

Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the
North American Chapter of the International Group for
the Psychology of Mathematics Education

Engaging *All* Learners

VOLUME 1: TEACHING

Reno, Nevada

Oct 1-4, 2023

Editors:

Teruni Lamberg
University of Nevada, Reno
terunil@unr.edu

Diana Moss
University of Nevada, Reno
dmoss@unr.edu



Lamberg, T., & Moss, D. (2023). *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (Vol. 1). University of Nevada, Reno.

Citation:

Lamberg, T., & Moss, D. (2023). *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (Vol 1). University of Nevada, Reno.

ISBN: 978-1-7348057-2-7

DOI: 10.51272/pmena.45.2023

Copyright: Articles published in the Proceedings are copyrighted by the authors. Permission to reproduce an article or portions from an article must be obtained from the author.

PME-NA HISTORY AND GOALS

PME-NA History and Goals

PME came into existence at the Third International Congress on Mathematical Education (ICME-3) in Karlsruhe, Germany, in 1976. It is affiliated with the International Commission for Mathematical Instruction. PME-NA is the North American Chapter of PME. The first PME-NA conference was held in Evanston, Illinois in 1979. Since their origins, PME and PME-NA have expanded and continue to expand beyond their psychologically oriented foundations. The major goals of the International Group and the North American Chapter are:

1. To promote international contacts and the exchange of scientific information in the psychology of mathematics education.
2. To promote and stimulate interdisciplinary research in the aforesaid area, with the cooperation of psychologists, mathematicians, and mathematics teachers; and
3. To further a deeper and better understanding of the psychological aspects of teaching and learning mathematics and the implications thereof.

PME-NA Membership

Membership is open to people who are involved in active research consistent with PME-NA's aims or who are professionally interested in the results of such research. Membership is open on an annual basis and depends on payment of dues for the current year. Membership fees for PME-NA (but not PME International) are included in the conference fee each year. If you are unable to attend the conference but want to join or renew your membership, go to the PME-NA website at <http://pmena.org>. For information about membership in PME, go to <http://www.igpme.org> and visit the "Membership" page.

PME-NA Contributors

PME-NA Steering Committee

Elected Members

Doris Jeannotte (Chair) – Université du Québec à Montréal
Ayman Aljarrah – Acadia University
Leslie Dietiker – Boston University
Christopher Kurz – Rochester Institute of Technology
Zareen Rahman – James Madison University
Angeles Dominguez – Tecnológico de Monterrey
Xiangquan (James) Yao – Pennsylvania State University
María S. García González – Universidad Autónoma de Guerrero
Oyemolade (Molade) Osibodu – York University
Casey Griffin (Graduate Student Rep.) – University of Delaware
Tabatha Rainwater (Graduate Student Rep.) – University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Appointed Members

Aaron Brakoniecki (Webmaster) – Boston University
Winnie Ko (Treasurer) – Indiana State University

Conference Organizing Committees

Current Conference (2022-2023)

Teruni Lamberg
Chair
University of Nevada, Reno
terunil@unr.edu

Shera Alberti-Annunzio
Conference Coordinator
University of Nevada, Reno
shera@unr.edu

Local Organizing Committee

Diana Moss*
University of Nevada, Reno
dmoss@unr.edu

Lynda Wiest
University of Nevada, Reno
wiest@unr.edu

Glenn Waddell*
University of Nevada, Reno
gwaddell@unr.edu

Rachael Welder*
University of Nevada, Reno
rwelder@unr.edu

Alysia Goyer*
Stockton University
alysia.goyer@stockton.edu

Joseph Antonides*
Virginia Tech
jantonides@vt.edu

*Served as strand leaders

Future Conference Chair (2023-2024)

Karl W. Kosko
Kent State University
kkosko1@kent.edu

Past Conference Co-Chairs (2021-2022)

Alyson Lischka
Middle Tennessee State
University
alyson.lischka@mtsu.edu

Elizabeth B. Dyer
University of Tennessee
Knoxville
edyer8@utk.edu

Ryan Seth Jones
Middle Tennessee State
University
ryan.Jones@mtsu.edu

Jennifer N. Lovett
Middle Tennessee State University
jennifer.lovett@mtsu.edu

Jeremy Strayer
Middle Tennessee State University
jeremy.strayer@mtsu.edu

Sponsor

University of Nevada, Reno

Reviewers

Abbaspour Tazehkand, Shahabeddin	Cardetti, Fabiana	Gebremichael, Andualem Tamiru
Acevedo, Carlos Ivan	Castanheira, Brittney	Ghousseini, Hala
Adeolu, Adewale	Cavey, Laurie Overman	Gilbertson, Nicholas J
Aguilar, Jair	Caviness, Stephen	Gómez-Árciga, Adrián
Akgul, Enisa	Chandler, Kayla	Goodson-Espy, Tracy
Akuom, Denish Ogwen	Chavez, Oscar	Goyer, Alysia
Aljarrah, Ayman	Chen, Lizhen	Graysay, Duane
Altshuler, Mari	Chicalote Jiménez, Tania	Greenstein, Steven
Alyami, Hanan	Azucena	Grewall, Tejvir Kaur
Alzayyat, Ahmad	Choi, Kyong Mi	Griffin, Camille
Ambrose, Rebecca C	Cirillo, Michelle	Griffin, Casey
Anthony, Monica	Complete Name	Gualdron Pinto, Elgar
Antonides, Joseph	Cook, Candies	Hackenberg, Amy J
Aqazade, Mahtob	Cordero Osorio, Francisco	Haiduc, Ana-Maria
Aryal, Harman Prasad	Corey, Douglas	Hall, Jennifer
Asempapa, Reuben	Corven, Julien	Han, Simon Byeonguk
Ataide Pinheiro, Weverton	Czocher, Jennifer A	Hand, Victoria
Austin, Christine Kathryn	Daniel, Amy L	Hartmann, Christine
Austin, Christopher	Davis, Jon D.	He, Jia
Azimi Asmaroud, Seyedehkhadijeh	De Alba, Carlos Alejandro	Hidayat, Angga
Bailey, Nina Gabrielle	Dietiker, Leslie	Hohensee, Charles
Balady, Steve	Dinapoli, Joseph	Hong, Dae S.
Baniahmadi, Mona	Dobie, Tracy Elyse	Hunt, Jessica H.
Bennett, Amy Been	Doherty, Kristin	Izard, Blair
Bermudez, Hillary	Dominguez, Angeles	Jarry-Shore, Michael
Bertolone-Smith, Claudia Marie	Dubbs, Christopher	Jeannotte, Doris
Bharaj, Pavneet Kaur	Ducloux, Kanita	Kacerja, Suela
Bieda, Kristen N	Duni, Dhimitraq	Kamaldar, Azar
Bofferding, Laura	Edwards, Belinda	Kamlue, Nitchada
Boncoddo, Rebecca	Egbedeyi, Temitope	Karanevich, Peter
Bondurant, Liza	Elizondo, Andrea Martina	Kaufman-Ridout, Bailey Anne
Bostic, Jonathan David	Erwin, Alicia	Kebreab, Lybrya
Boyce, Steven	Escobar Durán, Uriel	Kent, Laura Brinker
Bozzano, Patricia Eva	Fajardo, Maria Del Carmen	Kercher, Andrew
Brakoniecki, Aaron	Fan, Yiyun	Kerrigan, Sarah
Brass, Amy	Feikes, David	Kim, Hee-Jeong
Brown, Yuriko Hoshiya	Fink, Heather	Kim, Youngjun
Bui, Mai	Forde, Elizabeth	Kirkland, Patrick
Butler, Rebecca	Franks, Asia	Kirwan, J Vince
Cabañas-Sánchez, Guadalupe	Frazee, Leah Michelle	Kitchen, Richard
Cannon, Susan	Gantt, Allison L.	Ko, Winnie
	García González, María S.	Ko, Yi-Yin
	Gargroetzi, Emma Carene	Kochmanski, Nicholas

Kokushkin, Vladislav
 Krell, Michael W
 Kurz, Christopher A
 Kwon, Oh Hoon
 Lamberg, Teruni
 Lassak, Marshall
 Leatham, Keith R.
 Lee, Boram
 Lee, Carrie W
 Lee, Hwa Young
 Leonard, Helene
 Lim, Dexter
 Lloyd, Mary Elizabeth
 Riley
 López-Iñesta, Emilia
 Love, Candice
 Lovin, Louann
 Macdonald, Beth L.
 Magiera, Marta T.
 Mainzer, Emily
 Maldonado Reynoso,
 Norma Patricia
 Males, Lorraine M
 Margolis, Claudine
 Marsh, Dalton Dayne
 Martin, Tami S.
 Martínez Uribe, Alfredo
 Martinez-Soto, Eduan
 Mask, Walker
 Matranga, Anthony
 Mauntel, Matthew
 Max, Brooke
 Meagher, Michael S
 Méndez Huerta, Dinorah
 Moldavan, Alesia Mickle
 Montero-Moguel, Luis E
 Moss, Diana L.
 Nagle, Courtney
 Naresh, Nirmala
 Nitta, Kathleen
 Norton, Anderson
 O'Dell, Jenna R
 Odiwuor, Brian
 Orozco, Claudia
 Ortiz Galarza, Mayra
 Lizeth

Ortiz, Daniel
 Oslund, Joy Ann
 Osibodu, Oyemolade
 Otten, Samuel
 Pacheco, Mike
 Paliwal, Veena
 Panorkou, Nicole
 Paoletti, Teo
 Park, Hyejin
 Park, Jungeun
 Partridge, Eric
 Patterson, Cody L
 Phelps-Gregory, Christine
 M
 Piatek-Jimenez, Katrina
 Poling, Lisa L
 Polly, Drew
 Provost, Amanda
 Pujiyanto, Fnu
 Pynes, Kristen D'Anna
 Quansah, Abigail Lois
 Rahman, Zareen Gul
 Rainwater, Tabatha
 Raja, Waleed Ashraf
 Rathouz, Margaret
 Ricks, Thomas
 Roberts, Sarah A.
 Robinson, Molly L
 Roman, Christopher
 Orlando
 Roman, Kathryn E.
 Roscioli, Kate
 Ruiz, Steven L
 Rupnow, Rachel
 Rygaard Gaspard, Brandi
 Saldaña, Mike
 Sanchez Wall, Lina
 Sankaranarayanan,
 Ananthi
 Sayavedra, Alyssa
 Schwarts, Gil
 Sepulveda, Francisco
 Sevier, John
 Sianturi, Iwan Andi Jonri
 Siebert, Daniel
 Simon, Martin

Simpson, Amber
 Smith, Amy
 Smith, Bernard Ronald
 Smith, Shawnda
 Smithey, Montana
 Smucker, Karoline
 Son, Kyunghoon
 Sourwine, Jasmine
 Stoddard, Elyssa
 Suárez, Mayra Zulay
 Suazo-Flores, Elizabeth
 Sung, Yewon
 Swart, Michael I.
 Tague, Jenna
 Talbot, Jennifer
 Thrasher, Emily
 Towers, Jo
 Tucci, Anthony
 Turner, Blake O'Neal
 Turner, Erin
 Tyburski, Brady A
 Varghese, Sijo
 Voyias, Karley Violet
 Waddell, Jr., Glenn
 Warshauer, Hiroko
 Kawaguchi
 Watkins, Jonathan D
 Webb, David C
 Webel, Corey
 Wei, Xinyu
 Weiland, Travis
 Welder, Rachael Mae
 Wessman-Enzinger, Nicole
 Marie
 Westby, Kathryn R.
 Wheeler, Ann
 Willett, Brooklynn
 Winsor, Matthew
 Witt, Nicholas
 Wynn, Lynda
 Yao, Xiangquan
 Yavuz, Selim
 Yilmaz, Zuhail
 Zaldívar, José David
 Zhou, Lili
 Zhuang, Yuling

Zimmerman, Stacey C.

Zolt, Holly

Zwanch, Karen

Preface

The Forty Fifth Annual meeting of the North American chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education was held PME-NA 45 in Reno, Nevada, Oct. 1-4, 2023. The conference theme is listed below:

Engaging All Learners

Math learning should be a joyful experience for all students. When students are engaged and inspired, they are motivated to learn. Instruction that targets the learning needs and interests of our students makes it possible for students to excel in learning math. Participants in the conference explored how to create conditions to support learning that build on student engagement and interest in addition to other research engaged by the PME-NA community. The specific conference theme questions explored as part of the conference was:

- How can we engage all students to learn math content by building on their interest and motivation to learn?
- How do we design learning environments that take students and learning into account?
- What are the design features of tools and curricula design features considering student engagement and interest in supporting learning?
- How do we build partnerships with schools and the community to support student engagement and math learning?
- What research agendas should we pursue to ensure that all students reach their potential by paying attention to engagement and learning needs?

The acceptance rate for Research Report was 45%, the acceptance rate for brief research reports was 70 %. The acceptance rate for posters was 90%. Note: some papers were accepted in alternate format than originally proposed. The total number of participants who submitted proposals as co-authors was 1083.

Plenary Speakers

Motivation and Embodied Cognition

- Mitchell J. Nathan, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin at Madison
- James Middleton, Ph.D., Arizona State University

Connecting Math to Real-world Experiences, Culture and Technology

- Lisa Lunney Borden, Ph.D., St. Francis Xavier University, Canada
- Jose Luis Cortina, Ph.D., National Pedagogical University, Mexico City
- Theodore Chao, Ph.D., Ohio State University

Play Experiences and Math Learning Panel Presentation, "*What Do You See in Mathematical Play?*"

- Nathaniel Bryan, Ph.D., Ed.D., The University of Texas at Austin
- Melissa Gresalfi, Ph.D., Vanderbilt University
- Naomi Jessup, Ph.D., Georgia State University
- Amy Parks, Ph.D. Michigan State University
- Tran Templeton, Ed.D., Teachers College Columbia University
- Anita Wager, Ph.D. Vanderbilt University

Preparing Teachers to Engage Students (closing the plenary sessions)

- Robert Berry III, Ph.D., University of Arizona

The local organizing committee would like to thank the steering committee for all their support and everyone who helped make this conference a success.

Table of Contents

ENGAGING ALL LEARNERS	1
PME-NA HISTORY AND GOALS	3
PME-NA CONTRIBUTORS	4
PREFACE	2
PLENARY SPEAKERS	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
PLENARY PAPERS	5
MATHEMATICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHING	65
MATHEMATICAL PROCESSES AND PRACTICES	87
CURRICULUM, ASSESSMENT, AND RELATED TOPICS	228
PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION	359
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION	606
TEACHING PRACTICE AND CLASSROOM ACTIVITY	800
POLICY, INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP, TEACHER EDUCATORS	1045

CLASSIFYING CURRICULAR REASONING: WAYS FOR CAPTURING TEACHERS' CURRICULAR DECISIONS

Shannon Dingman
University of Arkansas
sdingman@uark.edu

Dawn Teuscher
Brigham Young University
dawn.teuscher@byu.edu

Travis Olson
University of Nevada Las Vegas
travis.olson@unlv.edu

Amy Roth-McDuffie
Washington State University
mcduffie@wsu.edu

Mathematics teachers make numerous decisions that form lessons that in turn greatly influence what students learn. In making these decisions, teachers rely on their curricular reasoning (CR) to decide on what mathematics to teach, how to structure their lesson, and what problems or tasks to use to achieve their lesson goals. However, teachers differ with respect to the sophistication of their CR and the diversity of CR aspects used in their reasoning. In this paper, we detail two ways to classify teachers' CR: a leveled approach to capture the increasing sophistication of teachers' CR, and a heat map approach that highlights the extent to which teacher use various CR aspects in their planning. These methods provide stakeholders avenues by which CR can be studied and that teachers' CR abilities can be further developed.

Keywords: Curriculum; Instructional Activities and Practices; Instructional Vision

Mathematics teachers make innumerable decisions that shape their lessons and impact students' opportunity to learn. Past research has often focused on teachers, students, and the mathematical content as key classroom elements that drive classroom interactions (Cohen & Ball, 1999; Cohen et al., 2003), yet research has illustrated the essential role curriculum plays in influencing instruction (Stein et al., 2007; Rezat, 2006). Over the past 25 years, mathematics education researchers have extensively studied mathematics curriculum and how teachers use it, including how curriculum can be educative for both teachers and students. Lloyd et al. (2017) defines curriculum as the "written curriculum materials and textbooks...and the resources with which students and teachers work most closely in the mathematics classroom" (p. 824). We extend the definition of curriculum to include any materials (e.g., written or digital resources) that teachers use to plan and enact lessons that support students' mathematics learning.

Following current trends in the field, we have come to view teachers as designers who engage in a participatory relationship as they work with curriculum (Brown, 2009; Remillard, 2005). From this perspective, Roth McDuffie and Mather (2009) expanded the work of Shulman (1986) on curricular knowledge by exploring the cognitive work teachers engage in while working with curriculum. This cognitive work, termed as curricular reasoning (CR), encompasses the "thinking processes that teachers engage in as they work with curriculum materials to plan, implement, and reflect on instruction" (Breyfogle et al., 2010, p. 308). CR is heavily informed by teachers' knowledge, background, and teaching experience, and is used by teachers as they operationalize curriculum and enact decisions with different types of curricula. Building on Roth McDuffie and Mather's (2009) research, Dingman et al. (2021) identified five

CR aspects that teachers reason with as they use curriculum to plan and enact mathematics lessons. The five empirically identified CR aspects identified in our research are: 1) *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner's Perspective* (teachers' reasoning about the assessment and anticipation of student thinking and reasoning about the purpose of the task, given their prior knowledge about students' backgrounds and experience); 2) *Mapping Learning Trajectories* (teachers' reasoning about connections across content in the unit, across units, or across grades); 3) *Considering Mathematical Meanings* (teachers' reasoning about the mathematics for themselves or for the student); 4) *Analyzing Curriculum Materials* (teachers' reasoning about the curriculum, identifying strengths and limitations); and 5) *Revising Curriculum Materials* (teachers' reasoning about past teaching experiences to make changes to the task or the curriculum). Teachers vary in terms of how many CR aspects they reason with while planning and enacting lessons. Qualitative findings indicate that these differences in teachers' reasoning influence students' learning of mathematics (Dingman et al., 2021).

Much research on teachers' decisions is based on the Instructional Triangle introduced by Cohen et al. (2003), which is used to study interactions among teachers, students, and the content under study. However, some researchers (Rezat, 2006; Rezat & Sträber, 2012; Tall, 1986) suggest that this focus is too narrow, neglecting other resources that inform classroom interactions such as technology and curricula. Our findings demonstrate that curriculum is a critical element of teachers' practice, and that CR is inherent to teachers' work as they plan and enact lessons (Choppin et al., 2018, 2020, 2021; Dingman et al., 2021; Roth McDuffie et al., 2018). Given the diverse approaches to mathematics provided by various curricula, these findings make sense. Our findings also suggests that teachers' CR influences their decisions and students' learning opportunities. Further investigations should consider curriculum as well as the teachers, students, and the content under study.

To that point, Dingman et al. (2021) propose the Instructional Pyramid displayed in Figure 1 that expands the Instructional Triangle (Cohen et al., 2003) in order to represent and capture the myriad interactions that occur in the instructional environment. Figure 1 illustrates the interplay among these four key classroom elements and highlights the aspects of CR teachers employ as they reason with these elements. Teachers' curricular decisions are based upon the classroom *elements* (vertices) and the CR *aspects* (edges and faces) found in the Instructional Pyramid.

How and why teachers make these curricular decisions is important to understand, given the potentially limited role of written textbooks in determining what is taught, in favor of open-source and teacher-developed activities aligned (or purported to align) to standards (Banilower et al., 2013). Teachers' decisions regarding the use of these various resources holds considerable influence over students' opportunity to learn mathematics (Stein et al., 2007).




Figure 1: Instructional Pyramid for Curricular Reasoning

The importance of viewing teachers' decisions and reasoning through the Instructional Pyramid model for CR is based on data from our project that suggests that oftentimes teachers reason on more than one edge of the model. Investigating teachers' CR can elucidate why teachers make specific mathematical decisions, such as skipping or reordering lessons, revising tasks, or modifying definitions. While some decisions may appear to be inappropriate for a given situation, these decisions are likely multi-faceted and nuanced in ways that elude clear notions of correct and incorrect, or right and wrong. By determining how and why teachers come to these decisions and identifying the aspects of CR teachers reason with most frequently, professional developers, teacher leaders, and mathematics teacher educators can build teachers' capacity to reason differently and more robustly about these decisions.

Our working hypothesis is that teachers who coordinate multiple CR aspects in their decision-making provide different learning opportunities for students than those who reason with only one or two CR aspects. In the preliminary analysis of data from teachers within our project in relation to the Instructional Pyramid, it is apparent that some teachers tend to reason with certain CR aspects more than others. In fact, many teachers reasoned with *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner's Perspective* (Anticipating/Assessing) and *Considering Mathematical Meanings* (Teacher and Student Mathematics) yet used the other CR aspects less often.

However, some teachers reasoned with multiple CR aspects as they made individual decisions. This suggests that some teachers may need support to recognize ways in which they are reasoning, to understand what they are not attentive to, and to develop productive ways to learn how to reason with different CR aspects so as to create different learning opportunities for their students.

To this point, we propose two potential ways to characterize teachers' CR in terms of its sophistication and its diversity. In this paper, we detail these approaches and provide data from our work with middle grades mathematics teachers to illustrate ways to capture differences in teachers' CR as well as highlight CR aspects that are most/least used. Data discussed in this paper derive from our research question under investigation: What CR aspects do middle school teachers reason with as they plan and enact mathematical lessons? See Dingman et al. (2021) for detailed discussion of our overall research project.

A Leveled Approach to Characterizing CR

Our first approach to capturing differences in teachers' CR is a six-level framework that works to classify the varying levels of sophistication teachers incorporate as they reason about curriculum. This framework aims to capture the degree to which teachers use the various vertices and edges depicted in the Instructional Pyramid (see Figure 1) when making curricular decision. These six levels are:

- **Level 0:** A teacher reasons only with the Reflect and Revise CR aspect. In this case, *no vertices or edges* are used in the reasoning. In these instances, the teacher is implicitly reasoning with one or more elements but the reasoning is not explicit.
- **Level 1:** A teacher reasons with *any single edge* of the Instructional Pyramid. In doing so, the teacher reasons with one CR aspect and uses only two elements in the decision-making process. For example, a teacher reasons only with the Mapping Learning Trajectory CR aspect, which connects the two elements Curriculum and Mathematics.
- **Level 2:** A teacher reasons with *two edges connected by a common vertex* on the Instructional Pyramid. In doing so, the teacher reasons with two CR aspects that connect three elements in their decisions. For example, a teacher reasons with the Considering Mathematical Meaning (TM) and Mapping Learning Trajectory CR aspects, which incorporates the elements of Teacher, Mathematics and Curriculum (but no discussion of Students).
- **Level 3:** A teacher reasons with *three edges that form a face* on the Instructional Pyramid. In doing so, the teacher reasons with three CR aspects that connect three elements but does not incorporate the fourth element in their reasoning. For example, a teacher reasons with the Considering Mathematical Meaning (TM), Mapping Learning Trajectory, and Analyzing Curriculum Materials CR aspects, which connect the three elements Teacher, Mathematics, and Curriculum on a complete face.
- **Level 4:** A teacher reasons with *two unconnected edges* on the Instructional Pyramid. In doing so, the teacher incorporates all four elements that form the Instructional Pyramid but in a manner in which the two edges are not connected. For example, a teacher uses the Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective-Anticipating/Assessing (A/A) and the Mapping Learning Trajectory CR aspects, which uses all four elements on two edges of the pyramid that are unconnected. Note that, even though a teacher is reasoning with fewer CR aspects in Level 4 in comparison to Level 3, all four elements are used in Level 4 reasoning, as opposed to only three of the four elements used in Level 3.
- **Level 5:** A teacher reasons with *three or more connected edges* on the Instructional Pyramid. In doing so, the teacher reasons in a manner that connects all four elements of the Instructional Pyramid. For example, a teacher reasons with the Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (A/A) the Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective - Intentionality of Task (IT), and the Mapping Learning Trajectories CR aspects, connecting all four elements in a path around the edges of the pyramid.

As part of our research, we collected interview data from 15 middle grades teachers as they planned instruction for a unit on geometric transformations. These teachers were given the geometric transformations unit from the *UCSMP* series (Benson et al., 2009) and used this curriculum as the basis for planning their grade 8 unit pertaining to geometric transformations

(reflections, rotations, translations, and sequences of transformations). This topic was chosen as a content area that had traditionally appeared in secondary mathematics but that had now emerged in the grade 8 curriculum after the widespread adoption of the *Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM)*. The *UCSMP* unit on geometric transformations was chosen because of its unique approach to geometric transformations to construct the definition of congruence, which was rarely seen in past state standards but is now used in *CCSSM*. Teachers were interviewed before and after teaching lessons with the *UCSMP* curriculum. These interviews were partitioned in initial pass coding according to teachers' mathematical decisions that emerged during the pre- and post-interviews and then coded for the various CR aspects seen in Figure 1. The codes for each decision (N) were then analyzed and classified by the levels described above. Our analysis illustrated considerable differences in teachers' levels of reasoning when planning and reflecting upon their curricular decisions. We share the results from two teachers—Jill with 12 years of teaching experience, and Cathy with 8 years of teaching experience—to highlight these differences in Table 1.

Table 1: Breakdown by level of teachers' CR

Teacher	N	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Jill	161	10 (6.2%)	104 (64.6%)	36 (22.4%)	3 (1.9%)	1 (0.6%)	7 (4.4%)
Cathy	281	3 (1.1%)	120 (42.7%)	91 (32.4%)	6 (2.1%)	15 (5.3%)	46 (16.4%)

As seen in table 1, Cathy used a greater percentage of higher-level CR (levels 4 & 5) when making decisions than Jill. Further analysis of the data revealed trends on which vertices and edges each teacher uses most when making decisions. To provide an illustration for one of these teachers, 58% of Cathy's Level 1 instances were on the *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (A/A)* edge connecting the Student and Teacher elements, while nearly 70% of Cathy's Level 2 codes involved either the Student or Teacher element as *the connector* between the two CR aspects used in her reasoning. However, Cathy's Levels 3 and 4 instances saw an even balance across the four elements (student, teacher, mathematics and curriculum), while her Level 5 instances contained a heavy emphasis on either Mathematics or Curriculum. This led us to conclude that Cathy tended to reason more about the Student and Teacher elements in her instructional decisions, while her limited higher level reasoning involved her expanding her focus to the Mathematics and Curriculum elements.

Using Heat Maps to Identify Use of CR Aspects

Our second approach to analyzing teachers' use of CR aspects involved the utilization of heat maps. After collecting and analyzing the pre- and post-interview data, we compared the frequency of reasoning with each CR aspect to the total number of decisions made by individual teachers to calculate a percentage of use for each CR aspect by teacher. Because teachers used multiple CR aspects to make decisions or teachers did not provide reasoning for some decisions, the percentages do not add to 100%. These CR percentages were used to create heat-map models - a graphical representation where data values are labeled with cool and warm colors. Warmer colors signify that the teacher reasoned with the CR aspect often, while cooler colors signify that the teacher reasoned with the CR aspect less often. Table 2 displays the scale we used to design the data-generated heat-maps. We determined that five colors allowed us to

differentiate among teachers more easily than three colors. We also note that green is the optimal range because if teachers reasoned with a CR aspect over 45% of their decisions, this often limited their use of other CR aspects. Using the Instructional Pyramid model of CR we developed a data-generated model for each teacher.

Table 2: Color Scale for Heat-Map Models

	Curricular Reasoning Percentage
Purple	0-15%
Blue	15.01-25%
Green	25.01-45%
Orange	45.01-55%
Red	55.01%+

Data-Generated Models

Our goal in creating the data-generated models for the teachers participating in our study was to highlight similarities and differences in reasoning and identify CR aspects that may not be used as often as others. This led to implications for teachers, teacher educators, and professional developers. A few notable patterns emerged when comparing the data-generated models across all teachers. First, we found that for 91% of the teachers in our study, the CR aspect *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (IT)* was used the least-often in their decisions regarding their planning and enacting of mathematics lessons. These decisions connect the student and curriculum aspects of the Instructional Pyramid model of CR. Secondly, we found that 74% of our teachers used the CR aspect *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (A/A)* the most often in their reasoning, with the remaining 26% of teachers using the CR aspect *Considering Mathematical Meaning (TM)* the most often. Both of these CR aspects are represented on the front face of the Instructional Pyramid of CR, connecting the elements teachers and students, and teachers and mathematics respectively. Importantly, the CR aspects with the highest use do not connect the elements of teacher, student, or mathematics to the curriculum while the CR aspect with the lowest use has the curriculum connection. In fact, across all these data, the majority of teachers reasoned with CR aspects on the front face of the Instructional Pyramid of CR (i.e., *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (A/A)* and *Considering Mathematical Meaning (TM/SM)*) with greater frequency than the CR aspects connected to curriculum (i.e., *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (IT)*, *Analyzing Curriculum Materials*, and *Mapping Learning Trajectory*). These patterns have potential implications for professional development of teachers and pre-service teachers.

Figure 3 displays data-generated models for two teachers in our study that highlight extremes to show the range in our data. Helen (left) was an example of a teacher in the mid-range with five of the six CR aspects in the green and the sixth being close to the less extreme mid-range (blue). Vance (right) was an example of a teacher who reasoned with fewer CR aspects. The majority of teachers' models were more similar to Vance than Helen, with more variety in the colors on the model. In fact, only 17% of the teachers' models had four or more CR aspects in the green mid-range. However, with all but one CR aspect outside of the mid-range, Vance displayed a more varied CR use with the more extreme-ranges (i.e., purple, red) present than many of the other models. We found that the majority of teachers (52%) had at least half of the six CR aspects in the green mid-range. The data were reasonably centered around the green mid-range.




Figure 2: Two Teachers' Heat-Maps to Represent Their Curricular Reasoning

Implications/Conclusion

Using our two ways we can see how teachers are using their CR in two different ways. In the leveled approach, we found that teachers reasoned most often with CR aspects connecting the elements of teacher, student, and mathematics on the Instructional Pyramid, but reasoned much less frequently with those connected to the curriculum vertex on the pyramid. In the heat-map approach, we found that teachers reasoned most often with the *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (A/A)* and *Considering Mathematical Meaning (TM)* as they planned and enacted lessons.

Both ways highlighted above provide different and significant approaches to characterize teachers' CR. The leveled approach allowed for the examination of the sophistication of teachers' reasoning. As the levels of reasoning increased, teachers incorporated more of the four classroom elements (Teacher, Student, Mathematics, Curriculum) represented as the vertices on the Instructional Pyramid as well as more of the CR aspects represented as the edges on the Instructional Pyramid. As stated previously, our working hypothesis is that teachers who coordinate multiple CR aspects and subsequently focus their attention on greater numbers of elements provide different learning opportunities for students than those who reason with only one or two CR aspects and subsequently fewer elements. The leveled approach provides a method to examine how often teachers reason with greater sophistication (more CR aspects and elements). On the other hand, the heat map approach allows for a detailed analysis of how often teachers use different CR aspects. In the process, teachers can see the CR aspects that figure most prominently in their reasoning as well as the CR aspects used least often. To that point, the heat map approach can be used to provide support to teachers in developing their abilities to diversify their reasoning in order to coordinate more CR aspects into their decision making.

While both approaches provide more information about a single teacher, these findings have implications for teachers, teacher educators, and professional developers. The first is that current professional development and pre-service education appear to be developing teachers' ability to reason with *Viewing Mathematics from the Learner Perspective (A/A)* and *Considering Mathematical Meaning (TM)* as those two CR aspects are more widely used by teachers in our study. In the heat-map models these were the CR aspects that were most often in the warm colors (i.e., red and orange) on teachers' models. This suggests that teachers are reasoning with these aspects often. In our leveled model, we also found that these CR aspects are the ones that connect the elements of teacher, student and mathematics. Second, teachers' reasoning with the other CR aspects that connect curriculum in the Instructional Pyramid: *Analyzing Curriculum Materials*, *Mapping Learning Trajectories*, and *Viewing the Learner Perspective (IT)* were not as widely used. This has implications for students as their teachers are generally reasoning less with the element of curriculum as they prepare and enact lessons. These results may not be surprising because professional developments have primarily focused on making decisions and reasoning from the front face of the Instructional Pyramid. We believe these ways of reasoning are important and should remain a key part of teacher education and professional development.

Therefore, we recommend that teacher educators and professional developers include explicit activities and task that encourage teachers to make decisions and reason with the other CR aspects that include curriculum as all CR aspects are important to provide the best possible learning opportunities for students.

These findings also have implications for teacher educators and professional developers, informing content to be taught. Based on initial work, we propose that the Instructional Pyramid model can be used to examine how teachers reason with the classroom elements and CR aspects discussed previously. This can allow stakeholders to analyze the factors and reasons that shape teachers' decisions as they plan and implement mathematics lessons. The Instructional Pyramid model can also be used as a self-assessment for teachers to identify strengths and weaknesses in their CR. Through the use of both the leveled approach and the heat map approach, teacher educators can support teachers' continuing development of the sophistication and diversity of their CR.

Acknowledgments

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. 1561542, 1561154, 1561569, 1561617. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions are recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the National Science Foundation.

References

- Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campbell, K. M., & Weis, A. M. (2013). Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education. Horizon Research, Inc.
- Breyfogle, M. L., Roth McDuffie, A., & Wohlhuter, K. A. (2010). Developing curricular reasoning for Grades pre-K-12 mathematics instruction. In B. Reys, R. Reys, & R. Rubenstein (Eds.), *Mathematics Curriculum: Issues, Trends and Future Direction*, 72nd Yearbook (pp. 307-320). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Brown, M. W. (2009). The teacher-tool relationship: Theorizing the design and use of curriculum materials. In J. T. Remillard, B. A. Herbel-Eisenmann & G. M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp. 17-36). New York: Routledge.
- Choppin, J., Roth McDuffie, A., Drake, C., & Davis, J. (2018). Curriculum ergonomics: Conceptualizing the interactions between curriculum design and use. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 75-85.

Lamberg, T., & Moss, D. (2023). *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (Vol. 1). University of Nevada, Reno.

- Choppin, J., Roth McDuffie, A., Drake, C., & Davis, J. (2020). The role of instructional materials in the relationship between the official curriculum and the enacted curriculum. *Mathematics Thinking and Learning*. DOI: 10.1080/10986065.2020.1855376
- Choppin, J., Davis, J., Roth McDuffie, A., & Drake, C. (2021). The influence of features of curriculum materials on the planned curriculum. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 53(6), 1249-1263.
- Cohen, D., & Ball, D. L. (1999). Instruction, capacity, and improvement (Research Report Series No. RR-43). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Cohen, D., Raudenbush, S., & Ball, D. (2003). Resources, instruction and research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(2), 119-142.
- Dingman, S. W., Teuscher, D., Olson, T. A., & Kasmer, L. (2021). Conceptualizing curricular reasoning: A framework for examining mathematics teachers' curricular decisions. *Investigations in Mathematics Learning*, 13(4), 267-286.
- Lloyd, G. M., Cai, J., & Tarr, J. (2017). Issues in curriculum studies: Evidence-based insights and future directions. In J. Cai (Ed.), *First compendium of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 824-852). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Remillard, J. (2005). Examining key concepts in research on teachers' use of mathematics curricula. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 211-246.
- Rezat, S. (2006). A model of textbook use. In J. Novotna, H. Moraova, M. Kratka, & N. A. Stehlikova (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 30th conference of the international group of the psychology of mathematics education* (Vol. 4, pp. 409-416). Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Education.
- Rezat, S. & Sträber, R. (2012). From the didactical triangle to the socio-didactical tetrahedron: Artifacts as fundamental constituents of the didactical situation. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 44(5), 641-651.
- Roth McDuffie, A., & Mather, M. (2009). Middle school mathematics teachers' use of curricular reasoning in a collaborative professional development project. In J. T. Remillard, B. A. Herbel-Eisenmann & G. M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp. 302-320). New York: Routledge.
- Roth McDuffie, A., Choppin, J., Drake, C., & Davis, J. (2018). Middle school teachers' orientations and noticing of features of mathematics curriculum materials. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 173-187.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- Stein, M. K., Remillard, J. T., & Smith, M. S. (2007). How curriculum influences student learning. In F. Lester Jr. (Ed.), *Second Handbook of Research on Mathematics Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 1, pp. 319-369). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Tall, D. (1986). Using the computer as an environment for building and testing mathematical concepts. In *Papers in Honour of Richard Skemp* (pp. 21-36). Warwick.