



Proceedings of the Seventh Congress
of the European Society for Research
in Mathematics Education



Editors

Marta Pytlak, Tim Rowland, Ewa Swoboda

University of Rzeszów, Poland

Editors

Marta Pytlak, University of Rzeszów, Poland

Tim Rowland, University of Cambridge, UK

Ewa Swoboda University of Rzeszów, Poland

Editorial Board

Paul Andrews, Carmen Batanero, Claire Berg, Rolf Biehler, Angelika Bikner-Ahsbals, Laurinda Brown, María C. Cañadas, Susana Carreira, Maria Luiza Cestari, Sarah Crafter, Thérèse Dooley, Viviane Durand-Guerrier, Andreas Eichler, Ingvald Erfjord, Pier Luigi Ferrari, Anne Berit Fuglestad, Athanasios Gagatsis, Uwe Gellert, Alejandro S. González-Martin, Núria Gorgorió, Sava Grozdev, Ghislaine Gueudet, Kirsti Hemmi, Marja van den Heuvel-Panhuizen, Jeremy Hodgen, Paola Iannone, Eva Jablonka, Niels Jahnke, Uffe Thomas Jankvist, Gabriele Kaiser, Ivy Kidron, Götz Krummheuer, Alain Kuzniak, Jan van Maanen, Kate Mackrell, Mirko Maracci, Pietro Di Martino, Snezana Lawrence, Roza Leikin, Thomas Lingefjärd, Nicolina Malara, Emma Mamede, Carlo Marchini, Maria Meletiou-Mavrotheris, Alain Mercier, John Monaghan, Elena Nardi, Reinhard Oldenburg, Alexandre Pais, Marilena Pantziara, Efi Papanistodemou, Bettina Pedemonte, Richard Philippe, Demetra Pitta-Pantazi, Despina Potari, Dave Pratt, Susanne Prediger, Luis Radford, Leonor Santos, Wolfgang Schloeglmann, Gérard Sensevy, Florence Mihaela Singer, Nad'a Stehlikova, Andreas Ulovec, Paola Valero, Konstantinos Tatsis, Joke Torbeyns, Jana Trgalová, Constantinos Tzanakis, Fay Turner, Geoff Wake, Kjersti Wæge, Hans-Georg Weigand, Carl Winsløw.

The proceedings are published by University of Rzeszów, Poland
on behalf of the European Society for Research in Mathematics

ISBN 978-83-7338-683-9

© Copyright 2011 left to the authors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>General Introduction</u>	1
<i>Ferdinando Arzarello, Tim Rowland</i>	
<u>Editotrial Introduction</u>	5
<i>Tim Rowland, Ewa Swoboda, Marta Pytlak</i>	
PLENARY LECTURES	
Plenary lecture 1	
<u>Research into Pre-service elementary teacher education courses</u>	9
<i>Anna Sierpińska</i>	
Plenary lecture 2	
<u>The structure and dynamics of affect in mathematical thinking and learning</u>	34
<i>Markku S. Hanula</i>	
Plenary lecture 3	
<u>Proving and proof as an educational task</u>	61
<i>Maria Alessandra Mariotti</i>	
RESEARCH PAPERS	
WORKING GROUP 1	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 1: Argumentation and proof</u>	93
<i>Viviane Durand-Guerrier, Kirsti Hemmi, Niels Jahnke, Bettina Pedemonte</i>	
<u>Meta-cognitive unity in indirect proofs</u>	99
<i>Ferdinando Arzarello, Cristina Sabena</i>	
<u>Abduction in generating conjectures in dynamic geometry through maintaining dragging</u>	110
<i>Anna Baccaglioni-Frank</i>	
<u>Argumentation and proof: discussing a “successful” classroom discussion</u>	120
<i>Paolo Boero</i>	
<u>Mathematical proving on secondary school level I: supporting student understanding through different types of proof. A video analysis</u>	131
<i>Esther Brunner, Kurt Reusser, Christine Pauli</i>	
<u>Everyday argumentation and knowlegde construction in mathematical tasks</u>	141
<i>Julia Cramer</i>	
<u>Analyzing the proving activity of a group of three students</u>	151
<i>Patricia Perry, Óscar Molina, Leonor Camargo, Carmen Samper</i>	
<u>On the role of looking back at proving processes in school mathematics: focusing on argumentation</u>	161
<i>Yosuke Tsujiyama</i>	

<u>Making the discovery function of proof visible for upper secondary school students</u>	172
<i>Kirsti Hemmi, Clas Löfwall</i>	
<u>Conjecturing and proving in AINuset</u>	181
<i>Bettina Pedemonte</i>	
<u>A schema to analyse students' Proof evaluations</u>	192
<i>Kirsten Pfeiffer</i>	
<u>The appearance of algorithms in curricula a new opportunity to deal with proof?</u>	202
<i>Modeste Simon, Ouvrier-Buffer Cécile</i>	
<u>Proof: a game for pedants?</u>	213
<i>Joanna Mamona-Downs, Martin Downs</i>	
<u>Two beautiful proofs of Pick's theorem</u>	223
<i>Manya Raman, Lars-Daniel Öhman</i>	
<u>Multimodal derivation and proof in algebra</u>	233
<i>Reinert A. Rinvold, Andreas Lorange</i>	
<u>The view of mathematics and argumentation</u>	243
<i>Antti Viholainen</i>	
<u>Upper secondary school teachers' views of proof and the relevance of proof in teaching mathematics</u>	253
<i>Emelie Reuterswärd, Kirsti Hemmi</i>	
<u>Development of beginning skills in proving and proof-writing by elementary school students</u>	263
<i>Stéphane Cyr</i>	
<u>Designing interconnecting problems that support development of concepts and reasoning</u>	273
<i>Margo Kondratieva</i>	
WORKING GROUP 2	
<u>Introduction to the Papers of WG 2: Teaching and learning of number system and arithmetics</u>	283
<i>Susanne Prediger, Nad'a Stehlikova, Joke Torbeyns, Marja van den Heuvel-Panhuizen</i>	
<u>Cognitive styles and their relation to number sense and algebraic reasoning</u>	287
<i>Marilena Chrysostomou, Chara Tsingi, Eleni Cleanthous</i>	
<u>Danish number names and number concepts</u>	297
<i>Lisser Rye Ejersbo, Morten Mistfeld</i>	
<u>Strategies and procedures: what relationship with the development of number sense of students?</u>	307
<i>Elvira Ferreira, Lurdes Serrazina</i>	
<u>Preschool children's understanding of equality: opting for a narrow or a broad interpretation?</u>	316
<i>Anatoli Kouropatov, Dina Tirosh</i>	
<u>Using the double number line to model multiplication</u>	326
<i>Dietmar Küchemann, Margaret Brown, Jeremy Hodgen</i>	

<u>Proportion in mathematics textbooks in upper secondary school</u>	336
<i>Anna Lundberg</i>	
<u>Teaching arithmetic for the needs of the society</u>	346
<i>Hartwig Meissner</i>	
<u>Analysing children’s learning in arithmetic through collaborative group work</u>	356
<i>Carol Murphy</i>	
<u>A theoretical model for understanding fractions at elementary school</u>	366
<i>Aristkolis Nikolaou, Demetra Pitta-Pantazi</i>	
<u>Between algebra and geometry: the dual nature of the number line</u>	376
<i>Ildikó Pelczer, Cristian Voica, Florence Mihaela Singer</i>	
<u>Special education students’ ability in solving subtraction problems up to 100 by addition</u>	386
<i>Marjolijn Peltenburg, Marja van den Heuvel Panhuizen</i>	
<u>Mental calculation strategies for addition and subtraction in the set of rational numbers</u>	396
<i>Sebastian Rezat</i>	
 WORKING GROUP 3	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 3: Algebraic thinking</u>	406
<i>María C. Cañadas, Thérèse Dooley, Jeremy Hodgen, Reinhard Oldenburg</i>	
<u>Can they “see” the equality?</u>	410
<i>Vassiliki Alexandrou-Leonidou and George N. Philippou</i>	
<u>Patterning problems: sixth graders’ ability to generalize</u>	420
<i>Ana Barbosa</i>	
<u>The role of technology in developing principles of symbolical algebra</u>	429
<i>Giampaolo Chiappini</i>	
<u>Secondary school students’ perception of best help generalising strategies</u>	440
<i>Boon Liang Chua, Celia</i>	
<u>Using epistemic actions to trace the development of algebraic reasoning in a primary classroom</u>	450
<i>Thérèse Dooley</i>	
<u>Graphical representation and generalization in sequences problems</u>	460
<i>María C. Cañadas, Encarnación Castro, Enrique Castro</i>	
<u>The entrance to algebraic discourse: informal meta-arithmetic as the first step toward formal school algebra</u>	470
<i>Shai Caspi, Anna Sfard</i>	
<u>Students’ reasoning in quadratic equations with one unknown</u>	479
<i>M. Gözde Didiş, Sinem Baş, A. Kürşat Erbaş</i>	
<u>Investigating the influence of student’s previous knowledge on their concept of variables - an analysis tool considering teaching reality</u>	490
<i>Sandra Gerhard</i>	
<u>What is algebraic activity? Consideration of 9-10 year olds learning to solve linear equations</u>	500
<i>Dave Hewitt</i>	

<u>The role of discursive artefacts in making the structure of an algebraic expression emerge</u>	511
<i>Laura Maffei, Maria Alessandra Mariotti</i>	
<u>Algebraic thinking of grade 8 students in solving word problems with a spreadsheet</u>	521
<i>Sandra Nobre, Nélia Amado, Susana Carreira, João Pedro da Ponte</i>	
<u>Algebraic reasonings among primary school 4th grade pupils</u>	532
<i>Marta Pytlak</i>	
WORKING GROUP 4	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 4: Geometry teaching and learning</u>	542
<i>Philippe Richard, Athanasios Gagatsis, Sava Grozdev</i>	
<u>Innovative early teaching of isometries</u>	547
<i>Carlo Marchini, Paola Vighi</i>	
<u>Static and dynamic approach to forming: the concept of rotation</u>	558
<i>Edyta Jagoda, Ewa Swoboda</i>	
<u>Elementary students' transformational geometry abilities and cognitive style</u>	568
<i>Xenia Xistouri, Demetra Pitta-Pantazi</i>	
<u>Geometrical transformations as viewed by prospective teachers</u>	578
<i>Xhevdet Thaqi, Joaquin Giménez, Nuria Rosich</i>	
<u>Preservice teachers and the learning of geometry</u>	588
<i>Lina Fonseca, Elisabete Cunha</i>	
<u>Towards a comprehensive theoretical model of students' geometrical figure understanding and its relation with proof</u>	598
<i>Eleni Deliyianni, Athanasios Gagatsis, Annita Monoyiou, Paraskevi Michael, Panayiota Kalogirou, Alain Kuzniak</i>	
<u>Secondary Students behavior in proof tasks: understanding and the influence of the geometrical figure</u>	608
<i>Athanasios Gagatsis, Paraskevi Michael, Eleni Deliyianni, Annita Monoyiou, Alain Kuzniak</i>	
<u>Relations between geometrical paradigms and van Hiele levels</u>	618
<i>Annette Braconne-Michoux</i>	
<u>Geometry as propaedeutic to model building – a reflection on secondary school teachers' beliefs</u>	628
<i>Boris Girnat</i>	
<u>Geometric work at the end of compulsory education</u>	638
<i>Alain Kuzniak</i>	
<u>Language in the geometry classroom</u>	649
<i>Caroline Bulf, Anne-Cécile Mathé, Joris Mithalal</i>	
<u>Proofs and refutations in lower secondary school geometry</u>	660
<i>Taro Fujita, Keith Jones, Susumu Kunimune, Hiroyuki Kumakura, Shinichiro Matsumoto</i>	

<u>Identifying the structure of regular and semiregular solids – a comparative study between different forms of representation</u>	670
<i>Jürgen Steinwandl and Matthias Ludwig</i>	
<u>Generating shapes in a dynamic environment</u>	681
<i>Sue Forsythe</i>	
<u>Integrating number, algebra, and geometry with interactive geometry software</u>	691
<i>Kate Mackrell</i>	
WORKING GROUP 5	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 5: Stochastic thinking</u>	701
<i>Dave Pratt</i>	
<u>Designing pedagogic opportunities for statistical thinking within inquiry based science</u>	705
<i>Janet Ainley, Tina Jarvis and Frankie McKeon</i>	
<u>Preservice primary school teachers’ intuitive use of representations in uncertain situations</u>	715
<i>Chiara Andrà</i>	
<u>Relating graph semiotic complexity to graph comprehension in statistical graphs produced by prospective teachers</u>	725
<i>Pedro Arteaga, Carmen Batanero</i>	
<u>The challenges of teaching statistics in secondary vocational education</u>	735
<i>Arthur Bakker, Monica Wijer, Sanne Akkerman</i>	
<u>Children’s emergent inferential reasoning about samples in an inquiry-based environment</u>	745
<i>Dani Ben-Zvi, Katie Makar, Arthur Bakker, Keren Aridor</i>	
<u>Investigating relative likelihood comparisons of multinomial, contextual sequences</u>	755
<i>Egan J Chernoff</i>	
<u>Prospective teachers’ common and specialized knowledge in a probability task</u>	766
<i>J. Miguel Contreras, Carmen Batanero, Carmen Díaz, José A. Fernandes</i>	
<u>Investigating secondary teachers’ statistical understandings</u>	776
<i>Helen M. Doerr, Bridgette Jacob</i>	
<u>Mental models of basic statistical concepts</u>	787
<i>Andreas Eichler, Markus Vogel</i>	
<u>Instructional representations in the teaching of statistical graphs</u>	797
<i>Maria Teresa González Astudillo, Jesús Enrique Pinto Sosa</i>	
<u>Assessing difficulties of conditional probability problems</u>	807
<i>M. Pedro Huerta, Fernando Cerdán, M^a Ángeles Lonjedo, Patricia Edo</i>	
<u>Using a rasc partial credit model to analyze the responses of Brazilian undergraduate students to a statistics questionnaire</u>	818
<i>Verônica Y. Kataoka, Claudia Borim da Silva, Claudette Vendramini, Irene Cazorla</i>	
<u>Attitudes of teachers towards statistics: a preliminary study with Portuguese teachers</u>	828
<i>José Alexandre Martins, Maria Manuel Nascimento, Assumpta Estrada</i>	
<u>Developing an online community of teaching practitioners: a case study</u>	838
<i>Maria Meletiou-Mavrotheris, Efi Papanastasiou</i>	

<u>Risk taking and probabilistic thinking in preschoolers</u>	848
<i>Zoi Nikiforidou, Jenny Pange</i>	
<u>Influential aspects in middle school students' understanding of statistics variation</u>	853
<i>Antonio Orta, Ernesto Sánchez</i>	
<u>Carrying out, modelling and simulating random experiments in the classroom</u>	864
<i>Michel Henry, Bernard Parzysz</i>	
<u>Risk-based decision-making by mathematics and science teachers</u>	875
<i>Dave Pratt, Ralph Levinson, Phillip Ken, Cristina Yogui</i>	
<u>Individual pathways in the development of students' conceptions of patterns of chance</u>	885
<i>Susanne Predige, Susanne Schnell</i>	
<u>The role of relevant knowledge and cognitive ability in gambler fallacy</u>	896
<i>Caterina Primi & Francesca Chiesi</i>	
<u>Connecting experimental and theoretical perspectives</u>	905
<i>Theodosia Prodromou</i>	
<u>Implementing a more coherent statistics curriculum</u>	915
<i>Anneke Verschut and Arthur Bakker</i>	
 WORKING GROUP 6	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 6: Application and modelling</u>	925
<i>Gabriele Kaiser, Susana Carreira, Thomas Lingefjärd, Geoff Wake</i>	
<u>Are integrated thinkers better able to intervene adaptively? – a case study in a mathematical modelling environment</u>	927
<i>Rita Borromeo Ferri and Werner Blum</i>	
<u>A modelling approach to developing an understanding of average rate of change</u>	937
<i>Helen M. Doerr and AnnMarie H. O'Neil</i>	
<u>An investigation of mathematical modelling in the Swedish national course test⁴⁷ in mathematics</u>	947
<i>Peter Frejd</i>	
<u>Modelling problems and digital tools in German centralised examinations</u>	957
<i>Gilbert Greefrath</i>	
<u>Analysis of the problem solving process and the use of representations while handling complex mathematical story problems in primary school</u>	964
<i>Johannes Groß, Katharina Hohn, Siebel Tellil, Renate Rasch, Wolfgang Schnotz</i>	
<u>Application and the identity of mathematics</u>	973
<i>Kasper Bjering Søby Jensen</i>	
<u>Students constructing modelling tasks to peers</u>	982
<i>Thomas Lingefjärd</i>	
<u>Modelling as a big idea in mathematics with significance for classroom instruction – how do pre-service teachers see it?</u>	990
<i>Hans-Stefan Siller, Sebastian Kuntze, Stephen Lerman, Christiane Vogl</i>	

<u>Modelling in an integrated mathematics and science curriculum: bridging the divide</u>	1000
<i>Geoff Wake</i>	
<u>Exploring the solving process of groups solving realistic Fermi problem from the perspective of the anthropological theory of didactics</u>	1010
<i>Jonas Bergman Ärlebäck</i>	
<u>Hypotheses and assumptions by modeling – a case study</u>	1020
<i>Roxana Grigoraş</i>	
 WORKING GROUP 7	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 7: Mathematical potential, creativity and talent</u>	1030
<i>Roza Leikin, Demetra Pitta-Pantazi, Florence Mihaela Singer, Andreas Ulovec</i>	
<u>Integrating theories in the promotion of critical thinking in mathematics classrooms</u>	1034
<i>Einav Aizikovitsh-Udi, Miriam Amit</i>	
<u>High attaining versus (highly) gifted pupils in mathematics: a theoretical concept and an empirical survey</u>	1044
<i>Matthias Brandl</i>	
<u>Does mathematical creativity differentiate mathematical ability?</u>	1056
<i>Maria Kattou, Katerina Kontoyianni, Demetra Pitta-Pantazi, Constantinos Christou</i>	
<u>Unraveling mathematical giftedness</u>	1066
<i>Katerina Kontoyianni, Maria Kattou, Demetra Pitta-Pantazi, Constantinos Christou</i>	
<u>Questioning assumptions that limit the learning of fractions: The story of two fifth graders</u>	1075
<i>Andreas O. Kyriakides</i>	
<u>Mathematical creativity of 8th and 10th grade students.</u>	1084
<i>Roza Leikin, Yona Kloss</i>	
<u>Employing multiple-solution-tasks for the development of mathematical creativity: two comparative studies</u>	1094
<i>Roza Leikin, Anat Levav-Waynberg, Raisa Guberman</i>	
<u>Mathematical creativity in elementary school: Is it individual or collective?</u>	1104
<i>Esther Levenson</i>	
<u>Developing creative mathematical activities: method transfer and hypotheses' formulation</u>	1115
<i>Božena Maj</i>	
<u>Didactical vs. mathematical modelling of the notion competence in mathematics education: case of 9-10-year old pupils' problem solving</u>	1125
<i>Bernard Sarrazy, Jarmila Novotná</i>	
<u>Problem posing and modification as a criterion of mathematical creativity</u>	1133
<i>Florence Mihaela Singer, Ildikó Pelczer, Cristian Voica</i>	
<u>Creativity in three-dimensional geometry: How can an interactive 3d-geometry software environment enhance it?</u>	1143
<i>Paraskevi Sophocleous, Demetra Pitta-Pantazi</i>	
<u>Mathematical challenging tasks in elementary grades</u>	1154
<i>Isabel Vale, Teresa Pimentel</i>	

WORKING GROUP 8

- [Introduction to the papers of WG 8: Affect and mathematical thinking](#) 1165
Marilena Pantziara, Pietro Di Martino, Kjersti Wæge, Wolfgang Schloeglmann
- [Self – about using representations while solving geometrical problems](#) 1167
Areti Panaoura, Eleni Deliyianni, Athanasios Gagatsis and Iliada Elia
- [A comparative study of Norwegian and English secondary students' attitude towards mathematics](#) 1179
Birgit Pepin
- [The pupils' voice in creating a mathematically resilient community of learners](#) 1189
Clare Lee, Sue Johnston-Wilder
- ["You understand him, yet you don't understand me?!" – On learning mathematics as an interplay of mathematizing and identifying](#) 1199
Einat Heyd-Metzuyanin, Anna Sfard
- [An intervention on students' problem-solving beliefs](#) 1209
Gabriel Stylianides, Andreas Stylianides
- [A reversal theory perspective on disaffection using two examples](#) 1219
Gareth Lewis
- [Students' dispositions to study further mathematics in higher education: the effect of students' mathematics self-efficacy](#) 1229
Irene Kleanthous, Julian Williams
- [An examination of the connections between self discrepancies' and effort, enjoyment and grades in mathematics](#) 1239
Laura Tuohilampi
- [The impact of context and culture on the construction of personal meaning](#) 1249
Maïke Vollstedt
- [The effect of a teacher education program on affect: the case of Teresa and PFCM](#) 1259
Maria Pezzia and Pietro Di Martino
- [Fear of failure in mathematics. What are the sources?](#) 1269
Marilena Pantziara and George Philippou

WORKING GROUP 9

- [Introduction to the papers of WG 9: Language and mathematics](#) 1279
Maria Luiza Cestari
- [Infinite and unbounded sets: a pragmatic perspective](#) 1282
Cristina Bardelle
- [Mathematical joint construction at elementary grade – a reconstruction of collaborative problem solving in dyads](#) 1292
Birgit Brandt, Gyde Höck
- [The concept of equivalence in a socially constructed language in a primary school class](#) 1302
Cristina Coppola, Monica Mollo, Tiziana Pacelli

<u>Contention in mathematical discourse in small Groups in elementary school teaching</u>	1313
<i>Andrea Gellert</i>	
<u>Turn-taking in the mathematics classroom</u>	1325
<i>Jenni Ingram, Mary Briggs and Peter Johnston-Wilder</i>	
<u>Communicating experience of 3D space: Mathematical and Everyday Discourse</u>	1335
<i>Candia Morgan, Jehad Alshwaikh</i>	
<u>A working model for Improving Mathematics teaching and learning for bilingual students</u>	1346
<i>Máire Ní Ríordáin</i>	
<u>Revoicing in processes of collective mathematical argumentation among students</u>	1356
<i>Núria Planas, Laura Morera</i>	
<u>Epistemological and semiotic issues related to the concept of symmetry</u>	1366
<i>Frode Rønning</i>	
<u>Language as a shaping identity tool: The case of in-service Greek teachers</u>	1376
<i>Konstantinos Tatsis</i>	

WORKING GROUP 10

<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 10:</u>	
<u>Discussing diversity in mathematics education from social, cultural and political perspectives</u>	1386
<i>Paola Valero, Sarah Crafter, Uwe Gellert, Núria Gorgorió</i>	
<u>Agency in mathematics education</u>	1389
<i>Annica Andersson, Eva Norén</i>	
<u>Interplays between context and students' achievement of agency</u>	1399
<i>Annica Andersson</i>	
<u>Climate change and mathematics education: making the invisible visible</u>	1409
<i>Richard Barwell, Christine Suurtamm</i>	
<u>Teachers discussions about parental use of implicit and explicit mathematics in the home</u>	1419
<i>Sarah Crafte, Guida de Abreu</i>	
<u>Students perceptions about the relevance of mathematics in an Ethiopian preparatory school</u>	1430
<i>Anduaem Tamiru Gebremichael, Simon Goodchild and Olav Nygaard</i>	
<u>Differential access to vertical discourse</u>	
<u>– Managing diversity in a secondary mathematics classroom</u>	1440
<i>Uwe Gellert, Hauke Straehler-Pohl</i>	
<u>Mathematics teachers' social representations and identities made available to immigrant students</u>	1450
<i>Núria Gorgorió, Montserrat Prat</i>	
<u>Social functions of school mathematics</u>	1460
<i>David Kollosche</i>	
<u>Becoming disadvantaged: public discourse around national testing</u>	1470
<i>Troels Lange, Tamsin Meaney</i>	

<u>Parent-child interactions on primary school-related mathematics</u>	1481
<i>Richard Newton, Guida de Abreu</i>	
<u>Socio-cultural roots of the attribution process in family mathematics education</u>	1491
<i>Javier Díez-Palomar, Sandra Torras Ortin</i>	
<u>Between school and company: a field of tension?</u>	1501
<i>Toril Eskeland Rangnes</i>	
<u>Ethnomathematics in European Context</u>	1511
<i>Charoula Stathopoulou, Karen Françoi, Darlinda Moreira</i>	
<u>Doctoral programs in mathematics education: current status and future pathways for Turkey</u>	1521
<i>Behiye Ubuz, Erdinç Çakıroğlu, Ayhan Kürşat Erbaş</i>	
<u>Connecting the notion of foreground in critical mathematics education with the theory of habitus</u>	1531
<i>Tine Wedege</i>	
 WORKING GROUP 11	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 11: Comparative studies in mathematics education</u>	1541
<i>Eva Jablonka, Paul Andrews</i>	
<u>The case of calculus: Comparative look at task representation in textbooks</u>	1545
<i>Emmanuel Adu-tutu Bofah, Markku Hannula</i>	
<u>The teaching of linear equations: Comparing effective teachers from three high achieving European countries</u>	1555
<i>Paul Andrews</i>	
<u>Exploratory data analysis of a european teacher training course on modelling</u>	1565
<i>Richard Cabassut, Jean-Paul Villette</i>	
<u>Comparison of item performance in a Norwegian study using U.S. developed mathematical knowledge for teaching measures</u>	1575
<i>Arne Jakobsen, Janne Fauskanger, Reidar Mosvold and Raymond Bjuland</i>	
<u>Belgian and Turkish pre-service primary school mathematics teachers' metaphorical thinking about mathematics</u>	1585
<i>Çiğdem Kiliç</i>	
<u>Problem solving and open problems in teachers' training in the French and Mexican modes</u>	1594
<i>Alain Kuzniak, Bernard Parzysz, Manuel Santos-Trigo, Laurent Vivier</i>	
<u>What kind of teaching in different types of classes?</u>	1605
<i>Céline Maréchal</i>	
<u>Comparing the construction of mathematical knowledge between low-achieving and high-achieving students – a case study</u>	1614
<i>Ingolf Schäfer, Alexandra Winkler</i>	
<u>Conceptual metaphors and “grundvorstellungen”: a case of convergence?</u>	1625
<i>Jorge Soto-Andrade, Pamela Reyes-Santander</i>	

WORKING GROUP 12

<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 12: History in mathematics education</u>	1636
<i>Uffe Thomas Jankvist, Snezana Lawrence, Constantinos Tzanakis, Jan van Maanen</i>	
<u>Uses of history in mathematics education: development of learning strategies and historical awareness</u>	1640
<i>Tinne Hoff Kjeldsen</i>	
<u>Classifying the arguments and methodological schemes for integrating history in mathematics education</u>	1650
<i>Constantinos Tzanakis, Yannis Thomaidis</i>	
<u>The development of attitudes and beliefs questionnaire towards using history of mathematics in mathematics education</u>	1660
<i>Mustafa Alpaslan, Mine Isiksal, Cigdem Haser</i>	
<u>Implementing ‘modern math’ in iceland –Informing parents and the public</u>	1670
<i>Kristín Bjarnadóttir</i>	
<u>Voices from the field: incorporating history of mathematics in Teaching</u>	1680
<i>Kathleen M. Clark</i>	
<u>Designing teaching modules on the history, application, and philosophy of mathematics</u>	1690
<i>Uffe Thomas Jankvist</i>	
<u>Uses of history in mathematics education: development of learning strategies and historical awareness</u>	1700
<i>Tinne Hoff Kjeldsen</i>	
<u>Establishing the ‘meter’ as citizens of French National assembly during French Revolution</u>	1710
<i>Panayota Kotarinou, Charoula Stathopoulou, Anna Chronaki</i>	
<u>Lessons from early 17th century for current mathematics curriculum design</u>	1720
<i>Jenneke Krüger</i>	
<u>How much meaning can we construct around geometric constructions?</u>	1730
<i>Snezana Lawrence and Peter Ransom</i>	
<u>Identity of mathematics educators. The Portuguese case (1981 - 1990)</u>	1740
<i>José Manuel Matos</i>	
<u>The Teaching of Mathematics in Portugal in the 18th century – The creation of the 1st faculty of Mathematics in the world</u>	1750
<i>Catarina Motaa, Maria Elfrida Ralhab, Maria Fernanda Estrada</i>	
<u>Using students’ journals to explore their affective engagement in a module on the history of mathematics</u>	1760
<i>Maurice OReilly</i>	
<u>A cross-curricular approach using history in the mathematics classroom with students aged 11-16</u>	1770
<i>Peter Ransom</i>	

WORKING GROUP 13

<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 13: Early years mathematics</u>	1780
<i>Ingvald_Erfjord, Ema Mamede, Götz Krummheuer</i>	
<u>Issues on children's ideas of fractions when quotient interpretation is used</u>	1782
<i>Ema Mamede, Manuela Oliveira</i>	
<u>Finger-symbol-sets and multi-touch for a better understanding of numbers and operations</u>	1792
<i>Silke Ladel, Ulrich Kortenkamp</i>	
<u>Similar but different - investigating the use of MKT in a Norwegian kindergarten setting</u>	1802
<i>Reidar Mosvold, Raymond Bjuland, Janne Fauskanger, Arne Jakobsen</i>	
<u>Kindergartners' perspective taking abilities</u>	1812
<i>Aaltje Berendina Aaten, Marja van den Heuvel-Panhuizen, Iliada Elia</i>	
<u>The linguistic coding of Mathematical Supports</u>	1822
<i>Anna-Marietha Hümmer</i>	
<u>Analysis of mathematical solutions of 7 year old pupils when solving an arithmetic problem on distribution</u>	1832
<i>Edelmira Badillo, Vicenç Font, Mequè Edo, Núria Planas</i>	
<u>Kindergartners' use of gestures in the generation and communication of spatial thinking</u>	1842
<i>Iliada Elia, Athanasios Gagatsis, Paraskevi Michael, Alexia Georgiou, Marja van den Heuvel-Panhuizen</i>	
<u>How do children's classification appear in free play? A case study</u>	1852
<i>Vigdis Flottorp</i>	
<u>ERSTMAL-Fast (early Steps in Mathematics Learning - Family Study)</u>	1861
<i>Ergi Acar</i>	
<u>Changing mathematical practice of kindergarten teachers.</u>	
<u>Co-learning in a developmental research project</u>	1872
<i>Per Sigurd Hundeland, Martin Carlsen and Ingvald Erfjord</i>	
<u>"Looking for tricks": a natural strategy, early forerunner of algebraic thinking</u>	1882
<i>Maria Mellone</i>	
<u>Can you take half? Kindergarten children's responses</u>	1891
<i>Dina Tirosh, Pessia Tsamir, Michal Tabach, Esther Levenson, and Ruthi Barkai</i>	
<u>Investigating geometric knowledge and self-efficacy among abused and neglected kindergarten children</u>	1902
<i>Pessia Tsamir, Dina Tirosh, Esther Levenson, Michal Tabach, and Ruthi Barkai</i>	
<u>Playing and learning in early mathematics education – Modelling a Complex relationship</u>	1912
<i>Stephanie Schuler</i>	

WORKING GROUP 14

<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 14: University mathematics education</u>	1923
<i>Elena Nardi, Alejandro S. González-Martin, Ghislaine Gueudet, Paola Iannone, Carl Winsløw</i>	
<u>Why abstract algebra for pre-service primary school teachers</u>	1928
<i>Eleni Agathocleous</i>	
<u>‘Applicationism’ as the dominant epistemology at university level</u>	1938
<i>Berta Barquero, Marianna Bosch, Josep Gascón</i>	
<u>Designing alternative undergraduate delivery: oil and massage</u>	1949
<i>Bill Barton</i>	
<u>Why do Students go to Lectures?</u>	1960
<i>Christer Bergsten</i>	
<u>Designing and evaluating blended learning bridging courses in mathematics</u>	1971
<i>Biehler, R.; Fischer, P.R.; Hochmuth, R.; Wassong, Th.</i>	
<u>Employing potentialities and limitations of electronic environments: The case of derivative</u>	1981
<i>Irene Biza, Victor Giraldo</i>	
<u>The changing profile of third level service mathematics in Ireland (1997-2010)</u>	1992
<i>Fiona Faulkner, Ailish Hannigan, Olivia Gill</i>	
<u>Using CAS based work to ease the transition from calculus to real analysis</u>	2002
<i>Erika Gyöngyösi, Jan Philip Solovej, Carl Winsløw</i>	
<u>Undergraduate students’ use of deductive arguments to solve “prove that...” tasks</u>	2012
<i>Paola Iannone, Matthew Inglis</i>	
<u>How we teach mathematics: discourses on/in university teaching</u>	2022
<i>Barbara Jaworski and Janette Matthews</i>	
<u>What affects retention of core calculus concepts among university students? A study of different teaching approaches in Croatia and Denmark</u>	2033
<i>Ljerka Jukić, Bettina Dahl (Soendergaard)</i>	
<u>University students linking limits, derivatives, integrals and continuity</u>	2043
<i>Kristina Juter</i>	
<u>‘Driving noticing’ yet ‘risking precision’: university mathematicians’ pedagogical perspectives on verbalisation in mathematics</u>	2053
<i>Elena Nardi</i>	
<u>Threshold concepts: a framework for research in University mathematics education</u>	2063
<i>Kerstin Pettersson</i>	
<u>Challenges with visualization: the concept of integral with undergraduate students</u>	2073
<i>Blanca Souto Rubio, Inés María Gómez-Chacón</i>	
<u>The secondary-tertiary transition: a clash between two mathematical discourses</u>	2083
<i>Erika Stadler</i>	

<u>Students' conceptions of functions at the transition between secondary school and university</u>	2093
<i>Fabrice Vandebrouck</i>	
<u>Discourses of functions – university mathematics teaching through a commognitive lens</u>	2103
<i>Olov Viirman</i>	
<u>Secondary-tertiary transition and evolutions of didactic contract: the example of duality in linear algebra</u>	2113
<i>Martine De Vleeschouwer, Ghislaine Gueudet</i>	
<u>A didactic survey of the Main characteristics of Lagrange's Theorem in mathematics and in economics</u>	2123
<i>Sebastian Xhonneux, Valérie Henry</i>	
<u>A questionnaire for surveying mathematics self-efficacy expectations of prospective teachers</u>	2134
<i>Marc Zimmermann, Christine Bescherer, Christian Spannagel</i>	
WORKING GROUP 15	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 15: Technologies and resources in mathematics education</u>	2144
<i>Jana Trgalová, Anne Berit Fuglesta, Mirko Maracci, Hans-Georg Weigand</i>	
<u>Mathematics student teachers' pedagogical use of technologies – different taxonomies in the classroom</u>	2148
<i>Nélia Amado</i>	
<u>Symbolic generalization in a computer intensive environment: the case of Amy</u>	2158
<i>Michal Tabach</i>	
<u>Teachers' and students' first experience of a curriculum material with TI-Nspire technology</u>	2168
<i>Per-Eskil Persson</i>	
<u>Teachers transforming resources into orchestrations</u>	2178
<i>Paul Drijvers</i>	
<u>The use of mathematics software in university mathematics teaching</u>	2188
<i>Iris Attorps, Kjell Björk, Mirko Radic</i>	
<u>Calculators as digital resources</u>	2198
<i>Gilles Aldon</i>	
<u>Transitions between micro-contexts of mathematical practices</u>	2208
<i>Vasilis Tsitsos, Charoula Stathopoulou</i>	
<u>Function concept and transformations of functions: the role of the graphic calculator</u>	2218
<i>Madalena Consciência, Hélia Oliveira</i>	
<u>A survey of technology use: the rise of interactive whiteboards and the mymaths website</u>	2228
<i>Nicola Bretscher</i>	
<u>Graphic calculator use in primary schools: an example of an instrumental approach</u>	2238
<i>Per Storfossen</i>	
<u>An online games as a learning environment for early algebraic problem solving by upper primary school students</u>	2248
<i>Angeliki Kolovou, Marja van den Heuvel-Panhuizen</i>	

<u>Framing a problem solving approach based on the use of computational tools to develop mathematical thinking</u>	2258
<i>Manuel Santos-Trigo, Matías Camacho-Machín</i>	
<u>Analysing teachers' classroom practice when new technologies are in use</u>	2268
<i>Mary Genevieve Billington</i>	
<u>Implementation of a multi-touch environment supporting finger symbol sets</u>	2278
<i>Silke Ladel, Ulrich Kortenkamp</i>	
<u>Researching technological, pedagogical and mathematical undergraduate primary teachers' knowledge (TpaCK)</u>	2288
<i>Spyros Doukakis, Maria Chionidou-Moskofoglou, Dimitrios Zibidis</i>	
<u>The co-construction of a mathematical and a didactical instrument</u>	2298
<i>Mariam Haspekian</i>	
<u>Working with teachers: collaboration in a community around innovative software</u>	2308
<i>Jean-Baptiste Lagrange</i>	
<u>Extending the technology acceptance model to assess secondary school teachers' intention to use cabri in geometry teaching</u>	2318
<i>Marios Pittalis & Constantinos Christou</i>	
<u>Challenges teachers face with integrating ICT with an inquiry approach in mathematics</u>	2328
<i>Anne Berit Fuglestad</i>	
<u>Technologies and tools in teaching mathematics to visually impaired students</u>	2339
<i>Iveta Kohanová</i>	
<u>A study on mathematics teachers' use of textbooks in instructional process</u>	2349
<i>Meriç Özgeldi, Erdinç Çakıroğlu</i>	
<u>Collective design of an online math textbook: when Individual and collective documentation works meet</u>	2356
<i>Hussein Sabra, Luc Trouche</i>	
<u>Developing a competence model for working with symbolic calculators</u>	2367
<i>Hans-Georg Weigand</i>	
WORKING GROUP 16	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 16:</u>	
<u>Different theoretical perspectives and approaches in research in mathematics education</u>	2377
<i>Ivy Kidron, Angelika Bikner-Ahsbabs, John Monaghan, Luis Radford, Gérard Sensevy</i>	
<u>Research praxeologies and networking theories</u>	2381
<i>M. Artigue, M. Bosch, J. Gascón</i>	
<u>Exploring fragmentation in mathematics education research</u>	2391
<i>Ayshea Craig</i>	
<u>Complementing and integrating theoretical tools: a case study concerning poor learners</u>	2401
<i>Nadia Douek</i>	
<u>Mathematical objects through the lens of three different theoretical perspectives</u>	2411
<i>Vicenç Font, Uldarico Malaspina, Joaquin Giménez, Miguel R. Wilhelmi</i>	

<u>Using different sociocultural perspectives in mathematics teaching developmental research</u>	2421
<i>Simon Goodchild</i>	
<u>The possibility of a perspectival research on mathematics learning</u>	2431
<i>Tim Jay</i>	
<u>Recovering mathematical awareness by linguistic analysis of variable substitution</u>	2441
<i>Kaenders, R.H., Kvasz, L., Weiss-Pidstrygach, Y.</i>	
<u>How a general epistemic need leads to a need for a new construct</u>	
<u>A case of networking two theoretical approaches</u>	2451
<i>Ivy Kidrona, Angelika Bikner-Ahsbahs, Tommy Dreyfus</i>	
<u>Mathematics learning through the lenses of cultural historical activity theory and the theory of knowledge objectification</u>	2462
<i>Lionel N. LaCroix</i>	
<u>Using practical epistemology analysis to study the teacher's and students' joint action in the mathematics classroom</u>	2472
<i>Florence Ligozat, Per-Olof Wickman, Karim Hamza</i>	
<u>Discerning in and between theories in mathematics education</u>	2482
<i>John Mason</i>	
<u>Theoretical genesis of an informal meta-theory to develop a way of talking about mathematics and science education and to connect European and North American literature</u>	2493
<i>John Monaghan</i>	
<u>Meaning of mathematical objects: a comparison between semiotic perspectives</u>	2503
<i>Giorgio Santi</i>	
<u>Modeling external representations as mediators of meaning in the mathematics classroom</u>	2513
<i>Håkan Sollervall</i>	
<u>Combining theories to analyze classroom discourse: a method to study learning process</u>	2524
<i>Michal Tabach Talli Nachlieli</i>	
 WORKING GROUP 17	
<u>Introduction to the papers of WG 17:</u>	
<u>From a study of teaching practices to issues in teacher education</u>	2533
<i>Leonor Santos, Claire Berg, Laurinda Brown, Nicolina Malara, Despina Potari, Fay Turner</i>	
<u>Primary school teachers' practices using a same manual written by didactician</u>	2539
<i>Sara Arditì</i>	
<u>A study of a problem solving oriented lesson structure in mathematics in Japan</u>	2549
<i>Yukiko Asami-Johansson</i>	
<u>Lesson study as a process for professional development: working with teachers to effect significant and sustained changes in practice</u>	2559
<i>Jenni Back, Marie Joubert</i>	
<u>An attempt at defining teachers' mathematics through research on mathematics at work</u>	2569
<i>Nadine Bednarz, Jérôme Proulx</i>	

<u>Adopting an inquiry approach to teaching practice: the case of a primary school teacher</u>	2580
<i>Claire Vaugelade Berg</i>	
<u>Mathematical investigations in the classroom: a context for the development of professional knowledge of mathematics teachers</u>	2590
<i>Ana Paula Canavarro, Mónica Patrício</i>	
<u>Why do some french teachers propose «problèmes ouverts» in mathematics to their pupils in primary school ?</u>	2600
<i>Christine Choquet</i>	
<u>The need to make ‘boundary objects’ meaningful: a learning outcome from lesson study research</u>	2609
<i>Dolores Corcoran</i>	
<u>Analysis of the teacher’s role in an approach to algebra as a tool for thinking: problems pointed out during laboratorial activities with perspective teachers</u>	2619
<i>Annalisa Cusi, Nicolina A. Malara</i>	
<u>The impact of teaching mental calculation strategies to primary PGCE students</u>	2630
<i>Sue Davis</i>	
<u>Re-defining HCK to approach transition</u>	2640
<i>Sáinza Fernández, Lourdes Figueiras, Jordi Deulofeu, Mario Martínez</i>	
<u>Conceptions and practices of mathematical communication</u>	2650
<i>António Guerreir, Lurdes Serrazina</i>	
<u>Lesson study in Teacher Education: a tool to establish a learning community</u>	2660
<i>Guðný Helga Gunnarsdótti, Guðbjörg Pálsdóttir</i>	
<u>The use of the empty number line to develop a programme of mental mathematics for primary trainee teachers</u>	2670
<i>Gwen Ineson</i>	
<u>Readings of the mathematical meaning shaped in the classroom: exploiting different lenses</u>	2680
<i>Maria Kaldrimidou, Haralambos Sakonidis, Marianna Tzekaki</i>	
<u>The nature of preservice teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge</u>	2690
<i>Hulya Kilic</i>	
<u>Literacy in mathematics – a challenge for teachers in their work with pupils</u>	2697
<i>Bodil Kleve</i>	
<u>Helping in-service teachers analyze and construct mathematical tasks according to their cognitive demand</u>	2707
<i>Eugenia Koleza, Christos Markopoulos, Stella Nika</i>	
<u>Professional knowledge related to Big Ideas in Mathematics – an empirical study with pre-service teachers</u>	2717
<i>Sebastian Kuntze, Stephen Lerman, Bernard Murphy, Elke Kurz-Milcke, Hans-Stefan Siller, Peter Winbourne</i>	
<u>The role of video-based experiences in the teacher education of pre-service mathematics teachers</u>	2727
<i>Miriam Listo, Olivia Gill</i>	

<u>Multicommented transcripts methodology as an educational tool for teachers involved in constructive didactical projects in early algebra</u>	2737
<i>Nicolina A. Malara, Giancarlo Navarra</i>	
<u>Laboratory activities in teacher training</u>	2746
<i>Francesca Martignone</i>	
<u>Plannig teaching activity within a continuous training program</u>	2756
<i>Cristina Martin, Leonor Santos</i>	
<u>Mathematics problem solving professional learning through collaborative action research</u>	2766
<i>Joyce Mgombelo, Kamini Jaipal-Jamani</i>	
<u>A study of the differences between the surface and the deep structures of math lessons</u>	2777
<i>Edyta Nowińska</i>	
<u>Teachers managing the curriculum in the context of the mathematics' subject group</u>	2787
<i>Cláudia Canha Nunes, João Pedro da Ponte</i>	
<u>Prospective mathematics teachers' noticing of classroom practice through critical events</u>	2798
<i>Despina Potari, Giorgos Psychari, Eirini Kouletsi, Maria Diamantis</i>	
<u>Curricular changes in preparation of future teachers – financial mathematics course</u>	2808
<i>Michaela Regecová, Mária Slavičková</i>	
<u>Knowing mathematics as a teacher</u>	2817
<i>C. Miguel Ribeiro; José Carrillo</i>	
<u>Secondary mathematics teachers' content knowledge: the case of Heidi</u>	2827
<i>Tim Rowland, Libby Jared, Anne Thwaites</i>	
<u>Pre-service teacers learning to assess mathematical competencies</u>	2838
<i>Norma Rubio, Vicenç Font, Joaquim Giménez, Uldarico Malaspina</i>	
<u>Moving beyond an evaluative teaching mode: the case of diana</u>	2848
<i>Rosa Antónia Tomás Ferreira</i>	
<u>Preservice elementary teachers' geometry content knowledge in methods course</u>	2858
<i>Fatma Aslan-Tutak</i>	
<u>How to promote sustainable professional development?</u>	2868
<i>Stefan Zehetmeier, Konrad Krainer</i>	
<u>Concepts from mathematics education research as a trigger for mathematics teachers' reflections</u>	2878
<i>Mario Sánchez</i>	
<u>Teacher competences prerequisite to natural differentiation</u>	2888
<i>Marie Tichá, Alena Hošpesová</i>	
<u>Differences in the propositional knowledge and the knowledge in practice of beginning primary school teachers</u>	2898
<i>Fay Turner</i>	

POSTERS COMMUNICATIONS

Posters WG02

[Didactical environments “stepping” and “staircase”](#) 2911

Nad'a Stehliková, Milan Hejny, Darina Jirotková

[Understanding the infinity sets of numbers](#) 2913

Cristian Voica, Florence Mihaela Singer

Posters WG03

[Exploring patterns and algebraic thinking](#) 2915

António Borralho, Elsa Barbosa

[Prospective teachers doing modeling activities and interpreting students work](#) 2917

Neusa Branco

[Differentiated learning routes for school algebra using online database systems](#) 2919

Julia Pilet

[The teaching and learning of parameters in families of functions](#) 2921

Manuel Saraiva

Posters WG05

[Learning risk in socio-scientific context](#) 2923

Hasan Akyuzlu

[Future elementary and kindergarten teachers' knowledge of statistics and of its didactics](#) 2925

Raquel Santos

[Comparing attitudes towards mathematics and statistics of k-10 students:
preliminary results](#) 2927

Assumpta Estrada, Ana Serradó

Posters WG06

[Teaching differential equations with modelling](#) 2929

Guerrero-Ortiz, C., Camacho-Machín, M.

Poster WG08

[Beliefs of the usefulness of mathematics and mathematics self-beliefs as
important factors for mathematics attitudes](#) 2931

Peter Vankus

Posters WG09

[On the meaning of multiplication for different sets of numbers in a context of visualization](#) 2933

Raquel Barrera

[Gesture and visual-spatial thinking](#) 2935

Conceição Costa, José Manuel Matos

<u>The evolution of school mathematics discourse as seen through the lens of GCSE examinations</u>	2937
<i>Candia Morgan, Anna Sfard</i>	
<u>Self-regulation of students in Mathematics and oral communication in classroom</u>	2939
<i>Silvia Semana, Leonor Santos</i>	
<u>Teachers' endorsed and enacted narratives to promote mathematical communication</u>	2941
<i>Marie Bergholm</i>	
<u>Communication – a/the key to mathematics</u>	2943
<i>Birgit Gustafsson</i>	
Posters WG10	
<u>Family mathematics involvement: drawing from sociological point of view</u>	2945
<i>Javier Díez-Palomar, Sandra Torras-Ortin</i>	
<u>Learning mathematics: thoughts and interpretations of students with foreign backgrounds</u>	2947
<i>Petra Svensson</i>	
<u>The emergence of cultural mathematics: an ethnomathematical approach in the context of classroom</u>	2949
<i>Joana Latas, Darlinda Moreira</i>	
<u>Parental involvement in children's achievement: An exploratory study with French 2nd graders in Mathematics</u>	2951
<i>Ana Lobo de Mesquita</i>	
Posters WG11	
<u>Students' self-regulation, self-efficacy and mathematical competence in OECD's PISA</u>	2953
<i>David Pepper</i>	
<u>Contrasting prospective teacher education and student teaching in England and Slovakia</u>	2955
<i>Ján Šunderlík, Soňa Čeretková</i>	
Posters WG12	
<u>Developing a modern mathematics pedagogical content knowledge: the case of telescola in Portugal in the middle 1960'</u>	2957
<i>Mária Correia de Almeida, José Manuel Matos</i>	
<u>A study on the fundamental concept of 'measure' and its history</u>	2959
<i>Ana Amaral; Alexandra Gomes; Elfrida Ralha</i>	
<u>The Project of Modernization of the Mathematical Initiation in Primary School as curriculum development (1965-1973)</u>	2961
<i>Rui Candeias</i>	
<u>Who can understand the gifted students? A lesson plan based on history to enhance the gifted students' learning</u>	2963
<i>Ersin İlhan</i>	
<u>Teacher training at Pedro Nunes normal secondary school (1956-1969)</u>	2965
<i>José Manuel Matos, Teresa Maria Monteiro</i>	

Posters WG13

[The pedagogical consequences of a laissez Faire individualistic society](#) 2967
Judy Sayers

[ICT supported learning of mathematics in kindergarten](#) 2969
Martin Carlsen, Per Sigurd Hundeland, Ingvald Erfjord

Posters WG14

[The design and implementation of mathematical tasks to promote advanced mathematical thinking](#) 2971
Sinéad Breen, Ann O'Shea

[Critical multicultural instruction for undergraduate mathematical thinking courses](#) 2973
Irene M. Duranczyk

[Problem-based learning as a methodology of studying the didactic knowledge of derivatives in undergraduate courses in mathematics for economists](#) 2975
Moreno, M.M.; García, L., Azcárate, C.

[Some meanings of the derivative of a function](#) 2977
Perdomo-Díaza, J., Camacho-Machina, M. and Santos-Trigob, M.

[Transition secondary-tertiary level education via Math-Bridge](#) 2979
Julianna Zsidó, Viviane Durand-Guerrier

Posters WG15

[Chase for a bullet – use of ICT for developing students' functional thinking](#) 2981
Antonín Jančařík, Jarmila Novotná, Alena Pelantová

[The challenge of developing a European course for supporting teachers' use ICT](#) 2983
Michèle Artigue, Claire Cazes, Françoise Héroult, Gilles Marbeuf, Fabrice Vandebrouck

[Remedial scenarios for online and blended-learning bridging courses](#) 2985
Rolf Biehler, Pascal R. Fischer, Reinhard Hochmuth, Thomas Wassong

[I2geo.net – a platform for sharing dynamic geometry resources all over Europe](#) 2987
*Jana Trgalova, Ulrich Kortenkamp, Ana Paula Jahn, Paul Libbrecht, Christian Mercat
Tomas Recio, Sophie Soury-Lavergne*

[Mobile technology in mathematics courses for teacher students](#) 2989
Iveta Kohanová

[Pepimep Project: online database system and differentiated learning routes for school algebra](#) 2991
Françoise Chenevotot, Brigitte Grugeon-Allys

[Extending the mathematics textbooks analysis: questions of language and ICT](#) 2993
Carlos Alberto Batista Carvalho, José Manuel Leonardo de Freitas

[Intensive use of ICT in pre-service primary teachers' professional training in mathematics: Impact on teaching practices](#) 2995
Jean Baptiste Lagrange, Alexandre Becart

Posters WG16

- [Theoretical framework to analyse the problem solving process while handling complex mathematical story problems in primary school](#) 2997
Johannes Groß, Katharina Hohn, Sibel Telli, Renate Rasch, Wolfgang Schnotz
- [The complexity of advanced mathematical thinking at the non-university level](#) 2999
Miguel Silva, António Domingos
- [Networking theories: the ‘kom project’ and ‘adding it up’ through the lens of a learning situation](#) 3001
Yvonne Liljekvistan Jorryt van Bommel
- [A successful combination of COP and CHAT to understand prospective primary mathematics teachers’ learning?](#) 3003
Kicki Skog
- [Connecting theories to think of plane geometry teaching from elementary to middle school](#) 3005
Marie-Jeanne Perrin-Glorian

Posters WG17

- [Didactical analysis and citizenship with prospective mathematics teachers](#) 3007
Yuly M. Vanegas M., Joaquín Giménez, Vicenç Font
- [How to teach mathematical knowledge for teaching](#) 3009
Jorryt van Bommel
- [Analysing exams mathematical questions](#) 3011
Mário José Miranda Ceia
- [The practices of prospective teachers in South African and Canadian mathematical literacy teacher education programs: What works and what does not?](#) 3013
Joany Fransman, Joyce Mgombel, Marthie Van der Walt
- [Teachers’ use of graphing calculators in high school mathematics classroom – the influence of teachers’ professional knowledge](#) 3015
Helena Rocha
- [Deeper mathematical understanding through teacher and teaching assistant collaboration](#) 3017
Paul Spencer, Julie-Ann Edwards

SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF SCHOOL MATHEMATICS

David Kollosche

Universität Potsdam, Germany

In this essay, I explore the question which social functions school mathematics might hold. After presenting a criticism of prescriptive functions, the function of imparting mathematical knowledge and its boundaries are presented. A discussion of logic thinking, of alienation in modern societies, and of the functions of school mathematics in technocratic societies in general is presented that broadens the understanding of which social functions school mathematics might hold, leaving many open questions to explore.

RAISING THE QUESTION

Mathematics education is compulsory for all children in modern societies. What should be learnt and why it should be learnt are central questions of mathematics education research worldwide. Answers to these questions may vary in many aspects, but most mathematics education researchers agree on one point: routine calculations are over-represented and mathematics lessons should be more mind-challenging. Depending on perspective, »mind-challenging« may include focusing on creativity, problem solving, proofs and argumentations, applications and modelling, historical and social issues of mathematics, and so on; but, no matter the perspective, most suggest alternatives to routine calculations.⁴⁹

The questions *why to teach* and *what to teach* are explicitly addressed throughout the mathematics education literature and in national standards documents. Heinrich Winter's (1995) essay "Mathematikunterricht und Allgemeinbildung"⁵⁰ and Hans-Werner Heymann's thesis (1996) *Allgemeinbildung und Mathematik*⁵¹ are the most popular German examples of the first; the *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics* (2000) – published by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics in the USA – and the *Bildungsstandards im Fach Mathematik* (2004) –

⁴⁹ This paper will not discuss the corresponding concepts and show in what way they criticise too much routine calculations. For the purpose of this paper, it suffices to see that mathematics lessons comprehend routine calculations and that alternative concepts, in advocating different activities, are therefore directed against routine calculations. However, this is not to mean that mathematic educators or even mathematic teachers condemn routine calculations altogether.

⁵⁰ *Allgemeinbildung*, literally translated meaning *general education*, is a highly influential concept in German pedagogy without any conceptual equivalent in the English speaking world.

⁵¹ Available to English readers as Heymann (2003) *Why Teach Mathematics? A Focus on General Education*.

published by the German Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs and influenced by Heymann's work – are exemplars of the later.

Addressing what should be done implies that what is being done is not satisfactory. Winter and Heymann certainly belong to those who criticise too much calculating. But while the prescriptive concepts of Winter and Heymann suggest what should be done, they are unable to explain what is being done. Therefore, I ask: Is there any sense in having children master the masses of routine calculations, which we – the community of mathematics education researchers – might regard as being over-represented? Are there any reasons for the contemporary state of school mathematics? Can these explain why the abovementioned »mind-challenging« alternatives are not implemented on a large scale? And would not the answers to these questions strongly influence our ideas of what school mathematics should be like?

Pointing to tradition does not help here. Tradition may show us how the situation came to be, but it does not explain why some things changed while others have not. Therefore, I propose to address the issue in a broader context. Identifying school mathematics as an organ in our interacting, organic society, I raise the question: What are the social functions of school mathematics?

DISCUSSING NAÏVE ANSWERS

Curricular research offers a division between *material education*, i. e. mainly imparting knowledge, on the one hand and *formal education* on the other hand. My thesis is that the role of imparting mathematical knowledge is over-estimated and that further functions must be analysed to develop a comprehensive understanding of school mathematics.

A first approach to these functions might be a sceptical discussion of the concept of *competences* which curricular standards often use. These competences may already point to social functions of school mathematics, but starting with them creates problems. First, it is yet unclear how (or if) the demanded competences are indeed learned by children – especially when curricular concepts are used as tools for curricular reforms as is the case in the *Bildungsstandards im Fach Mathematik* –, and how (or if) these competences are indeed used outside school. Second, the focus on these competences might mask other functions of school mathematics that could be more central. Therefore, I suggest a different approach: After a discussion of the boundaries of imparting mathematical knowledge, I will elaborate on insightful connections between mathematical education on the one hand and Aristotelian logic, alienation and technocracy on the other hand. These are the points my studies concentrated on so far. In each case we can ask: What is the social impact of these and how does mathematical education contribute to them?

MATHEMATICAL KNOWLEDGE AND ITS BOUNDARIES

A function of school mathematics could be to have children impart certain mathematical knowledge in order to master certain situations that arise in society. Central questions are: What are these situations? What knowledge suits them? Is this knowledge indeed acquired in school?

A first set of situations that can be mastered mathematically is located in *private life*. Popular examples are cooking, shopping and trading, investments, or painting walls. A second set could consist of situations from *work life* that are not mathematics-intensive. Assuming that the mathematical knowledge required to master these situations is acquired in school mathematics, we nevertheless have to admit that the better part of school mathematics used in these situations has been taught after 7 or 8 years of school. For most people, quadratic, exponential, and trigonometric functions are not tools needed in mastering everyday situations in private or work life; neither are linear equation systems, calculus, conditional probability, and so forth. Heymann (2003, p. 104) argues:

In their private and professional everyday lives, adults who are not involved in mathematics-intensive careers make use of relatively little mathematics. Everything beyond the content of what is normally taught up to 7th grade (computing percentages, computing interest rates, rule of three) is practically insignificant in later life.⁵²

After comparing several studies exploring the uses of mathematics in private and work life, Heymann outlines the mathematical concepts that are frequently used (2003, pp. 88-89):

Arithmetic: counting; mastery of basic arithmetical operations ('in one's head' or with paper and pencil, depending on the complexity); calculating with quantities, knowledge of the most important units of measurement, making simple measurements (primarily of time and distance); calculating fractions with simple denominators in unambiguous contexts; calculating decimal fractions; computing averages (arithmetic mean); computing percentages; computing interest rates; using the rule of three; completing arithmetical operations with a pocket calculator; basic skills in estimating and making rough calculations.

Geometry: familiarity with elementary regular figures (circle, rectangle, square, etc.) and objects, as well as with elementary geometrical relationships and properties (perpendicularity, parallelism); ability to interpret and draw simple graphic representations of quantities and their relationships (charts, diagrams, maps) and the relationships between given points using Cartesian coordinate systems.

⁵² Heymann's thesis was followed by a vivid public discussion when the German red-top newspaper *Bild* (1995), disregarding the context of Heymann's work, printing the title »Professor: Too Much Maths is Nonsense« and stated, that »The mathematics adults need has been learned after 7 years of school.«

Working Group 10

Mathematics certainly *is* used to master situations in private and work life, and this mathematics *is* being taught in school. Here, I must make two points, however. First, only until the seventh year of school, imparting mathematical knowledge can be regarded as a social function for people in non-mathematical jobs. Second, it is yet unclear whether the mathematical knowledge used in private and work life is indeed learned in school.

It is at least doubtful whether the mathematical knowledge used in private and work life is indeed learned in school. In her influential publication *Cognition in practice*, Jean Lave (1988) presents studies of the everyday use of mathematics in private and work life conducted in Liberia and the USA. She doubts whether »schooling is a font of transferable abilities« (p. xiii) and develops her thesis that mathematical knowledge needed to master situations in private and work life is learned »in practice« rather than in school. More recent studies, for example studies on the numeracy of nurses in the UK (see Coben, 2010, p. 14), support Lave's thesis. Heymann shares this view (2003, p. 98):

A number of factors indicate that specific vocational mathematical qualifications tend to be learned more implicitly on the job and that thus the persons involved often remain unaware of them.

The thoughts presented above leave only a relatively small group of people engaged in mathematics-intensive professions, for whom higher mathematical qualification in school might be useful. Interpreted from a social perspective, it is possible that a function of school mathematics is to prepare as many children as possible for mathematics-intensive professions. It then would be reasonable to teach all children mathematics beyond their seventh year of school, attempting to maximise the number of children entering mathematics-intensive professions.

ENCULTURATION BEYOND KNOWLEDGE

Imparting mathematical knowledge is not as dominant a social function of school mathematics as might be expected. A critical examination of the sets of competences that curricular standards want children to learn in school mathematics suggests that competences such as »solving problems«, »modelling«, »using formal aspects of mathematics« or even »thinking logically« point at the nature of our engagement with the world, of our thinking. Our worldviews and the nature of our thinking depend on the society (or culture) in which we learned thinking and perceiving the world. This learning process can be called *enculturation*⁵³.

⁵³ »Enculturation« as a terminology, derives from cultural studies. Sociologists prefer to speak about »socialisation« while educators often prefer »education«, although the latter has a strong intentional meaning.

Working Group 10

Imparting mathematical knowledge is a part of enculturation, as it enables and encourages people to perceive and approach the world in a certain way, namely mathematically. Unfortunately, there is little literature on enculturation in school mathematics, though the work of, e.g., Roland Fischer, Alan Bishop and Ole Skovsmose is well acknowledged. However, Fischer's work (e. g. 2006) is very fragmentary and does not draw a comprehensive picture. Bishop's (1988) chapters on the »Values of Mathematical Culture« and on »Mathematical Culture and the Child« are highly important for my issue, but I do not want to discuss them in this paper. Skovsmose's work (2005) raises inspiring questions about the social functions of school mathematics, but he does not come to convincing answers.

Further related work are the analyses (and criticism) of »rationalism« and the role of mathematics in modern society in the work of Max Weber (1921/2008), as well as Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno (1944/1997), the sociologic analysis of mathematicians in practice by Bettina Heintz (2000) and the critical study concerning the legitimacy of modern mathematics by Philipp Ullmann (2008). Horkheimer and Adorno analyse and criticise how the ideas of Enlightenment shape our thinking and organise our society. Ullmann's work is strongly based on that of Horkheimer and Adorno but lays more emphasis on mathematics and its applications in society. Heintz' studies come to the conclusion that the modern mathematician is characterised by his will to avoid contradictions and that he therefore chooses a method that is intended to avoid contradictions, namely the logical proof. However, her work hardly draws attention to the social and educational implications of her results.

I do not want to discuss or present this literature in any more detail. Instead, I present my current, ever-evolving thinking of further social functions of school mathematics.

HIERARCHY AND LOGIC

The first thought I offer reaches back into the depths of history on human culture, specifically, to the development of hierarchical thinking. Roland Fischer (2006, pp. 133–141), building on the work of the Austrian philosopher Gerhard Schwarz (2007), describes *hierarchy* as a certain system of relationships between people of a certain community. In the history of human culture, the genesis of hierarchies can be observed wherever a community transitioned from a nomadic "tribe" to a fixed "state". The organising principle for tribes was based on kinship, setting a limit to the growth of a community. So, on the one hand, social growth and the development of states were only possible where hierarchies were established. On the other hand, the idea of organising communities hierarchically could only spread because the developing state communities were successful.

Working Group 10

Living in a society that is ordered hierarchically is a powerful everyday experience: People learn that for every (but some) person(s) there is a person who decides what to do and what not to do; that actions are either allowed or forbidden; and that everyone is held responsible for his obedience or disobedience, neglecting the situation that led to her or his actions.

Living in such a society leaves its marks not only on the principles of our everyday actions but also on the principles of our everyday thinking. The idea of hierarchy became an element of thinking, of perceiving the world. For example, today we consider it normal to think of a husky as a dog, of a dog as a mammal, and so on. In fact, the biological classification is totally hierarchical.

In ancient Greece, scholars became aware of the principles of the thinking invoked by hierarchies. The *logic* of Aristotle is a description and analysis of this *logical thinking*. He postulates, for example, that every statement is either *true* or *false*. This may mean: allowed or forbidden in thinking. Furthermore, for every (but some) statement(s) we have statements on the basis of which we can decide whether the first statement is true or false. Eventually, the truth or falsity of a statement depends on the system of logic only, neglecting any (e. g. everyday life) connotations the statement may have.

While logic thinking was already a topic of ancient Greece philosophy, it was not until the beginning of modernity that logical thinking became conventionalised as the only “right” thinking with mathematics as its purest manifestation. René Descartes, the French mathematician and philosopher, may be considered the founder of this modern rationalism. In his *Rules for the direction of the mind*, he states, that »arithmetic and geometry alone are free of any error of falsity or uncertainty«⁵⁴ (1629/1959, pp. 8–9) and

that those who seek the right way to truth must not engage with any matter that does not allow them to obtain a certainty comparable to that of arithmetic and geometric proofs.

This kind of thinking features a worldview that relies on antagonisms, causalities, and pre-determined, static concepts. It has certainly helped mankind to increase its understanding and possibilities of handling the world, but at the same time, it has shaped our thinking and perceiving the world in a certain way, leaving black spots and possibly discrediting those who think differently.

Logical thinking is not without alternative; it is not the only way of making sense. This alternative becomes clear when we look at non-Western societies (see Bishop 1988 for examples) or acknowledge that people had indeed thought in tribal communities before hierarchies and logic thinking evolved. The relentless division

⁵⁴ Translated into English from the German translation of the Latin original *Regulae ad directionem ingenii* from 1629 by D. K.

into true or false has even been criticised from within mathematics. For instance, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the Dutch mathematician L. E. J. Brouwer (1918) began to create mathematics without the assumption that every statement must be either true or false.⁵⁵

Connecting my aforementioned (somewhat oversimplified) analysis of logic to school mathematics, we might ask: Is logical thinking represented here, *more* than in any other school subjects, maybe even *only* here? Does school mathematics prepare children to think and act in a logically thinking and acting society? Extending the connection more critically, we might ask: What worldview do we create by teaching the dominance of logical thinking? And eventually, what does it mean for children who develop alternatives to “our” logic?

MODERNITY AND ALIENATION

At the verge to modernity, industrialisation made everyday life change dramatically. The medieval man (or woman) was a peasant or a craftsman, subsisting on what he produced. Although committed to kin, church, and state, he was the sovereign of his everyday life, making nearly every decision, especially the economic ones, on his own. This personal freedom was lost when more and more people began working in factories, where they had to perform prescribed repetitious work at a prescribed time of the day without causing any problems that might interfere with the production of the factory.

But it would be short sighted to assign the qualities of obedience, punctuality, and reliability in doing repetitious work to the factory worker of early industrialism alone. Contemporary work life requires the same qualities, and the modern employee must be enculturated to think, feel and act accordingly. The essence of this performance, which can be named *alienation*⁵⁶, is that a person must not act according to his actual feelings and wishes. Alienation is necessary for cooperative work where the work of many depends on the cooperation and reliability of the individual.

Primary and middle schools that emerged at the time of industrialisation took over a function of enculturation, preparing children to endure the alienation necessary for factory work. School mathematics was included from the very beginning and might have a particular role in the process of alienation so typical for the modern man and woman: Do the command-like masses of mathematics exercises drill obedience (cf. Skovsmose 2005)? Does the lack of individualisation in the mathematics classroom – in the process of teaching as well as in the nature of the answers expected from

⁵⁵ In Brouwer’s logic, statements can be neither true nor false. But still, they cannot be both true and false.

⁵⁶ Alienation here is understood in a slightly broader sense than in Marxian terms.

children – represent the factory's disregard for individual concerns? And to return to the beginning of this essay: Do routine mathematics calculations serve a social function, e. g., developing the ability and willingness to perform repetitious routine tasks whose broader sense might not be understood and/or favoured?

MODERN GOVERNMENT AND TECHNOCRACY

Modern government⁵⁷ has often been interpreted under the term *technocracy*. Technocrats (i.e., scientific specialists of a certain domain) name and determine the urgent questions of our time, planning work, health systems, education, economy, and so forth. Considering the aforementioned discussion, we may register that technocracy features a certain way of thinking; that is, logical thinking, and requires that people perform in a predictable, alienated fashion. Specifically, a technocracy requires people who follow rules which are not set up by themselves but by experts. (i. e., the technocrats).

Technocratic decision-making depends a lot on mathematics. Mathematical models are used to describe, prescribe, and predict technical, economical, and social matters. For example, medical studies claim that the effect of a new medication is twice as high as the old, the 2% increase of the GDP shows that the economy is doing well, or income taxes must be raised because the costs of the health system exceed the budget by 2 billion Euros. We accept these decisions, although we do not fully understand the justifications used.

But technocracy is nothing *imposed* on people; it is *lived* by people. Technocracy requires people to trust in it and it requires technocrats. Concerning the issue of trust, we might ask: How do people come to trust in mathematical justifications? Do people consider mathematics especially trustworthy?⁵⁸ And if so, do they develop this trustworthy attitude in school mathematics?

Concerning the issue of technocrats, another function of school mathematics can be identified. School mathematics might not only practice logical thinking, it might also select those children able to thinking logically, allocating the special few to technocrat positions in society. Ole Skovsmose (2005), in his book *Travelling Trough Education: Uncertainty, Mathematics, Responsibility*, raises the corresponding questions (p. 11):

Could it be that mathematics education in fact acts as one of the pillars of the technological society by preparing well that minority of students who are to become 'technicians', quite independent of the fact that a majority of students are left behind?

⁵⁷ »Government« here means any form of decision-making that other people depend on, not only in the executive of a state.

⁵⁸ Here, I omit an excessive, yet illuminating, discussion about the certainty and legitimacy of mathematics (cf. Skovsmose, 2005; Ullmann, 2008).

Working Group 10

Could it be that mathematics education operates as an efficient social apparatus for selection, precisely by leaving behind a large group of students as not being ‘suitable’ for any further and expensive technological education?

FINAL THOUGHTS

In this essay, I have argued that school mathematics might have the social function of *identifying*, *selecting*, and *allocating* children, as well as preparing children for the contemporary predominant society in terms of

- developing children’s *mathematical knowledge*,
- shaping children’s *thinking* towards a form we may call logical, and
- shaping children’s *feeling* towards a form that supports technocracy and living in a society that requires alienation.

As the works cited suggest (e. g., Skovsmose, 2005), many of these points have been discussed in the literature. These discussions are limited and often isolated, and fail to draw a cohesive picture of the social functions of school mathematics. Moreover, the discussions are highly evaluative, especially when it comes to people who suffer from mathematics education and are interpreted as being suppressed by a reign of technocrats. Although our own feelings and ideals *are* important, I am afraid that a perspective that places emphasis on the ethics of mathematics education might silence possible explanations that are necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the social functions of school mathematics.

Moreover, in this essay, I raise more questions rather than provide answers. The purpose of the essay, however, was to only mark the trajectory of my research project. My project aims not only to determine probable answers to the questions raised but also to develop a cohesive understanding of the social functions of school mathematics. This project requires not only further research on the functions discussed but also the development of deeper understandings of the intellectual concepts on the basis of which functions of school mathematics might be discussed.

REFERENCES

- Bishop, A. J. (1988). *Mathematical enculturation: A cultural perspective on mathematics education*. Mathematics education library: Vol. 6. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Brouwer, L. E. J. (1918). *Begründung der Mengenlehre unabhängig vom logischen Satz vom ausgeschlossenen Dritten: Erster Teil. Allgemeine Mengenlehre*. Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Verhandelingen, (5), 1–43.
- Coben, D. (2010). “At the sharp end of education for an ethical, equitable and numerate society: working in a safety-critical context – numeracy for nursing”. In U. Gellert, E. Jablonka, & C. Morgan (Eds.) *Proceedings of the sixth international*

Working Group 10

- mathematics education and society conference* (Vol. 1, pp. 9–22). Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.
- Descartes, R. (1959). *Regeln zur Leitung des Geistes*. Hamburg: Meiner (Original work published 1629).
- Fischer, R. (2006). *Materialisierung und Organisation: Zur kulturellen Bedeutung der Mathematik*. München: Profil.
- Heintz, B. (2000). *Die Innenwelt der Mathematik: Zur Kultur und Praxis einer beweisenden Disziplin*. Wien: Springer.
- Heymann, H. W. (1996). *Allgemeinbildung und Mathematik*. Weinheim: Beltz.
- Heymann, H.W. (2003). *Why Teach Mathematics? A Focus on General Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1997). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. London: Verso (Original work published 1944).
- Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in Practice: Mind, Mathematics and Culture in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Reston, Va.: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Professor: "Zu viel Mathe ist Quatsch" (1995, October 6). Bild.
- Schwarz, G. (2007). *Die „Heilige Ordnung“ der Männer: Hierarchie, Gruppendynamik und die neue Rolle der Frauen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften (Original work published 1985).
- Skovsmose, O. (2005). *Travelling Through Education: Uncertainty, Mathematics, Responsibility*. Rotterdam: Sense Publ.
- Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (2004). *Bildungsstandards im Fach Mathematik für den Mittleren Schulabschluss*. [Beschluss vom 4.12.2003]. Beschlüsse der Kultusministerkonferenz. Neuwied: Luchterhand.
- Ullmann, P. (2008). *Mathematik, Moderne, Ideologie: Eine kritische Studie zur Legitimität und Praxis der modernen Mathematik*. Konstanz: UVK.
- Weber, M. (2008). *Economy and society*. London: Routledge (Original work published 1921).
- Winter, H. (1995). „Mathematikunterricht und Allgemeinbildung.“ In: *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Didaktik der Mathematik*, (61), 37–46.