\ &= k^2 + (2k + 1) \\ &= (k + 1)^2 \\ &= \text{RHS} \end{aligned}$$

Conclusion: Because we have verified the initial and inductive steps we can conclude by induction that the statement

$$S(n) : 1 + 3 + 5 + \dots + (2n - 1) = n^2$$

is true for all integers $n \geq 1$.

Worked example 2: Divisibility

Prove by mathematical induction that for all integers $n \geq 1$

$S(n) : 3^{2n} - 1$ is divisible by 8.

Worked solution

1. Initial step: We need to show that the statement $S(1)$ is true. Substituting $n = 1$ into the expression gives us:

$$3^{2(1)} - 1 = 3^2 - 1 = 9 - 1 = 8$$

which is clearly divisible by 8.

Therefore, $S(1)$ is true.

2. Inductive step: We assume that the statement (inductive hypothesis)

$$3^{2k} - 1 \text{ is divisible by } 8 \tag{1}$$

is true for a fixed and arbitrary value of $k \geq 1$. We must verify that the statement

$$S(k + 1) : 3^{2(k+1)} - 1 \text{ is divisible by } 8$$

is true. Now, we manipulate the expression $3^{2(k+1)} - 1$ using algebraic rules until it becomes divisible by 8.

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{2(k+1)} - 1 &= 3^{2k+2} - 1 \\ &= 3^{2k} \times 3^2 - 1 \\ &= 3^{2k}(9) - 1 \\ &= 3^{2k}(8 + 1) - 1 \\ &= 8 \times 3^{2k} + 3^{2k} - 1 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Now because from (1) we have assumed that $3^{2k} - 1$ is divisible by 8, there are two terms which are divisible by 8—one proven through clear algebra, and the other via an assumption from the inductive step. As such, both terms of (2) are divisible by 8 and therefore so is their sum. In other words, $S(k+1)$ is true.

Worked example 3: Inequalities

Using mathematical induction, prove that for all integers $n \geq 3$

$$S(n) : 2^n > 2n + 1$$

Worked solution

1. Initial step: We need to show that the statement $S(3)$ is true. Substituting $n=3$ into this expression gives:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^3 &> 2(3) + 1 \\ 8 &> 7 \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly true.

Therefore, $S(3)$ is true.

2. Inductive step: We assume that the statement (inductive hypothesis)

$$S(k) : 2^k > 2k + 1 \quad (1)$$

is true for a fixed and arbitrary value of $k \geq 3$. We must verify the statement

$$S(k + 1) : 2^{k+1} > 2(k + 1) + 1 \quad (2)$$

We now manipulate both sides of (1) to transform it into (2). In other words, the inductive statement will be manipulated algebraically so the values of $n = k$ have been transformed into $n = k + 1$. Once we have done this, by implication we will have shown that the statement will remain true for all values of k and the very next value after k . Ideally, the ‘finished product’ will look like:

$$2^{k+1} > 2(k + 1) + 1$$

Some annotations have been included on the RHS of the inequality to assist in following the steps in working out.

$2^k \times 2 > 2(2k + 1)$	Multiply both sides by 2
$2^{k+1} > 4k + 2$	Simplify
$2^{k+1} > 2k + 2k + 2$	Re-express the RHS terms
$2^{k+1} > 2k + 2 + 2k$	Rearrange the RHS terms
$2^{k+1} > 2(k + 1) + 2k$	Factorise the first two terms

Now, as the original problem stated, $n \geq 3$ which implies that the LHS of the original statement $2n + 1 > 1$. In particular, if we substitute $n = 3$ into the LHS we obtain a value of 7, which is clearly greater than 1. As such we can create a concatenated inequality statement:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{k+1} &> 2(k + 1) + 2k > 2(k + 1) + 1 \\ \therefore 2^{k+1} &> 2(k + 1) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

In this way, the inductive step $S(k)$ has implied $S(k+1)$ is true.

Some caveats associated with mathematical induction

A review of literature on mathematical induction reveals that this method is difficult to teach for a variety of reasons (Ashkenazi & Itzkovitch, 2014; Harel, 2002; Stylianides et al., 2007). To commence, Ashkenazi and Itzkovitch (2014) contended that although secondary school and university students can successfully apply this proof method to statements of the kind they are accustomed to, they do not understand the correctness of the proof. Put another way, these authors suggest that most students learn how to use the method mechanically; such learning does not foster a deep understanding of the correctness of the method and ultimately contributes to a failure to solve problems

of a different style (Ashkenazi & Itzkovitch, 2014). Echoing the contention of these authors contention, both Harel (2002) and Stylianides et al. (2007) asserted that undergraduate university students often display both a fragile knowledge on mathematical induction and a propensity to follow the steps without understanding what they are doing. In his analysis of students' attempts at mathematical induction, Harel (2002) further identified two specific difficulties experienced by students. First, students tended to consider mathematical induction as a case of circular reasoning as they believe that the proof assumes $S(n)$ is true for all positive integers. Second, students demonstrated a belief that the general argument for mathematical induction can be derived from a number of particular cases, rather than proving for all cases.

Divisibility

An alternative method that can be used to prove induction divisibility problems (such as Worked example 2) requires the use of two assumptions. Because the strength of a mathematical argument relies on the extent to which assumptions are minimised, the method shown below should be treated cautiously and avoided. If we recommence Worked Example 2 at the inductive step, it could be written that:

$$3^{2k} - 1 = 8A \text{ for some integer } A, A \geq 1$$

We can rearrange this inductive assumption as $3^{2k} = 8A + 1$ (1), which will be used when manipulating the statement $S(k+1)$. Herein:

$$\begin{aligned} 3^{2(k+1)} - 1 &= 3^{2k+2} - 1 \\ &= 3^{2k} \times 3^2 - 1 \\ &= 9 \times 3^{2k} - 1 \\ \text{We now substitute (1):} &= 9(8A + 1) - 1 \\ &= 72A + 9 - 1 \\ &= 72A + 8 \\ &= 8(9A + 1) \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly a multiple of 8.

Having completed the necessary algebraic manipulations to reach a final statement which is divisible by 8, we are able to conclude that the conjecture is indeed true. However, looking back at the Inductive Step, we assumed that not only was the conjecture true for $k \geq 1$ but we also assumed that it was equal to a $8A$ (a multiple of 8) for $A \geq 1$. As such, the inductive assumption itself rested upon an assumption, which is a practice that should be avoided. Rather, to fulfil the logical steps of the proof we need to actually use the inductive assumption of the proof (i.e., $3^{2k} - 1$) in the final stages and not a substitute.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to offer insight to educators about proof by mathematical induction as it pertains to the Australian Curriculum: Mathematics. In particular, this method of proof has been outlined in a step-by-step fashion, and some worked examples have been offered to amplify these steps and the theoretical approach overall.

Additionally, a cursory review of literature has revealed how scholars have championed the place of proof in a mathematics curriculum. In a study where mathematics professors were asked to evaluate and score undergraduate university students' completion of proofs (an example of mathematical induction was Task 4), these professors acknowledged that the most important characteristics of a well-written proof are logical correctness, clarity, fluency, and demonstration of understanding of the proof (Moore, 2016). It is the author's hope that this paper will be useful to mathematics educators within Australia—and perhaps internationally—as they model to secondary students how to apply the principles of mathematical induction to statements. Moreover, it is hoped that as students strive to master those characteristics of well-written proofs, their efforts will be underscored by a demonstration of procedural understanding.

Examples to try with secondary students

Use mathematical induction to prove that for all positive integers n :

1. $1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
2. $1^2 + 2^2 + 3^2 + \dots + n^2 = \frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6}$
3. $1^3 + 2^3 + 3^3 + \dots + n^3 = \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2}\right)^2$

Use mathematical induction to prove that for all positive integers n :

4. $5^n + 3$ is divisible by 4
5. $3^{4n} - 1$ is divisible by 80
6. $4^n - 1$ is divisible by 3

Use mathematical induction to prove the following statements for all natural numbers $n \geq 5$:

7. $2^n > n^2$
8. $4n < 2^n$
9. $1 \times 2 \times 3 \times \dots \times (n - 1) > 2^n$

References

- Ashkenzi, Y. & Itzkovitch, E. (2014). Proof by mathematical induction. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*, 1(3), 2349–5219.
- Ball, D.L., Hoyles, C., Jahnke, H.N. & Movshovitz-Hadar, N. (2002). The teaching of proof. In *Proceedings for the International Congress of Mathematicians* (pp. 907–920). Beijing, China: Higher Education Press.
- Baştürk, S. (2010). First-year secondary school mathematics students' conceptions of mathematics proofs and proving. *Educational Studies*, 36(3), 283–298.
- Garnier, R. & Taylor, J. (2010). *Discrete mathematics: Proofs, structures and applications* (3rd ed.). Boca Raton, FA: Taylor & Francis.
- Guler, G. (2016). The difficulties experiences in teaching proof to prospective mathematics teachers: Academician views. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(1), 145–158.
- Hanna, G. (1995). Challenges to the importance of proof. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 15(3), 42–50.
- Harel, G. (2002). The development of mathematical induction as a proof scheme: A model for DNR-based instruction. In S. Campbell & R. Zaskis (Eds). *Learning and Teaching Number Theory: Research in Cognition and Instruction* (pp. 185–212). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

- Moore, R.C. (2016). Mathematics professors' evaluation of students' proofs: A complex teaching practice. *International Journal of Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education*, 2, 246–278.
- Peressini, A.P., McConnell, J.W., Usiskin, Z., Epp, S.S., Ahbel, N.P., Witonsky, D., Hollowell, K.A., Brown, S., Ellis Jnr, W., Sorteberg, J. (1998). *Precalculus and discrete mathematics* (The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project). Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman Addison Wesley.
- Siemon, D., Beswick, K., Brady, K., Clark, J., Faragher, R., Warren, E. (2015). *Teaching mathematics: Foundations to middle years* (2nd ed.). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Styliandes, G.J., Styliandes, A.J., Phillippou, G.N. (2007). Preservice teachers' knowledge of proof by mathematical induction. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 10, 145–166.
- Reid, D. (2011). Understanding proof and transforming teaching. In Wiest, L.R. & Lamberg, T. (Eds). *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada: Reno.
- Tall, D. (1998). *The cognitive development of proof: Is mathematical proof for all or for some?* Conference of the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project, USA.
- Wilkerson-Jerde, M.H. & Wilensky, U.J. (2011). How do mathematicians learn math? Resources and acts for constructing and understanding mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 78, 21–43.