

Communications

Caring in the teaching and learning of mathematics

THOMAS FALKENBERG

A comment on 'A model of mathematical learning and caring relations', Hackenberg, 25(1): In this commentary on Hackenberg's article, I suggest that her notion of mathematical caring cannot only be integrated into the larger framework of an ethic of care, but also helps to understand what it can mean to (generally) care in the teaching and learning of mathematics. This suggestion assumes a relationship between the two notions of general caring and mathematical caring that is different from that of Hackenberg.

Hackenberg's starting point is her view that social interaction can lead to the feelings of depletion and stimulation (p. 45). Based on these aspects of social interaction, she explicates the notion of mathematical caring as

work toward balancing the ongoing depletion and stimulation involved in student-teacher mathematical interaction. (p. 45)

Later, she adds, as the second aspect of mathematical caring, that mathematically caring teachers

harmonize with students ... [attempt] to take on the students' mathematical realities ... [set] their own mathematical ways of operating temporarily to the side in order to focus on students' ways of operating (p. 47),

which I like to call *empathetic understanding of how individual students see and do mathematics*.

I want to make a more general comment about Hackenberg's term 'mathematical caring'. Although an argument can be made that the feeling of depletion is more prominent in a mathematics class than in a class of any other subject matter, there does not seem to be anything specific to mathematics about Hackenberg's notion of mathematical caring, except that it is applied to the teaching and learning of mathematics rather than social studies or home economics, for example. It seems to me that 'mathematical caring' rather conceptualizes caring (of a certain type) in (any) subject matter content teaching.

So, what is the larger framework of an ethic of care into which I suggest Hackenberg's notion of mathematical caring can be integrated? I like to use Noddings's work on caring, to which Hackenberg is referring, for the notion of general caring in teaching and learning.

At the centre of Noddings's conceptualization of caring is the concern for the *needs* of the cared-for. Her (1984, 2001) phenomenological starting point for her ethic of care is the concept of caring in a dyadic caring encounter: the carer cares for the cared-for if and only if

- a. the carer's state of consciousness is characterized by:
 - i. engrossment (open, non-selective attention to the cared-for's needs)
 - ii. motivational displacement (motivation to do something to address those needs)
- b. the cared-for receives the carer's state of consciousness (acknowledges the carer's caring state of consciousness).

What could such (general) caring encounters between a teacher and her students look like in the teaching and learning of mathematics? The teacher's social interaction with her students has an impact on the feelings of depletion and stimulation in students with respect to their learning of mathematics. Adopting the theoretical assumptions on learning made by Hackenberg (pp. 45-46), teacher-student interaction that aims for balancing feelings of depletion and stimulation and is characterized by empathetic understanding of students' ways of seeing and doing mathematics is conducive to students' learning of mathematics. (General) caring for the students *includes* being concerned for their (inferred) need to learn school mathematics, and, thus, mathematical caring in Hackenberg's sense is a way of enacting (general) caring in the teaching and learning of mathematics, with empathetic understanding of how individual students see and do mathematics as an instantiation of practicing non-selective attention to the cared-for's needs.

Students, however, have different needs. A teacher's mathematical caring addresses one (type of) need for students with respect to their schooling in general and even their learning of mathematics in particular. There are larger issues in teaching and learning, such as a student's momentary need to be comforted in her emotional state coming into the classroom from lunch break. There are, as well, larger issues in the teaching and learning of mathematics that are directly linked to students' needs: Does the learning of this particular mathematical content address the needs of this particular student with respect to her current situation and her future aspirations and possibilities? The (inferred) need of students to become mathematically literate or to have their ways of seeing and doing mathematics validated is here seen within the larger picture of the needs-network for each particular student.

Hackenberg proposes a certain level of independence between what she calls "a more general notion of caring" (pp. 46-47) in teaching and schooling and her notion of mathematical caring. While Noddings gives priority to the development of caring people over the learning in a subject area, Hackenberg conceptualizes "*mathematical* caring relations as inseparable from learning" (p. 47). Rather than contrasting 'general' and 'mathematical' caring, balancing students' feelings of depletion and stimulation in the learning of mathematics and the empathetic understanding of students' ways of seeing and doing mathematics can be seen as a way of a teacher's caring in her teaching and her students' learning of mathematics. The teaching and learning of mathematics, then, frames a particular context for the caring and the concern for the needs of students. The issues captured in Hackenberg's notion of mathematical caring are integrated as issues of (general) caring in the teaching and learning of

mathematics. Addressing these issues are here seen as one aspect of addressing *the needs* of the student as a holistic being. Embedding Hackenberg's concept of mathematical caring into the larger framework of an ethic of care will allow the keeping together of caring and learning mathematics. However, this connection is qualified by a more comprehensive consideration of the students' needs, with priority given to a larger purpose of teaching and schooling:

If the school has one main goal that guides the establishment and priority of all others, it should be to promote the growth of students as healthy, competent, moral people. (Noddings, 1992, p. 10)

It seems to me that an integration of Hackenberg's notion of mathematical caring into a larger framework of an ethic of care as suggested here does share some of the benefits Hackenberg lists for her model of mathematical learning and caring relations in the conclusion of her article. For her model, she suggests that

holding learning and caring together disrupts the traditional and harmful separation [...] of intellectual activity from emotional, embodied states. (p. 49)

If mathematical caring is seen within a care-ethical framework, which has a holistic view of the human need structure, the intellectual and emotional aspects of being human will also find their joint consideration in the teacher's caring.

Hackenberg writes that

[her] model explicates how student-teacher interaction can affect engagement with mathematical activity that is essential for acts of learning to occur. (p. 49)

In an ethic of care, social interaction is principal to being human, since humans are conceptualized as relational beings (Noddings, 2002, chapter 5). An ethic of care explicates the effect of human interaction on human functioning in general and students' and teachers' engagement in mathematical activities in particular. Placing mathematical caring within a care-ethical framework gives social interaction a central role in the teaching and learning of mathematics.

Finally, Hackenberg argues that her

model points toward the necessary involvement of ethical issues in considering the role of social interaction in learning. (p. 50)

Viewing mathematical caring within an ethic of care will also have this benefit, since ethical issues are at the very centre of an ethic of care.

References

- Hackenberg, A. (2005) 'A model of mathematical learning and caring relations', *For the Learning of Mathematics* 25(1), 45-51.
- Noddings, N. (1984) *Caring: a feminine approach to ethics and moral education*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2001) 'The caring teacher', in Richardson, V. (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, Washington, DC, American Educational Research Association, pp. 99-105.
- Noddings, N. (2002) *Starting at home: caring and social policy*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Response to Falkenberg

AMY HACKENBERG

I agree with Falkenberg that engendering mathematical caring relations (MCRs) should be considered part of an overall project to engender general caring relations with students. However, I describe how I formulated mathematical caring as distinct from general caring in order to address aspects of mathematical interaction with students for whom general caring seemed insufficient. That is, my formulation and use of MCRs is an attempt to build a model of caring in the context of mathematics teaching and learning. Such models are crucial for making the type of inferences about students' mathematical needs that Falkenberg and I both deem important. In fact, in my research, I have found that remaining at the level of general care theory does not provide a powerful enough tool for me to make such inferences in the process of establishing caring relations with my students in mathematical interaction.

My experience with Bridget, one of the four sixth grade (11-12 years old) students I taught in a year-long constructivist teaching experiment [1], can provide an example of the specificity I came to understand was necessary to establish and maintain a mathematical caring relation with a student.

At the start of the experiment in October, both Bridget and her partner Deborah could solve problems like this one,

The Money Problem: Tanya has \$16, which is $\frac{4}{5}$ of what David has. How much does David have?

Toward the end of the teaching experiment in May, we worked on problems like this one,

The Sub Problem: A mini-sub sandwich is 5 inches long, and that's $\frac{3}{4}$ of the length of a regular sub sandwich. How long is the regular sandwich?

The *Sub Problem* is considerably more complex than the *Money Problem* because the *Sub Problem* involves determining how to divide a five-unit quantity into three equal parts. During the experiment, we had worked on problems that might engender the construction of schemes for doing so (see Hackenberg, 2005a). However, in early May, Bridget experienced great difficulty in solving problems that required further partitioning a sub-divided quantity into some number of parts in order to determine a fractional amount of it.

Although I understood very soon that Bridget was experiencing considerable depletion, in the moment I did not know how to adapt my mathematical interaction with her so that she could act more independently, as well as feel more autonomous and in control. I resorted to coaching her through making drawings so that she might have some visual material on which to operate. This coaching was laborious for both of us. Because my suggestions were based on my perception of what breaking down the problems might involve (e.g., for someone with operations like mine), they were not very effective for her and indicated that I did not decenter enough cognitively. Thus my suggestions did not alleviate her depletion, and the longer she remained in a depleted state the more depletion I felt!

One might say that in this situation I tried to use general caring with Bridget, in decentering to 'receive' her emotional experience of darkness and frustration, and her general cognitive experience of not being able to operate. However, I did not sufficiently consider her specifically *mathematical* cognitive experience of being bothered by finding $\frac{1}{3}$ of a 5-part quantity, let alone conceiving of a 5-part quantity as $\frac{3}{4}$ of another quantity. In the moment of interaction with a student, decentering from my own ways of operating mathematically is quite challenging, in part because I may not have created explanatory constructs that I can formulate outside of the interaction. In this case, I had yet to formulate that solving the *Sub Problem* seems to require coordinating two different three-levels-of-units views of a quantity - *i.e.*, viewing the mini-sub's length as composed of a unit containing five units, each of which can be further partitioned into three (small) units, so that the length can be conceived of as a unit of three units each containing five (small) units (*cf.* Hackenberg, 2005a).

Yet even prior to this type of analysis, relying solely on general caring seems insufficient when trying to facilitate mathematical learning. That is, general caring does not seem to help a teacher address a student's specifically mathematical cognitive experience so that her mathematical activity might continue, albeit in ways that may be different from what the teacher originally had planned or envisioned.

My interactions with Bridget in early May set off a rather fervent search for better ways to communicate with her mathematically. Out of that search came a gradual reestablishment of our mathematical caring relation over the final episodes of the experiment. I began to take more seriously that Bridget could not yet view a quantity like 5 inches as partitioned into both 5 equal parts and 3 equal parts (without erasing the marks that made the 5 equal parts). Hence, I carefully planned a sequence of tasks for her that involved only unit quantities (1 meter or $\frac{1}{2}$ meter) and fractional relationships. These plans could not be considered successful mathematical care for her unless she experienced some alleviation of her depletion, or received them with some openness. In fact, she responded quite positively to the sequence, both cognitively and affectively (Hackenberg, 2005a).

I contend that my increased attention to Bridget's mathematical ways of operating was an example of the engrossment that, as Falkenberg notes, is featured in Noddings' care theory (1984, 2002) and that I include in my notion of harmonizing with students' mathematical ways of operating. My motivation was also harnessed in service of posing problems in which Bridget could operate autonomously without excessive coaching, and yet in which she might have opportunities to make new coordinations that she herself may not have imagined. In this sense, I believe I practiced both Noddings' motivational displacement and expansion of a student's world, other key features of her theory of general caring. In turn, Bridget's positive and productive responses to our interaction over the May episodes indicate that she received my care for her. Thus, I fully support Falkenberg's assertion that "[t]he issues captured in Hackenberg's notion of mathematical caring are integrated as issues of (general) caring in the teaching and learning of mathematics" (p. 29).

However, I propose that my receptivity to, and formulation of, Bridget's ways of operating as different from my own, and as not addressed by my initial coaching attempts, required more than engrossment and motivational displacement as described by Noddings and Falkenberg. That is, I needed to formulate inferences (or at least hunches) about Bridget's ways of operating that would allow me to pose 'effective' problems for her (*i.e.*, to decide what mathematical activity could be productive for her at that point in her mathematical education) in order to address both her cognitive and emotional states. To do so, I call on constructs regarding mathematical learning (Hackenberg, 2005b). This level of specificity regarding students' mathematical ways of operating is, in my current thinking, an essential tool in caring mathematically for another and can allow a teacher to develop, as Falkenberg says, "*empathetic understanding of how individual students see and do mathematics*" (p. 28).

Making these specific formulations about students' mathematics is one way I can operationalize caring in my work with students. Doing so also demonstrates the crucial activity of building models of caring in the context of doing research, rather than attempting to apply a general theory of care to research situations (Steffe and Wiegel, 1996).

Notes

[1] The purpose of the teaching experiment was to understand how sixth graders (11-12 year old students) construct algebraic reasoning based on their evolving quantitative reasoning in interaction with a teacher-researcher (myself) who endeavored to establish and maintain MCRs with them (Hackenberg, 2005a). A central focus was how students constructed quantitative schemes underlying their construction and solution of linear equations of the form $ax = b$.

References

- Hackenberg, A. (2005a) *Construction of algebraic reasoning and mathematical caring relations*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Athens, GA, Department of Mathematics and Science Education, University of Georgia.
- Hackenberg, A. (2005b) 'A model of mathematical learning and caring relations', *For the Learning of Mathematics* 25(1), 45-51.
- Noddings, N. (1984) *Caring: a feminine approach to ethics and moral education*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2002) *Educating moral people: a caring alternative to character education*, New York, NY, Teachers College Press.
- Steffe, L. and Wiegel, H. (1996) 'On the nature of a model of mathematical learning', in Steffe, L., Nesher, P., Cobb, P., Goldin, G. and Greer, B. (eds), *Theories of mathematical learning*, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 477-498.

On logical thinking in mathematics classrooms

KEITH WEBER

A comment on 'Talking about logic', Reid and Inglis, 25(2): Earlier this year, my colleague and I published an article in FLM 25(1) defining an implication as warranted if there is a socially accepted general mathematical principle for deducing its conclusion from its antecedent. We then argued for the importance of considering warranted implications when reading a mathematical proof (Weber and Alcock,

2005). This article prompted a response from Reid and Inglis (2005). Reading this response prompted two questions:

- Should undergraduates learn logic in their mathematics courses?
- Should the issue of teaching warranted implications be of concern to mathematics educators?

In response to the first question, I begin by clarifying. Reid states, "I do not think Weber and Alcock have shown that these mathematicians do not use material implications". We never intended to show this nor do we wish to devalue the role of formal logic in mathematical thinking. In other articles, we have stressed that formal logic is an important (if limited) component of mathematical thought and that mathematicians do consider this in some aspects of their proof-related behavior (*e.g.*, Weber, 2001; Weber and Alcock, 2004). Our argument is that, by itself, material implication is not sufficient to determine if a proof is valid.

Reid goes on to question the value of teaching logic at all:

Why should we try to do anything about helping students come to terms with the definition of the material conditional, or anything else about formal logic? Logic is useful only in a few domains of explanation [...] Why would a socially responsible teacher teach her students to reason in a way that is not generally useful? (p. 24-25, original emphasis)

Reid appears to be taking a strong utilitarian view of mathematics education, dismissing the learning of mathematical ideas that do not have widespread applicability in non-mathematical domains. Sfard (2003) questions this line of reasoning:

[Such arguments are] true and convincing as long as we agree that the only possible reason for learning anything in mathematics is its usability outside mathematics itself. Some types of knowledge, however, may be necessary not because they have practical applications but because of their intramathematical importance - that is, their function as an indispensable element in the process of constructing mathematical knowledge. (p. 364)

In Weber and Alcock (2005), my colleague and I argue that an understanding of warranted implications is necessary to gain conviction and understanding from a proof. Elsewhere, Selden and Selden (1995) contend that some aspects of formal logic are also required to understand and validate proofs. As fluency in working with formal logic and warranted implications is necessary for constructing mathematical understanding from the proofs of others, these are aspects of mathematical reasoning that students should learn in, or prior to, their advanced mathematics courses.

Should the teaching of logic and warranted implications be of concern to mathematics educators? Epp (2003) discusses pedagogical issues concerned with formal logic elsewhere, so I will concentrate my discussion on warranted implications. I begin by noting that warranted implications receive little attention in advanced mathematics classrooms. As Fukawa-Connelly (2005) illustrates, professors may even lead students to avoid the consideration of warrants altogether. Inglis notes that psychological research demonstrates that students will naturally consider warrants when they

encounter implications. He concludes that we do not need to teach students to consider warrants as they will naturally do this on their own.

It is well known that skills used in the day-to-day lives of students do not naturally transfer into formal mathematical settings (Carraher, Carraher and Schliemann, 1985). For instance, students will argue by contradiction outside of the mathematical classroom, but they generally cannot construct or understand indirect proofs without careful instruction (Epp, 1998). It is not legitimate to conclude that since students consider warrants for implications in their everyday reasoning, they will also do so in their advanced mathematics courses. Whether students will consider warrants when reading a proof is an empirical question.

My colleague and I have conducted a study addressing this very issue (Alcock and Weber, 2005). We examined the responses of thirteen undergraduates in a real analysis course as they read a proof that the sequence $(\sqrt[n]{n})$ diverged to ∞ . The first three lines of the proof established that $(\sqrt[n]{n})$ was an increasing sequence and the last concluded that $(\sqrt[n]{n}) \rightarrow \infty$. We asked these undergraduates to determine if this proof was valid. Only six of the thirteen students rejected the proof as invalid and just two did so for legitimate mathematical reasons. Only three considered what warrant was used to deduce that $(\sqrt[n]{n}) \rightarrow \infty$ from the fact that $(\sqrt[n]{n})$ was increasing.

However, when the interviewer prompted students to consider whether the last line of the proof is a consequence of previous assertions, ten students rejected the proof as invalid, arguing that the warrant used to establish the last line of the proof was not valid (Alcock and Weber, 2005). Clearly more research is needed before making conclusive claims. However, this study does suggest that many students in advanced mathematics courses do not consider warrants. Further, if these students were to develop the inclination of inferring and evaluating warrants, their abilities to determine the validity of proofs might improve considerably.

References

- Alcock, L. and Weber, K. (2005) 'Proof validation in real analysis: inferring and checking warrants', *Journal of Mathematical Behavior* 24(2), 125-134.
- Carraher, T., Carraher, D. and Schliemann, A. (1985) 'Mathematics in the streets and in the schools', *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 3, 21-29.
- Epp, S. (1998) 'A unified framework for proof and disproof', *Mathematics Teacher* 91(8), 708-713.
- Epp, S. (2003) 'The role of logic in teaching proof', *American Mathematical Monthly* 110(10), 886-899.
- Fukawa-Connelly, T. (2005) 'Thoughts on learning advanced mathematics', *For the Learning of Mathematics* 25(2), 33-35.
- Reid, D. and Inglis, M. (2005) 'Talking about logic', *For the Learning of Mathematics* 25(2), 24-25.
- Selden, J. and Selden, A. (1995) 'Unpacking the logic of mathematical statements', *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 29(2), 123-151.
- Sfard, A. (2003) 'Balancing the unbalancable: the NCTM Standards in light of theories of learning mathematics', in Kilpatrick, J., Martin, G. and Schifter, D. (eds), *A research companion to principles and standards for school mathematics*, Reston, VA, NCTM.
- Weber, K. (2001) 'Student difficulty in constructing proof: the need for strategic knowledge', *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 48(1), 101-119.
- Weber, K. and Alcock, L. (2004) 'Semantic and syntactic proof productions', *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 54(3), 209-234.
- Weber, K. and Alcock, L. (2005) 'Using warranted implications to understand and validate proofs', *For the Learning of Mathematics* 25(1), 34-38.