THE MATHEMATICS SUBJECT MATTER KNOWLEDGE OF PRE-SERVICE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Tim Rowland, Sarah Martyn, Patti Barber and Caroline Heal

University of Cambridge and
Institute of Education, University of London

This paper reports recent findings from a project which investigates the mathematics subject knowledge of prospective elementary school teachers in the UK, and how this relates to classroom teaching performance. The project was initiated in 1997 in the context of UK government policy to introduce subject content knowledge as an explicit dimension of the 'standards' for the award of Qualified Teacher Status in England. The methodology combines qualitative and quantitative approaches. We review here some findings about topics that trainees find difficult and explore early indications that the extent and security of their subject matter knowledge is related to their teaching competence.

BACKGROUND

Shulman's categories of teacher knowledge, and, in particular, his constructs of *subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge* and *curricular knowledge* have been influential in the US and beyond. *Subject matter knowledge* (SMK) is the 'amount and organisation of the knowledge *per se* in the mind of the teacher' (Shulman, 1986, p. 9) and is later (Shulman and Grossman, 1988) further analysed into *substantive knowledge* (the key facts, concepts, principles and explanatory frameworks in a discipline) and *syntactic knowledge* (the nature of enquiry in the field, and how new knowledge is introduced and accepted in that community). His *pedagogical content knowledge* consists of "the ways of representing the subject which makes it comprehensible to others…[it] also includes an understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult … (Shulman, 1986, p. 9)

Curricular knowledge consists of knowledge of the scope and sequence of teaching programmes and the materials used in them. These classifications are generic but can be applied with very little adjustment to the discipline of mathematics.

In a study of the planning and instruction of novice *secondary* school teachers, Steinberg, Marks and Haymore (1985) found that teachers use various coping strategies when they lack content knowledge, including relying heavily on 'the textbook' as a convenient source of information. Lack of SMK also affected style of instruction, resulting in the avoidance of discussion and student questions.

Grossman. Wilson and Shulman (1989) caution against assuming that the SMK component of teacher preparation is adequately fulfilled by undergraduate study. This might seem to be an overly-pessimistic view in the case of the initial training of elementary school teachers, given that they themselves would be expected to have learned the material they will teach by the age of 11. Notwithstanding the complex relationship between SMK and pedagogical content knowledge, there is evidence from the UK and beyond which would seem to support an increased emphasis on SMK (Alexander, Rose and Woodhead, 1992; Ofsted, 1994; Ma, 1999). Ma, in particular, presents compelling evidence that the adequacy of elementary teachers' substantive and syntactic knowledge of mathematics cannot by any means be taken for granted. UK Government Circular 4/98 (DfEE, 1998) sets out what is considered to be the "knowledge and understanding of mathematics that trainees need in order to underpin effective teaching of mathematics at primary [elementary] level", and charges Initial Teacher Training ITT 'providers' with the audit and remediation of students' SMK. The Circular requires providers to "audit trainees' knowledge and understanding of […] mathematics

…Where gaps in trainees' subject knowledge are identified, providers of ITT must make arrangements to ensure that trainees gain that knowledge during the course" (DfEE, 1998, p. 48).This requirement has not been welcomed by most trainees and some teacher educators, on the grounds that trainees must already have obtained at least the minimum mathematics pass level (grade 'C') in the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) as a condition of entry to the course.

In the UK, the vast majority of trainees follow a one-year, full-time course leading to a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) in a University Education department, about half the year being spent working in a school under the guidance of a school-based mentor. All primary trainees are trained to be generalist teachers of the whole primary curriculum. Later in their careers, most take on responsibility for leadership in one curriculum area (such as mathematics) in their school, but, almost without exception, they remain generalists, teaching the whole curriculum to one class.

In this paper, we describe our approach to the audit of the mathematics SMK of 173 primary trainees in 1998-99. This was the first cohort of students following the one-year PGCE course to whom the requirements of Circular 4/98 applied by statute. We had, however, piloted the audit and a draft version of the 'standards' on a voluntary basis the previous year, and draw on an analysis of one audit item in this paper.

OVERVIEW OF GOALS AND METHODS

The project goals include investigation of: those areas of SMK required by Circular 4/98 which prove to be problematic for significant numbers of trainees; whether secure SMK (or the lack of it) is reflected in classroom performance; ways in which trainees' practice in school-based placements is informed by their SMK.

The structure of the primary PGCE under consideration is such that by the middle of January, with fully six months of the course remaining, the main content areas – number concepts and operations, data handling, mathematical processes, shape and space, measures, algebra, probability – have been 'covered' in lectures and workshops. A 90-minute written assessment consisting of 16 test items in mathematics is administered at this point of the course. Each trainee's response to each question includes a self-assessment of their ability to tackle it.

The course includes two extended 'practicum' placements in schools in the latter parts of the second and third terms. Given these and other demands of the course, the major SMK remediation opportunity comes between the first and second placements.

Other aspects of the taught course based in the University	Maths SMK audit	Other aspects of the taught course based in the University	School placement 1	SMK peer-tutoring and remediation (with other aspects of the course)	School placement 2
Term 1 (autumn)		Term 2 (spring)			Term 3 (summer)

Table 1: The chronology of the PGCE course

During school placements, each student works under the joint supervision of a school-based mentor and a university tutor. The two supervisors agreed on assessments of the student's performance in teaching mathematics towards the end of (and in the context of) each placement, against the standards of Circular 4/98.

TRAINEES' MATHEMATICAL THINKING: GENERALISATION AND PROOF

One dimension of our research has been to identify what mathematics (within the remit of Circular 4/98) primary trainees find difficult, and the nature of their errors and misconceptions in these areas. In fact, the same audit instrument was administered to a sample of 41 trainees (PGDE and Dip Ed) in Singapore. The profile of easy/hard items is more or less identical for the English and the Singapore trainees (Swee Fong Ng, personal communication). The only differences worthy of note are on two items. The first concerns inverse operations, a topic which the Singapore students found more problematic than those in our sample. It may be significant that this topic is addressed in the algebra component of our taught course immediately prior to the audit. The second was an item on reasoning and proof (discussed later in this paper) on which the Singapore students demonstrated superior syntactic subject matter knowledge. In this brief account, we focus on just two aspects of the UK students' trainees mathematical thinking.

Generalisation

Just over half the trainees were insecure in an item designed to address the ability to observe and express a generalisation (see Rowland *et al* 2000 for details).

Check that 3+4+5=3x4 $\qquad$ 8+9+10=3x9 $\qquad$ 29+30+31=3x30
Write down a statement (in prose English) which generalises from these three examples. Express your generalisation using symbolic (algebraic) notation.

Some students did not recognise the features common to all three examples and tried to derive a generality from the first case only. For example, one wrote:

> Three consecutive numbers added together equals the product of the first two numbers.
> $n + (n+1) + (n+2) = n \times (n+1)$.

Others were able to express the generality in their own words but not symbolically. Responses such as $a + b + c = 3b$ captured part of the picture but omitted the essential condition that the three numbers being summed are consecutive (or in arithmetic sequence).

A few students struggled to find the words to communicate what they could 'see' in the examples. One wrote:

> Three ascending numbers may be equal, in sum, to 2 numbers that are multiplied together. The middle number of the sequence and the over all numbers are multiplied to give the same answer as those added together.

This item, then, exposed weaknesses in recognising and articulating pattern and relationships, identifying significant elements, and in formulating expressions to represent these relationships. This relates to syntactical subject knowledge, since inductive reasoning is central to the philogeny and the otogeny of mathematical knowledge. It is perhaps not difficult to share the concern of the UK government about prospective primary school teachers who, for example, find it so difficult to perceive and communicate unity of form (let alone of meaning) in the three equations. At the same time, we would question the adequacy of "guided self-study" (DfEE, 1998, p. 48) in the face of such cognitive obstacles.

Proof

Currently, there is evidence for concern in the UK about students' facility with mathematical proof, both at school and at university level (see e.g. London Mathematical Society, 1995). One argument suggests that logical reasoning was a casualty of curriculum and assessment reforms in the 1970s and 1980s. Circular 4/98 requires that trainees demonstrate "that they

know and understand […] methods of proof, including simple deductive proof, proof by exhaustion and disproof by counter-example (DfEE, 1998, p. 62)". The following item was designed to audit this 'standard'.

A rectangle is made by fitting together 120 square tiles, each 1 cm^2. For example, it could be 10cm by 12 cm. State whether each of the following three statements is true or false for every such rectangle. Justify each of your claims in an appropriate way:

(a) The perimeter (in cm) of the rectangle is an even number.

(b) The perimeter (in cm) of the rectangle is a multiple of 4.

(c) The rectangle is not a square.

More than one mode of justification is possible for each part, but we anticipated some deductive arguments for (a), counterexamples for (b), and perhaps contradiction ($\sqrt{120}$ is not an integer) for (c). In the event, only one third of students made a secure response to the whole question and 30% either gave insecure answers to all three parts or did not attempt the question (see Rowland *et al*., 2001 for a detailed analysis). Most interesting, perhaps, is the fact that a significant number of students did not seem to perceive the second statement as amenable to personal investigation on their part, which (for those who did so) uncovers counterexamples to refute the statement. Some claimed, for example, that the statement must be true because 120 is a multiple of 4, or even because the rectangles have 4 sides. These prospective teachers evidence little or no sense of mathematics as an experimental test-bed, in which they might confidently respond to an unexpected student question "I don't know, let's find out".

SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AND CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

We move on now to data that have enabled us to build on and update our earlier findings (Rowland *et al*., 2000) associated with the second of our project goals – investigating the relation between trainees' SMK and their teaching competence. The level of each student's subject knowledge (based on the audit) was categorised as low, medium or high, corresponding to the need for significant remedial support, modest support (or self-remediation), or none. In addition, assessments of the students' teaching of mathematics were made (against the standards set out in Circular 4/98) on a three-point scale weak/capable/strong. For the 1998-99 cohort, these assessments were made (a) on both first and second placements, and (b) with respect to both 'preactive' (related to planning and self-evaluation) and 'interactive' (related to the management of the lesson in progress) aspects of mathematics teaching (following Bennett and Turner-Bisset, 1993). Tables 2 to 5 below show the four 3 by 3 contingency tables, for Placement 1 (N=167: six students had withdrawn from the course) and Placement 2 (N=164: three more students had withdrawn), together with expected frequencies (in parentheses) based on the null hypothesis that audit performance and teaching performance are independent.

	TEACHING PRACTICE PERFORMANCE		
		Strong	Capable	Weak
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT — High	17 (12.4)	16 (17.3)	1 (4.3)
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT — Middle	31 (29.2)	38 (40.7)	11 (10.1)
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT — Low	13 (19.4)	31 (27.0)	9 (6.7)

Table 2: Placement 1, preactive

	TEACHING PRACTICE PERFORMANCE		
		1 (strong)	2 (capable)	3 (weak)
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT — A (high)	18 (12.4)	12 (16.1)	4 (5.5)
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT — B (middle)	32 (29.2)	37 (37.8)	11 (12.9)
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT — C (low)	11 (19.4)	30 (25.1)	12 (8.6)

Table 3: Placement 1, interactive

	TEACHING PRACTICE PERFORMANCE		
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT		Strong	Capable	Weak
	High	12 (8.1)	18 (14.1)	4 (11.8)
	Middle	20 (18.5)	33 (32.3)	25 (27.1)
	Low	7 (12.4)	17 (21.6)	28 (18.1)

Table 4: Placement 2, preactive

	TEACHING PRACTICE PERFORMANCE		
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AUDIT		1 (strong)	2 (capable)	3 (weak)
	A (high)	13 (8.5)	19 (18.2)	2 (7.3)
	B (middle)	21 (19.5)	42 (41.9)	15 (16.6)
	C (low)	7 (13.0)	27 (27.9)	18 (11.1)

Table 5: Placement 2, interactive

Each table has df=4, and values of χ^2 less than 9.5 support the null hypothesis against the alternative that audit performance and teaching performance are in some way linked ($p<0.05$). The χ^2 values for the preactive and interactive data are 8.2 (p=0.085) and 10.5 (p=0.03) respectively for Placement 1 and 17.8 (p=0.002) and 13.6 (p=0.009) for Placement 2. Thus, the association between audit score and teaching performance is significant for three of the four analyses, the exception being the preactive dimension of the first placement. This anomaly will be the subject of future statistical verification with a larger sample, together with close scrutiny of a sample of trainees in school, with the aim of enhancing our understanding of "what's really going on" in all four aspects of the analysis. For the moment, we conjecture that the assessment of preactive aspects favours not only clarity about mathematics teaching and learning, but also a certain kind of bureaucratic competence that acts as some kind of 'leveller' in the very first exposure to work in schools. Taken together, however, these results support our earlier findings with the 1997-98 cohort (Rowland *et al*., 2000) and point to the positive effect of strong SMK in both the planning and the 'delivery' of elementary mathematics teaching.

FURTHER QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

A more recent, unpublished independent analysis of the 1998-99 data (Proctor, 2001) incorporates hitherto unexamined variables in an attempt to 'predict' the mathematics teaching competence of these trainees. These additional variables are:

1. The gender (male/female) of the trainee.
2. Their chosen age specialism (Early Years 3-8 or Middle Years 7-11)
3. A subject knowledge audit self-assessment. For each audit item, trainees were asked to indicate their degree of confidence on each item, on a 5-point scale from 0 ("Terrifying, I can't really think about it") to 4 ("I could show someone else how to do this").

Variables S, A and TP then denote respectively the sum of the *self-assessment scores* for the 16 items, the sum of the actual *audit scores* for the 16 items and the sum of the four *teaching practice grades* (preactive and interactive for the two placements). Thus S lies in the range 0 to 64, A in the range 0 to 32 and TP from 4 to 16.

The account which follows is inevitably selective and omits the technical details to be found in the original. Proctor's report begins with some exploratory data analysis. This establishes that the normality of A is compromised to the extent that the maximum score (32) constrains the distribution because it acts as a buffer. (We have in fact modified the audit coding system in line with Proctor's recommendations). Calculation of correlation coefficients shows significant correlation between the three pairs of variables, although scatter graphs indicate that neither A nor S is going to be a useful predictor of TP.

A comparison of *audit scores* over gender (female F, male M) and course (early years EY, middle years MY) indicates that there is little difference between the four groups F/EY, F/MY, M/MY. The M/EY scores are high relative to the other groups, but the group is very small (2 individuals) and this group is excluded in subsequent analysis.

A comparison of *self-assessment scores* for the same groups, however, suggests a much higher level of confidence among the MY students irrespective of gender (omitting the M/EY pair).

A similar comparison of *Teaching Practice scores* points to the superiority of F/MY as a group. The mean TP score of M/MY is the highest (i.e. the worst) and this group contains a long 'tail' of weak students as regards mathematics teaching performance.

Comparison of the M/MY, F/EY and F/MY groups by multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is consistent with these indications.

Further MANOVA analysis seeks to assess the relative usefulness of audit score A and confidence score S in predicting the teaching practice score TP, irrespective of gender and course. Specifically, the sample of 153 students who completed both teaching practices were separated into two bands, the upper band consisting of those with a mean TP score of 1 or 2, the lower those with a mean TP score of 3 or 4. The two bands were similar in size (upper 83, lower 70). Borderline averages were rounded down, as university course assessors would tend to do so in practice. The upper band can be viewed as those clearly demonstrating a secure level of teaching competence. The lower band includes those who are merely satisfactory along with those who would be assessed as borderline or unsatisfactory. It turns out that individuals in both bands are represented across the range of audit and confidence self-assessment scores. However, there is evidence for a difference in the mean (A, S) vectors of the high/low bands (Hotellings T^2 statistic). Further analysis shows that the contribution of the audit score A to this difference is much greater than that of the confidence score S.

Figure 1: 95% confidence regions for the two teaching bands A (high) and B (low)

This is nicely illustrated in Figure 1, in which the 95% confidence regions of the mean for both A and S are represented by the ellipses $\mathbb{A}$ for the high band and $\mathbb{B}$ for the low band. Although these confidence regions themselves do not overlap, the projections onto the relevant axes show no overlap between the audit score confidence intervals for the two groups compared with a clear overlap between the self-assessment scores.

A final section of Proctor's analysis uses regression analysis in order to predict the TP score from A and S, together with dichotomous variables for gender G (M=0, F=1) and course Y (MY=0, EY=1). Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis results in the model:

$$TP = 16.7 - 0.166A - 0.0376S - 1.178G + 0.365Y$$

The overall significance of the model is high, and the greater contribution of the audit score A to this difference is much greater than that of the confidence score S However, the p-value of the course variable Y is found to be 0.35, indicating that there is little justification in including it in the model. The OLS model then becomes:

$$TP = 16.95 - 0.164A - 0.044S - 1.67G$$

An OLS model to predict the sum of the two scores for the second teaching placement only – the one that ultimately matters most in the PGCE course assessment – gives constants roughly half of those shown immediately above, as might be expected, although the contribution of the audit score and gender is even greater.

Perhaps the most startling result comes from a comparison of separate OLS models for the Early Years (excluding the two males) and Middle Years students.

For the Early Years trainees: $\quad TP = 14.5 - 0.0646A - 0.0818S$

For the Middle Years trainees: $\quad TP = 16.8 - 0.233A - 0.0045S - 1.82G$

This indicates that for the MY group, the predictive effect of the self-assessment score is negligible compared with that of the audit score and the gender effect, whereas for the EY trainees confidence is the more powerful predictor. (This may not be self-evident since the coefficients of A, S in the EY model are in the ratio 3:4 approximately. However, it must be remembered that the range of values of S is twice that of A. In fact, the correlation (Pearson's) between both TP and A and TP and S is significant ($p < 0.05$))

CONCLUSION

We have drawn attention to the problematic nature of generalisation and proof as a component of the mathematics SMK of pre-service elementary teachers, adding further weight to the doubts of Goulding and Suggate (2001) that much can be done to remedy trainees' difficulties with proof within initial training, especially given the multiple demands on them in all areas of the curriculum in an intensely pressured course. We would expect that clarity of understanding of the nature of proof and refutation in mathematics would inform the trainees' approach to questioning and enquiry with their students, and we are struck by the robustness under replication of our earlier finding (Rowland *et al.*, 2000) that effective classroom teaching of elementary mathematics is associated with secure SMK at a level beyond the elementary curriculum. It may be that, even within the constraints of PGCE courses, greater priority could be given to syntactic dimensions of SMK, although inevitably this would be at the expense of substantive elements.

Proctor's (2001) analysis could be interpreted in a number of ways. One conjecture would be that, for teachers of very young children, the actual audited SMK is less important than a confident attitude to mathematics, although this would be in conflict with the findings of Aubrey (1997). Perhaps the major contribution of quantitative analysis, in this case, has been to motivate the next phase of our work, which will involve qualitative analysis of classroom observations, in an attempt to find out 'what's going on' – how subject knowledge can be seen to come into play when these trainees teach elementary mathematics.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

Alexander, R., Rose, J. and Woodhead, C. (1992) *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Aubrey, C. (1997) *Mathematics Teaching in the early years: an investigation into teachers' subject knowledge*. London: Falmer Press.

Bennett, N. and Turner-Bisset, R. (1993) 'Knowledge bases and teaching performance'. In Bennett, N. and Carré, C. (eds.) *Learning to Teach*, pp. 149-164. London: Routledge.

DfEE (1998) *Teaching: High Status, High Standards: Circular 4/98*. London: HMSO.

Goulding M. and Suggate, J. (2001) 'Opening a can of worms: investigating primary teachers' subject knowledge in mathematics.' *Mathematics Education Review* 13, pp. 41-54.

Grossman, P., Wilson, S. and Shulman, L. (1989) 'Teachers of substance: subject matter knowledge for teaching.'. In Reynolds, M. (ed.), *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher*, pp. 23-36. Oxford: Pergamon.

London Mathematical Society (LMS) (1995) *Tackling the Mathematics Problem*. London: LMS.

Ma, L. (1999) *Knowing and teaching elementary mathematics: Teachers' understanding of fundamental mathematics in China and the United States*, Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ofsted (1994) *Science and Mathematics in Schools: A Review*. London: HMSO.

Proctor, E. (2001) 'Relationships between mathematics knowledge, mathematics confidence and teaching ability'. Unpublished dissertation for the MSc in Applied Statistics. Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University.

Rowland, T., Martyn, S., Barber, P. and Heal, C. (2000) 'Primary teacher trainees' mathematics subject knowledge and classroom performance'. In Rowland, T. and Morgan, C. (eds) *Research in Mathematics Education Volume 2: Papers of the British Society for Research into Learning Mathematics*, pp. 3-18. London: BSRLM..

Rowland, T., Martyn, S., Barber, P. and Heal, C. (2001) 'Investigating the mathematics subject matter knowledge of pre-service elementary school teachers'. In M. van den Heuvel-Panhuizen (ed.) *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education,* Volume 4 pp. 121-128. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University.

Shulman, L. S.(1986) 'Those who understand, Knowledge growth in teaching,' *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), p 4-14.

Shulman, L and Grossman, P. (1988) *Knowledge growth in teaching: a final report to the Spencer Foundation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Steinberg, R., Marks, R. and Haymore, J. (1985) 'Teachers' knowledge and structuring content in mathematics'. *Knowledge Growth in a Profession Publication Series*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education.