# How Soon Is Too Soon? Algebra in Elementary Grades

Ute Lentz University of North Carolina at Charlotte

# **Brief History of Algebra**

- Algebra as it is known today can be traced back to the Greek mathematician Diophantus (3<sup>rd</sup> century A. D.).
- His partially preserved work Arithmetica knowingly introduces the use of letters as symbolic representation of unknown numerical values.

## **Brief History of Algebra**

- Arab and European mathematicians combine and build their knowledge on the Hindu and Greek accomplishments, e. g.
  - Vieta (1540-1603) contributes the use of letters as variables for both unknown and known quantities
  - Euler (1707-1783) and Dirichlet (1805-1859) with development of functions

(Kieran, 2007)

# **Defining Algebra Historical Progression of Algebra** > Three stages (1) Rhetorical stage: Use of simple common language to explain relations between expressions (2) Syncopated algebra: Letters take the place of unknown numbers (3) Symbolic stage: Introduces the use of letters both for unknown and given values

(Carraher & Schliemann, 2007; Kieran, 2007).

#### **Algebra in US Education**

- Common perception of algebra in United States education is described as a branch of mathematics following basic arithmetic skills which are taught the first eight years of schooling.
- Algebra is treated like a stand-alone course under the umbrella of mathematics beginning in grades 8 or 9. Only students who intend to pursue certain college careers usually are exposed to some advances algebra courses in high school.

(Carraher & Schliemann, 2007; Kieran, 2007)

National and international comparisons

National Assessment of Educational **Progress (NAEP) and Programme for International Student Assessment** (PISA) provide evidence that American middle and secondary students have some knowledge of mathematical structures and how to operate on them, but often lack the ability to apply it to problem-solving tasks. (Kieran, 2007; Schoenfeld, 1992)

#### **Algebra versus Arithmetic?**

> On subject level:

Are arithmetic and algebra are of integral nature or are there clear boundaries separating both areas?

> On educational level:

How early can and should children be introduced to algebraic thinking and symbolism considering their physical and mental development?

#### **Algebra versus Arithmetic?**

- Advocates of early algebra claim that arithmetic and algebra are not separable and young students have the capability of solving problems with unknown values and formulating their ways of thinking in their common language.
- The three stages of the historical development of algebra define the beginnings of algebraic thinking and problem solving as such.

(Carraher and Schliemann, 2007)

**Organization of Early Algebra** 

- (a)Transformations from computations and relations to abstract structures and systems
- (b)The study of functions and relations
- (c)Supportive reasoning by using algebra specific language.
- Other proposed categorizations such as generalizing – problem-solving – modeling – functions are not supported, because they merge processes (generalizing, problem-solving) with topics (functions) or else (modeling)

(Carraher & Schliemann, 2007)

**Algebra in the Common Core State Standards** 

The 2003 North Carolina mathematics curriculum for grade 6 introduced algebra in competency goal 5: The learner will demonstrate an understanding of simple algebraic expressions.

(North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 2003)

Common Core State Standards introduce
 Operations and Algebraic thinking in Kindergarten maintaining the goal through 5<sup>th</sup> grade.
 Goal title changes to Expressions and Equations in 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

(http://maccss.ncdpi.wikispaces.net/home)

# **How Children Learn Mathematics**

**Social Formation of Mind** 

- > Vygotsky's (1896-1934) psychological and sociocultural theory informs us that children are very much influenced in their learning processes by their social environment.
- Cognitive learning occurs from interpersonal experiences to forming intrapersonal concepts according to age and maturity of the child described as zone of proximal development.

(Moll, 1990)

How Children Learn Mathematics Five Aspects of Cognitive Learning (1)The knowledge base of the individual (2)The problem-solving strategies (heuristics)

(3)Monitoring and control mechanisms that initiate self- or group-regulation
(4)Beliefs and affects guiding the individual problem solvers
(5)Practices of obtaining habits of interpreting and making sense of possible solutions

(Lesh and Zawojewski, 2007)

# **How Children Learn Mathematics**

#### **Mathematics Learning**

Cognitive and social behavioral patterns go hand in hand when peers interact and influence each other throughout the problem solving process.

Spoken conversation is an important measure of the participants' understanding of the algebraic characteristics of the tasks. The helping behavior can be categorized into helpseeking behaviors, help-giving strategies, and passivity.

(Webb & Mastergeorge, 2003)

# **How Children Learn Mathematics**

## **Mathematics Learning**

> Another interpretation model of interactive and communicative activities suggests the categories key activities, mental activities, and regulating activities which occur in several cycles throughout the problem-solving session (Dekker & Elshout-Mohr, 1998)

>All aspects combined, metacognitive processes, personal beliefs and depositions, and learning of new problem-solving strategies, determine the "productive problem-solving persona" a student develops.

(Lesh and Zawojewski, 2007)

#### **Numbers and Symbols**

- Before children are able to use numbers and symbols according to the historical social and subject specific conventions, they have to have a reference.
- Functions of a number or symbol has to be connected to an idea in order to receive meaning.

(Skemp, 1987)

## **Functions of Symbols**

- (a) Communication
- (b) Recording knowledge
- (c) Communicating of new concept
- (d) Classifying multiple concept, linear
- (e) Explaining
- (f) Reflecting activities
- (g) Structuring
- (h) Atomizing routine manipulations
- (i) Recovering understanding of information
- (j) Creating individual mental activities

(Skemp, 1987)

Research

- The purpose of the study is to explore in how far younger children are approaching problem solving tasks applying their arithmetic skills as well as algebraic thinking.
- > The study utilizes small group collaboration to investigate algebraic reasoning of elementary students when they are communicating their particular as well as general solutions to problems.

#### Research

- > Qualitative study following the guidelines of grounded theory design
- Focuses on two main factors, the problem solving task that has to be processed by each individual student before they cooperate and communicate with the two peers in the group.
- > Both studying of the task and the collaborating are external influences on the individual which will oblige them to interact with the peers.

#### Research

- > Because reading and beginning to think about the task is mostly an internal thought process, the group interaction will elicit the students' individual algebraic reasoning and generalizing.
- Expectations: Students will expose patterns and thus relationships between the thought processes of the group members. These data will be the basis for a theory development.

#### Sample Problem

> Fifth Grade

Garden Party. The Rose family is planning a cook-out for July 4<sup>th</sup> in their backyard. They want to push together square tables to make one long table where all their guests can sit. Each table by itself seats 4 people. How many tables are needed for eight people?

## **Findings: Excerpts from Video Transcript**

- N and K together: You can have 4 people on each side. K: Yeah.
- D: Yeah, yeah. This is ... an easier way to think about this is, you always have to remember that when you move them together, you always will have 7 on the outside...
- N: ...and those on the inside, in the middle, will have 6.
- K: Yeah.
- D: Yeah, two by two equals 12 and then the two on the outside.
- N: You have to think of the, uhm, strategy, because you don't know how many tables will be on the inside.
- D: True.
- N: But you always know how many will be on the outside.
- D: True. (To I:) Could you give us the number?

- Findings: Excerpts from Video Transcript I: Hm?
- D: Could you give us the number?
- I: I don't know the number either...
- N: (laughs)
- D: Oh. Hm, just a number?
- N: How about ...
- I: Do you have to use a number?
- N: No.
- I: No?
- N: We don't really need a number. It would work really well with ...
- (Interrupted by intercom)

**Findings: Excerpts from Video Transcript** 

- D: So it would really work with the other one.
- N: Because you could just add the eight together and take away ...
- **D:** ....two.
- N: ... two.
- I: Okay. And can you continue that pattern?
- D: Okay, let's try the chart. And let's try with 7. (Whispers to himself while working.) Yep. Do you guys think we should put a t for tables? Just a t?
- K: Yeah.

#### Work Sample



## Work Sample



if you have so many tables and add on a table that table on the outside will change to a six and it will go on and on and on.

2+x6+2=14

# Discussion

The findings of this pilot study reveal evidence that students younger than 12 years are conceivably capable to develop algebraic reasoning in a more abstract way.

The students are able to recognize patterns, reason about their thinking, and generalize the solutions. They reach the point where they implement a variable and apply it to an equation that expresses the general form of their problem solution.

## Discussion

> The equation does not quite follow the mathematical conventions, which these students have not been taught yet, but it clearly articulates the train of reasoning and the solution all group members agree upon. > The group work serves as a vehicle to encourage the students to verbalize their thinking and to correct each other in order to learn and to come to a common solution.

# Discussion

Early algebra is gaining more and more relevance with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards. Algebraic thinking is one of the five domains in which the standards are organized.

> The participants in the study mastered surprisingly well to develop an equation with a variable without having experienced any instructions on mathematical conventions pertaining to algebra.

>This is in sharp contrast to the traditional believes of mathematics education stakeholders that children only develop this ability when they have entered adolescence.

# Implications for Elementary Mathematics

#### **Implications for Future Research**

The study will be expanded to grades K-5 with similar age appropriate problem solving tasks focusing on the communication aspect.

#### **Implications for Classrooms**

- Educators can create social environment in their classrooms fostering algebraic thinking and reasoning at all ages.
- Language and context must be age and developmentally appropriate.

# Implications for Elementary Mathematics

Implications for Teacher Training and Curricula

Adjusting teacher education programs for elementary teachers by giving them a solid, rigorous mathematics knowledge foundation as well as training in teaching methods.

Further development of the operation and algebra strand within the Common Core State Standards with even more emphasis on algebraic thinking.

# Implications for Elementary Mathematics

## Implications for Teacher Training and Curricula

If the level of mathematics learning could be raised during early school years, middle school, high school, and college mathematics had a better foundation and could excel further than these programs are currently able to do.

# Thank you

Your feedback is appreciated

uklentz@uncc.edu

NCTM 2013 Annual Meeting Exposition

DRL NODE

# Rate this presentation on the conference app. **www.nctm.org/confapp**

Download available presentation handouts from the Online Planner! www.nctm.org/planner

Join the conversation! Tweet us using the hashtag **#NCTMDenver** 

#### References

- Carraher, D.W., & Schliemann, A. D. (2007). Early algebra and algebraic reasoning. In F. K. Lester (Ed.), Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: A project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (pp. 669-705). Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Carraher, D.W., Schliemann, A. D., Brizuela, B. M., & Earnest, D. (2006). A substituting meaning for the equals sign in arithmetic notating tasks. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *37*, 87-115.
- Clement, J. (2000). Analysis of clinical interviews: Foundation and model viability. In A. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education (pp. 547-590). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cobb, P. (2000). Conducting teaching experiments in collaboration with teachers. In A. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education (pp. 307-334). New York, NY: Routledge.

Common Sore State Standards for Mathematics (2011). Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI Math%20Standards.pdf

- Dekker, R., & Elshout-Mohr, M. (1998). A process model for interaction and mathematical level raising. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 36,* 303-314.
- Ellis, A. B. (2011). Generalizing-promoting actions: How classroom collaborations can support students' mathematical generalizations. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 42, 308-345.
- Goldin, G. A. (2000). A scientific perspective on structured, task-based interviews in mathematics education research. In A. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education (pp. 517-546). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Good, A., Mulryan, D., & McCaslin, M. (1992). Grouping for instruction in math: Research on small-group instruction. In A. Grouws (Ed.), Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: A project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (pp. 165-196). Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Hall, R. (2000). Videorecording as theory. In A. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education (pp. 647-664). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kieran, C. (2007). Learning and teaching of algebra at the middle school through college levels: Building meaning for symbols and their manipulation. In F. K. Lester (Ed.), Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: A project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (pp. 707-762). Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Lesh, R., Hoover, M., Hole, B., Kelly, A., & Post, T. (2000). Principles for developing thought-revealing activities for students and teachers. In A. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education (pp. 591-646). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lesh, R., & Kelly, A. (2000). Multitiered teaching experiments. In A. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education (pp. 197-230).
- Lesh, R., & Lehrer, R. (2000). Iterative refinement cycles for videotape analyses of conceptual change. In A. Kelly & R. Lesh (Eds.), Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education (pp. 665-708). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lesh, R., & Zawojewski, J. (2007). Problem solving and modeling. In F. K. Lester (Ed.), Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: A project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (pp. 763-804). Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Moll, L. C. (1990). Introduction. In L. C. Moll(Ed.), Vygotsky and education (pp. 1-27). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (2003). *NC standard course of study*. Retrieved from <u>http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/curriculum/mathematics/scos/2003/k-8/32grade6</u>
- Schoenfeld, G. (1992). Learning to think mathematically. In A. Grouws (Ed.), Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: A project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (pp. 334-370). Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Skemp, R. R. (1987). Psychology of learning mathematics. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc..
- Webb, N. M., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2003). The development of students' helping behavior and learning in peer-directed small groups. *Cognition and Instruction*, 21(4), 361-428.