

# Taking advantage of the different types of mathematical languages to promote students' meaningful learning

Helen Alfaro Víquez

# ▶ To cite this version:

Helen Alfaro Víquez. Taking advantage of the different types of mathematical languages to promote students' meaningful learning. Eleventh Congress of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education, Utrecht University, Feb 2019, Utrecht, Netherlands. hal-02435228

# HAL Id: hal-02435228 https://hal.science/hal-02435228

Submitted on 10 Jan2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Taking advantage of the different types of mathematical languages to promote students' meaningful learning

Helen Alfaro Víquez

University of Tampere, Finland; helen.alfaroviquez@tuni.fi

The low performance in mathematics of non-mathematics majors has forced higher education institutions to implement different measures to address the problem. Many of these measures have focused on curriculum modifications. This study presents a methodological way of approaching the problem, using written exercises, which combine symbolic, natural and pictorial languages to improve the mathematical learning of university students. These exercises promote the development of essential mathematical skills to achieve successful mathematical learning. In this paper, I describe one exercise and analyze the solutions of 28 students of Calculus 1 course, at the University of Costa Rica. The results suggest that the exercises allow exploring the benefits of different mathematical languages, so that the students can make connections between knowledge and theoretical concepts.

Keywords: Mathematical languages, university mathematics education, languaging exercises.

## Introduction

During the last few years, improving the mathematics performance of university students has been an important issue. Special attention has been paid to students of non-mathematics majors in the transition process from school to university (Goodchild & Rønning, 2014), since the students' mathematical background is not strong enough when they enter university. They may reach the levels of reproduction of procedures, but without understanding the mathematical significance of the contents involved (Winsløw et al., 2018). Thus, the students do not have the level of mathematical reasoning, abstract thinking and rigor required at university (Gruenwald, Klymchuk, & Jovanoski, 2004). This situation is reflected in the alarming failure and dropout rates presented in the initial courses, from many students who have mathematics in their academic programs (Biza et al., 2016).

This gap in the mathematical knowledge of students has led universities to implement several measures to improve the problem. For instance, peer work, bridging courses, mathematical support centers, interactive lectures, videos, digital assessment, among others (Mustoe & Lawson, 2002). White-Fredette (2009) highlights that the actions taken for facing this situation should consider the instructional level. Similarly, Gruenwald et al. (2004) suggest that teachers should look for effective ways to help students to "understand the abstract concepts, master the formal language, follow rigorous reasoning, get a good feeling for the mathematical objects and acquire so-called mathematical maturity" (p. 12). In a nutshell, attention should be paid to the students' understanding of the mathematical concepts and the need to develop their mathematical thinking.

Considering this need, I present the written languaging exercises as a teaching resource to improve the understanding of mathematical concepts by students, using different languages. The exercises ask students to provide written explanations or justifications using symbols, drawings or their own words. In this way, they must organize their thoughts and review the reasoning that led to their solution, being aware of the knowledge and concepts used, and the connection between them. In Finland, the languaging exercises applied in university engineering mathematics (Joutsenlahti, Ali-Löytty, & Pohjolainen, 2016) and honor mathematics courses (Silius et al., 2011) have showed promising results. In this paper, I present the outcomes of applying languaging exercises in a Calculus I course for non-mathematics majors in Costa Rica.

# **Theoretical background**

As literature indicates, it is necessary to promote conceptual understanding in students (Engelbrecht & Harding, 2015), teach them how to make connections between concepts (Nardi, 1996) and how to deal with the abstract nature of mathematical concepts and the complexity of mathematical thinking (Biza et al., 2016) required at the university level. Those actions may help students to experience a successful learning of mathematics and facilitate the process of transition from school to university. The mathematical proficiency theory offered by Kilpatrick, Swafford, and Findell (2001), proposes the development of key mathematical skills that help in this purpose. The theory suggests five main competences that are necessary to accomplish effective mathematics learning: conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, strategic competence, adaptive reasoning and productive disposition. These competences promote, among other, the ability to identify connections between concepts; to understand and provide justifications and reasons for procedures; to perform procedures flexibly, accurately and efficiently, knowing how, when and why to do it; to think logically, to represent, formulate and solve mathematical problems in different context; and to consider different strategies of solution. All the strands are therefore interwoven and should be practiced equivalently.

The mathematical proficiency competences can be developed by means of languaging exercises, which are designed based on the languaging theory. Languaging is defined as the students' expression of their mathematical thinking using different languages (Joutsenlahti et al., 2016), including mathematical symbolic language (SL), natural language (NL) and pictorial language (PL). In this way, the languaging written exercises combine models and tasks, which aim to promote different mathematics competencies. As well, the exercises use different languages to access the characteristics of the mathematical objects and students' mathematical thinking.

Languages play an important role in mathematics communication. Following the semiotic approach, it is a tool for representation, communication, thinking and constructing knowledge (Schleppegrell, 2010). Lemke (2003) argues that the integration and cross-referring of NL, SL and PL languages "form a single unified system for meaning-making" (p. 215) and is the combination of them that make possible the mathematical reasoning (Schleppegrell, 2010). In addition, research evidence that for students, the use of the three languages facilitates the understanding of concepts and mathematical exercises (e.g. Alfaro, 2018; Joutsenlahti et al., 2016). The use of different languages allows the exploration of more properties of a mathematical object than using only one (Dreher, Kuntze & Lerman, 2016), because each one shows specific features and connotations (O' Halloran, 2015).

The choice of written languaging exercises is based on research which suggests that by writing, students have to organize their thoughts, review and clarify the mental processes they went through in the solution of a task (Morgan, 2002). Furthermore, they must try to express it in a clear and concrete way, so that readers can understand their mathematical thinking (Morgan, 2002). According to Kline and Ishii (2008), this process improves students' understanding.

# **Context and method**

Due to the high rates of failure of non-mathematics majors in Calculus 1 course in the University of Costa Rica, the School of Mathematics decided to introduce the pre-calculus course, in order to provide students with the necessary knowledge for studying mathematics at university level. However, the high failure rates simply transferred to this new course, and the problem remains unsolved. Therefore, in this study, I suggest a different way of approaching the problem, with a resource that can be introduced in classes for students to have meaningful learning, by analyzing their solution processes when they have to write or explain them.

These languaging exercises were applied to 28 voluntary participants of non-mathematics major taking Calculus 1 course at the University of Costa Rica. There were 17 languaging exercises (see Alfaro, 2018, for details) that were used in class or as homework during the study of the derivative. The exercises were designed combining different tasks, including: explain with your own words, complete missing steps, identify mistakes, argumentation of the solution, organizing solution steps, and follow given solutions; combined with the use of the three languages. The purpose of the exercises is to promote the different competences of the mathematical proficiency theory, especially procedural proficiency, conceptual understanding and adapting reasoning; and to allow students to experience the use of different languages to express their thoughts.

The aim of this paper is to answer the research question: how the students' understanding of the cases where the function is not derivable, can be evidenced by SL, NL and PL. For that purpose, I describe one exercise (number 3) which exemplifies the use of the three languages to make different representations of a mathematical knowledge. The intention is to provide evidence of the languaging exercises as an effective teaching resource for improving students understanding of mathematical concepts. For the analysis of students' solutions, I did a qualitative analysis based on the stablished knowledge of derivatives for the Calculus I course, studies about students' difficulties with derivatives (e.g., Asiala et al., 1997) and my teaching experience.

#### **Description of the exercise**

Exercise three (Figure 1) consists of a table that presents three cases in which a function is not derivable. Each case is exemplified with one language: symbolic, natural or pictorial, and the students must complete the empty boxes with examples in the missing languages respectively, as shown in Figure 1. The use of the three languages allows students to explore different characteristics and properties of each case. Case I is described in NL with the phrase "At points where the curve presents peaks, since the lateral derivatives would be different." This statement has several characteristics. First, it does not refer to a particular function; therefore, students are not limited to the examples they can provide. In addition, it emphasizes the pictorial features by mentioning the graphical form (sharp points) of the function where the derivability requirement is violated. Finally, it refers to the theoretical aspect that fails (the lateral derivatives are different as shown in Figure 1).

For the case II, the example is given in SL, and refers to the situation in which the function has a vertical tangent line, at a point. This example refers to a specific function. However, the students must interpret from the symbolic expression what case it refers. It means that the student has to recall the definition of derivability to identify the characteristic that makes the function not derivable. Finally,

case III shows a graph of a function that presents a discontinuity in the point  $x_0$ . As in the previous case, the student must identify which case is presented in order to express it in NL.

The objective of the exercise is to observe if students understand the concepts and rules involved, in such a way that they can interpret them from any of the given representations and can express them in different ways.

What are the needible second in which a function is not deriverble?

Give examples of each of them using the three types of language.				
	Mathematical symbolic: numbers, symbols.	Natural Language: written words.	Pictorial Language: drawings, graphs, etc.	
Ι		At points where the curve presents peaks, since the lateral derivatives would be different.		
Π	$f(x) = \sqrt[3]{x}, in x = 0$			
III				

#### Figure 1: Languaging exercise #3

In the next section, I will present some excerpts of the students' solutions, as an evidence of the different uses of the languages they made, the different ways in which the students expressed the cases in their own words and some errors of interpretation and formality.

### **Results and discussion**

#### Case I: Statement in natural language

For this case, students have to offer examples in symbolical and pictorial language. In the column of SL, they wrote diverse function samples such as absolute value and piecewise functions, with criteria of minor and greater complexity (Figure 2). As well, some included general expressions such as  $f'_{-}(c) \neq f'_{+}(c)$ , and calculated the values of the lateral derivatives.

A)  x-2 = {x-2 51 x-2=0 Z-x 51 x-2<0	B) $f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{x} & \text{si } x \leq -1 \\ x & \text{si } -1 < x \end{cases}$ $f'(-1) = f(x) = -1$
en x=Z	$f_{+}^{(-1)=1}f_{+}^{(-1)} = 1$

Figure 2: S9 and S15 examples in SL

In most cases, students (n=10) did not make explicit in which point of the function the derivative does not exist, neither in the SL, nor in the PL. From this situation the questions of whether the students are aware of what is important in their example is the specific point where the derivative does not exist and what happens in it, can be raised. In the solutions in which it was possible to associate the example in SL with PL, one could verify if the student knew in what point the function described was not derivable by referencing the drawing. However, in the others, it was not clear. There were students' examples in which the function presented two cases where the derivative does not exist, and if they did not mark the point, one cannot know if they understood the case under discussion. It is important to note that all the examples chosen by the students were correct and represented the given case, which means that they were able to interpret correctly the sentence in NL. In addition, by combining the SL and PL columns, it was possible to evaluate the students' abilities to graph functions correctly, pointing out asymptotes and points of intersection, as shown in Figure 3.



Figure 3: Function with two cases of no derivability (S10)

Finally, some errors of rigor can be observed when writing in SL, as in example B of Figure 2, where the student writes the limit without indicating the function involved.

#### Case II: Example of the criteria of a function in SL

In this case, the most interesting results were presented in the NL column. In the PL column, most of the students drew the plot of the given function and a few drew the tangent line. The results in NL, however, show that the students were not sure about how to explain this case. Among the expressions, there were students (n=11) who could not even identify what was happening, arguing that the function was indefinite at that point, was discontinuous, had vertical asymptote or was constant. Nevertheless, there were cases (n=8) in which the students seemed unable to express their ideas in a mathematically correct way. Examples as such are when referring to a vertical line as the function: "where the function is a vertical line" or when associating the derivative with the line instead of the slope: "where the derivative is vertical."

Within the phrases they used to explain the phenomenon in case two, we can identify different connections between concepts that students used to justify their claims. Some made references to the calculation of the limit of the derivative at that point and others properly to the relationship between the derivative and the slope. Examples can be found in Table 1. Although in these sentences one can identify some conceptual errors, such as the idea of a "vertical function", they show that the students had an idea of what was happening in the given case.

When the tangent of the point is vertical, as in this case, it is considered that the function is not derivable at that point. (S3)

In the points where there are vertical lines, because this has no slope and therefore has no derivative. (S15)

In the points where the derivative tends to  $+\infty$ , since this would mean a perpendicular tangent line, which does not exist. (S10)

When solving the limit results in  $\frac{x}{0}$ , then it is a vertical function. (S5)

# Table 1: Students' answers in NL

#### Case III: The graphic of a discontinuous function

The task of the students in this case was to complete the SL and NL columns. In the SL column, responses with different characteristics were presented. Some students wrote piecewise functions in

which, as in case one, they forgot to point out the point of discontinuity. However, in other cases, the students, in addition to the criterion of the function and the point where the function was not derivable, also added the calculations of the conditions of continuity: lateral limits and the value of image in the point (Figure 4A). This was also evidenced in answers as in figure 4B. Nevertheless, in this case they used a more general form.



Figure 4: S12 and S4 examples in SL

Regarding the answers in NL, students were able to express the case of discontinuity recurring to the graphical feature of the "jump" or "breaks" (n=2) and others mentioned conceptual aspects as the fact that the lateral limits were different or the that limit does not exist at the point (n=9), the discontinuity of the function (n=15) and the fact that if a function is not continuous in x = a, then it is not derivable in x = a (n=6). Considering the different answers, it is possible to observe that students were able to recall different knowledge about continuity and the conditions of derivability to correctly explain what happened in the point.

# **Final considerations**

As stated at the beginning, when students begin their university studies, they lack mathematical skills and knowledge required for university level. I suggest languaging exercises as a methodological tool to address those issues and promote students' meaningful learning. The written languaging exercises offer an option for boosting students' understanding of mathematical concepts and noticing the connections between concepts, the rules and properties that justify the procedures and the different representations. The use of the three languages reinforces different strands of mathematical proficiency, such as conceptual understanding, adaptive reasoning and strategic competence. For example, from the results it is possible to conclude that for solving the exercise students must understand, identify and verbalize the connections between concepts, as well as represent mathematical situations in different situations. These actions are associated with conceptual understanding. It is important to highlight that in each case, in order to complete the empty boxes, the students had to interpret the given example, and from that point they were already connecting between representations. The adaptive reasoning is evidenced in the justifications and explanations that the students provide in natural language, and the strategic competence is present since the task presented to the students is not common for them, so they must show a flexible approach to solve this novel situation. All these actions helped them to experience meaningful learning and think about the concepts involved in the exercises instead of solving them mechanically.

The different languages allow studying different characteristics of the mathematical concepts involved. NL evidenced the theoretical knowledge involved and, how the connections between the ideas were made. SL showed aspects related to the correct use of the symbols and specificities in relation to the examples, as in the mention of the point where the derivability was violated. In PL, all

the features were combined and represented. In addition, the use of different languages makes it possible to observe the gaps in knowledge, misconceptions or difficulties the students have. As evidenced in case 2, where most of the students could make the graph from the interpretation of the symbolic expression, but they faced problems when trying to explain the situation in NL, for which deeper knowledge of the subject was required.

This experience shows the potential of the use of different languages to improve the mathematical learning of the non-mathematics major students and to promote their competences to become mathematically proficient. However, more studies are required to explore various ways to integrate different languages in mathematics learning at the university level.

## References

- Alfaro, H. (2018). *Appealing multimodal languages to access first year university students' understanding of mathematical concepts in Costa Rica* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Tampere, Finland.
- Asiala, M., Cottrill, J., Dubinsky, E., & Schwingendorf, K. E. (1997). The development of students' graphical understanding of the derivative. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 16(4), 399-431. doi: 10.1016/S0732-3123(97)90015-8
- Biza, I., Giraldo, V., Hochmuth, R., Khakbaz, A., & Rasmussen, C. (2016). Research on teaching and learning mathematics at the tertiary level: State-of-the-art and looking ahead. In I. Biza et al. (Eds.), *Research on teaching and learning mathematics at the tertiary level* (pp. 1-32). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Engelbrecht, J., & Harding, A. (2015). Interventions to improve teaching and learning mathematics in first year courses. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, *46*(7), 1046-1060. doi: 10.1080/0020739X.2015.1070441
- Dreher, A., Kuntze, S., & Lerman, S. (2016). Why use multiple representations in the mathematics classroom? Views of English and German preservice teachers. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *14*(2), 363-382. doi: 10.1007/s10763-015-9633-6
- Goodchild, S., & Rønning, F. (2014). Teaching mathematics at higher education. In H. Silfverberg, T. Kärki, & M. S. Hannula (Eds.), *Proceedings of NORMA 14* (pp. 396-400). Turku, Finland: Finnish Research Association for Subject Didactics.
- Gruenwald, N., Klymchuk, S., & Jovanoski, Z. (2004). Reducing the gap between the school and university mathematics: university lecturers' perspective. *The New Zealand Mathematics Magazine*, *41*(3), 12-24.
- Joutsenlahti, J., Ali-Löytty, S., & Pohjolainen, S. (2016). Developing learning and teaching in engineering mathematics with and without technology. *Proceedings 44th SEFI Conference*. Tampere, Finland. Retrieved from http://sefibenvwh.cluster023.hosting.ovh.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/joutsenlahti-developin g-learning-and-teaching-in-engineering-mathematics-with-and-without-technology-153\_a.pdf

- Kilpatrick, J., Swafford, J., & Findell, B. (2001). *Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Kline, S. L., & Ishii, D. K. (2008). Procedural explanations in mathematics writing: A framework for understanding college students' effective communication practices. *Written Communication*, 25(4), 441-461.
- Lemke, J. L. (2003). Mathematics in the middle: Measure, picture, gesture, sign, and word. In M. Anderson, A. Sáenz-Ludlow, S. Zellweger, & V. V. Cifarelli (Eds.), *Educational perspectives on mathematics as semiosis: From thinking to interpreting to knowing* (pp. 215-234). Ottawa, Canada: Legas.
- Morgan, C. (2002). The place of pupil writting in learning, teaching and assessing mathematics. In P. Gates (Ed.), *Issues in mathematics teaching* (pp. 232–244). London, England: Routledge.
- Mustoe, L., & Lawson, D. (2002). Mathematics for the European engineer: A curriculum for the twenty-first century. *Report by the SEFI Mathematics Working Group*. Brussels, Belgium: SEFI HQ.
- Nardi, E. (1996). *The novice mathematician's encounter with mathematical abstraction: tensions in concept-image construction and formalisation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oxford, England.
- O'Halloran, K. L. (2015). The language of learning mathematics: A multimodal perspective. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 40, 63-74. doi: 10.1016/j.jmathb.2014.09.002
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2010). Language in mathematics teaching and learning: A research review. In J.
  N. Moschkovich (Ed.), *Language and mathematics education: Multiple perspectives and directions for research* (pp. 73-112). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Silius, K., Pohjolainen, S., Kangas, J., Miilumäki, T., & Joutsenlahti, J. (2011). What can be done to bridge the competency gap between upper-secondary school and university mathematics? *Proceedings Global Engineering Education Conference* (pp. 428-436). Amman, Jordan: IEEE.
- White-Fredette, K. (2009). *What is mathematics? An exploration of teachers' philosophies of mathematics during a time of curriculum reform* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.
- Winsløw, C., Gueudet, G., Hochmuth, R., & Nardi, E. (2018). Research on university mathematics education. In Dreyfus, T., Artigue, M., Potari, D., Prediger, S., & Ruthven, K. (Eds.), *Developing research in mathematics education: Twenty years of communication, cooperation and collaboration in Europe* (pp. 82-96). London, England: Routledge.