



HAL
open science

Professionalizing primary school mathematics teacher educators

Ronald Keijzer, Michiel Veldhuis

► **To cite this version:**

Ronald Keijzer, Michiel Veldhuis. Professionalizing primary school mathematics teacher educators. Thirteenth Congress of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education (CERME13), Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics; Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest, Jul 2023, Budapest, Hungary. hal-04420716

HAL Id: hal-04420716

<https://hal.science/hal-04420716v1>

Submitted on 26 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Professionalizing primary school mathematics teacher educators

Ronald Keijzer¹ and Michiel Veldhuis^{1,2}

¹IPABO University of Applied Sciences, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, r.keijzer@ipabo.nl

²Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

Mathematics teacher educators in teacher education for primary school need expert knowledge and skills in teaching in primary school, in subject matter, and in research. Most starting mathematics teacher educators only partly possess this knowledge and skills. We developed and tested a two-year professional development trajectory for starting primary school mathematics teacher educators using design-based research to evaluate and improve the design. In this paper we describe the background and the design of the professional development trajectory and the experiences with several cohorts of starting mathematics teacher educators. We conclude that the professional development design's focus should be on mathematical knowledge for teaching, should refer to both teacher education and primary education practice, should offer opportunities for cooperative learning, and has to use practice based research as a developmental tool.

Keywords: Teacher educator education, primary education, mathematical knowledge for teaching, design-based research.

Introduction

Mathematics teacher educators in primary school teacher education need high level mathematical content knowledge, deep theoretical knowledge on mathematics teaching in primary education, knowledge and skills in supporting student teachers in teacher education, and knowledge of teaching practice in primary education (Goffree & Dolk, 1995; Kool, et. al., 2023). Only few starting mathematics teacher educators combine all these competences.

In the Netherlands, starting mathematics teacher educators have diverse backgrounds and differently developed competencies. There is no professional standard or certification to become a mathematics teacher educator. Almost all starting mathematics teacher educators feel that they have to develop extra skills and knowledge. But which skills and knowledge have to be developed varies depending on the educator in question.

Of course, new employees are rarely fully prepared for their new job or task. However, we notice that the support from colleagues for starting mathematics teacher educators on the job is mostly of practical nature. They get information on many relevant aspects of teacher education, such as the institute's curriculum, the digital system, the assessment processes and many more, but not on domain specific knowledge and skills that are necessary for providing high quality mathematics teacher education. From talks with starting colleagues at conferences and other gatherings a clear need came to the fore for a more profound, theoretical, and specific professionalization trajectory for primary mathematics teacher education in the Netherlands. That is why we decided to develop and perform a professional development trajectory for starting mathematics teacher educators.

Background

Teacher-educators' task implies mediating between student learning and pre-service teacher learning (Remillard & Geist, 2002). Teacher educators generally develop their skills and knowledge by elaborating on the teacher education program and curriculum. Doing so, they enrich their own experiences in teaching and teacher education with knowledge of teaching and learning, and about teaching and learning (Loughran, 2014). In the case of mathematics education, Hill et al. (2008) describe this knowledge on teaching and learning as 'Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching' (MKT). MKT can be seen as the interaction of various aspects of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, where pedagogical content knowledge includes knowledge of mathematics learning, mathematics teaching and the mathematics curriculum.

Mathematics teacher educators develop and use MKT in teacher education as means for developing their teacher education program and curriculum. This paper shows their need for support herein. It raises a design question into developing a learning environment for mathematics teacher educators. Design-based research is helpful in answering this question, as it focusses on understanding theoretical notions on teaching and learning in relation to designed learning environments and artifacts and practice (The Design-Based Research Collective, 2003). In this research, practical and theoretical arguments on mathematics teacher educators' development resulted in design principles and a hypothetical learning trajectory (Simon, 1995; Bakker, 2018). These principles were tested in a prototypical setting, where the hypothesized development was compared to the actual development, thus providing insight in theoretical notions on mathematics teacher educators' development.

Research question

We will sketch the process leading to formulating design principles. From these design principles, we developed a design used in the trajectory. Next, we elaborate on experiences in the professional development trajectory by providing an example from a morning session. This brings us to a critical analysis of the design and ideas for further development.

We thus answer the following research question: What are characteristics of a professional development trajectory for starting mathematics teacher educators?

Method

Overview

Main focus in this research is a critical analysis of a trajectory for mathematics teacher educators. It answers a design question using a design-based research approach.

Participants

Mathematics teacher educators for primary school were approached through advertisements in professional journals, on websites, and by notices at conferences. On the institutional level all Dutch teacher education institutes were approached.

The first cohort of 14 teacher educators commenced the professional development trajectory in 2020. In 2021, in the second cohort 13 teacher educators participated and in 2022, in the third cohort, 20 teacher educators. Within these three cohorts teacher educators from 17 different teacher education

institutes from all over the Netherlands participated. Several participants had to travel over two hours to get to the course location, which is a lot relative to the scale of the Netherlands.

Participants' background, knowledge, and educational experience differed significantly. Some just started as teacher educators, whereas others had one or several years' experience as mathematics teacher educator. There were participants with experience as primary school teacher or mathematics specialist in primary education, others had been mathematics teachers at secondary school. Some participants have a PhD in mathematics education, with extensive research experience and some teaching experience at university. Several participants had been educational advisor or textbook writer and developer for mathematics education. As a consequence there were large differences between participants in terms of subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, teaching experience in primary education or teacher education, and experience in doing research.

Towards design principles for the professional development trajectory

We developed a professional development trajectory taking into account the diverse population of relatively new mathematics teacher educators and the diverse skills and knowledge set they are supposed to develop. The skills and knowledge set consists of at least high level mathematical content knowledge (Oonk, et. al., 2007), mathematical knowledge for teaching (Hill, et. al., 2008), deep theoretical knowledge on mathematics teaching in primary education, knowledge and skills about supporting student teachers in teacher education (Oonk, 2009), and knowledge of teaching practice in primary education. To develop this, we estimated that educators would need support over an extensive period of time, we would have to know their starting level on the different aspects very well, taking good account of the different starting levels between them in order to optimally cater the sessions to their needs, and we would have to link the activities in the trajectory to primary school practice, teacher education practice, and insights from mathematics education literature. In several design sessions, we devised relevant topics to include in the trajectory and the design principles we would abide by in designing the meetings in the trajectory and the activities therein. Taking these practical and theoretical considerations into account, we developed a prototypical professional development trajectory with the following features.

The trajectory:

- has mathematical knowledge for teaching as a content and pedagogical framework,
- consists of activities that are embedded in both mathematics teacher education practice and primary education practice,
- offers opportunities for cooperative learning, and
- uses practice based research as a developmental tool.

The design team consisted of five experienced mathematics teacher educators and researchers who work at three different teacher education institutes in the Netherlands. Their expertise is in practice-oriented research, curriculum development, and professional development related to primary mathematics education and teacher education.

General characteristics of the professional development trajectory

The professional development trajectory takes two years, with five meetings of six hours over the course of a year. For each of these ten meetings the participants prepare specific tasks both individually and in small teams. These tasks generally involve some reading of literature and practical assignments in their teacher education institute, activities which they develop, carry out, and evaluate. The second year in the trajectory focuses on practice-based research with associated assignments. Estimated time needed for preparatory work for each meeting amounts to a maximum of 10 hours. The study load thus amounts to 160 hours over the two-year period. Participants are facilitated by their institutions to be able to make this time investment.

The design team members also taught the course. Generally two course leaders are responsible for a meeting day, but the other course leaders strive to be actively present in these meetings as well. Thus ensuring the continuous exchange between experts through co-teaching and further development of the trajectory.

Using the design principles to develop the professional development trajectory

1. The professional development trajectory has mathematical knowledge for teaching as a content and pedagogical framework

The professional development trajectory is called *verdiepingscursus* in Dutch, which means 'deepening course'. This implies that our participants are provided with more than practical lesson ideas and teacher educator skills, they are challenged to really develop their mathematical knowledge for teaching, both in subject matter knowledge as pedagogical content knowledge (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008). The starting point and thus the steepness and length of their needed learning curve differs between the participants. We strive to challenge each participant on their own level (or slightly above) to make the connection between their mathematics teacher education practice and their mathematical knowledge for teaching through studying, reflecting, experimenting, and analyzing, thus allowing for growth in both domains. In the meetings, we included several aspects of mathematical knowledge for teaching, sometimes focusing more on primary mathematics education, on mathematics teacher education, on (specialized) content knowledge, or on a combination of these. The meetings always are focused on several combined themes, to which the preparatory work is connected. The meetings provide in a gradual transfer from a slightly stronger focus on primary school towards mathematics teacher education.

2. The professional development trajectory consists of activities that are embedded in both mathematics teacher education practice and primary education practice

Participants in the professional development trajectory are expected to develop on three important aspects. Firstly, they further develop their own mathematical knowledge for teaching. They are challenged to apply this knowledge in their teacher education practice. For example, by discussing the goals and didactics of mathematics teacher education with their colleagues. Secondly, participants implement new teacher education activities with their preservice teachers. When discussing, designing, experimenting, and evaluating this mathematical knowledge for teaching in teacher education practice the question comes to the fore how preservice teachers can apply this knowledge

in their practice schools while teaching mathematics. The three levels in the professional development trajectory refer to activities in which the teacher educator, their students, or primary school students are exchanging and continually developing together.

3. The professional development trajectory offers opportunities for cooperative learning

The professional development trajectory offers a wide variety of learning activities in which knowledge and experience of the leading teacher educators and practical and scientific sources play an important role. Equally important are the experiences, knowledge, and competences of the participants. The course, purposefully, offers many tasks and activities that are aimed at exchanging and evaluating experiences, and offer opportunities to learn from and with peers. Such activities are, for example, activities in which participants, individually or in small peer groups, interview their colleagues in mathematics teacher education, have their preservice teachers solve non-routine mathematical problems, look for mathematics in the world and in media, analyze textbooks and syllabi used in their institution, evaluate assessments and student work, design lesson activities and trial these in teacher education, investigate the vision of their teacher education institute on mathematics education, illustrate the teaching and learning trajectories used by their teacher education institutes, read literature of their choosing as well as provided literature, and answer their own research questions in that way, and share their findings in the meetings with other teacher educators. Plenary and small-group discussions are connected with theory, or form the basis for a new assignment. This learning with and from each other is intertwined with instructions or reflections from the course leaders. By this approach to learning we strive to have the participants prepared for, and involved in, an existing professional network or as developed within the trajectory, whereon they can still rely after its completion. To facilitate these connections between the participants during the meetings there is always space built-in for informal exchanges in the form of lunches or walking tours.

4. The course uses practice based research as a developmental tool

Depth and progress in the learning process of the participants is aimed at by using an inquiry-based approach into questions or problems from their own teacher education practice. Participants select and study literature, design possible solutions, and trial these in their own institutions, all the while gathering data to analyse and evaluate their designed intervention (Bakker, 2018). Such inquiries allow both for solutions to local problems from practice and the development of participants' mathematical knowledge for teaching. In the first year of the professional development trajectory relatively small and well-defined inquiry activities are undertaken. In the second year, participants perform a research project during the entire year, in which they focus on investigating and designing an educational intervention in their own teacher education institute. The participants are grouped thematically and can thus divide the work and perform several cycles in their design research with different student groups and context. In addition to the thematic focus of the meetings of the trajectory, about half of the time in the meetings in the second year is dedicated to this research project.

Example morning session: mathematical attitude

We here describe activities performed during a morning session in year 1. The central theme is the development of a mathematical attitude. In preparation for the meeting, the participants have read Oonk and De Goeij's (2006) article on a mathematical attitude and prepare questions of the most appropriate way to work on the development of a mathematical attitude in primary school. In addition to affective aspects, such as self-confidence and pleasure in mathematics, participants are also presented reflective, inquisitive, critical, and communicative aspects of the mathematical attitude. Verbalizing different approaches to solving problems and sharing and evaluating them with peers plays an important role in developing a mathematical attitude. Following an introduction, participants were given a meaningful task to solve: "How many kilometres of toilet paper has been bought in the Netherlands last year?" Solving such a task requires content knowledge and higher-order mathematical skills.

To make the participants more aware of the process of developing a mathematical attitude, we provide them with a list of characteristics of a mathematical attitude with the request to tick the characteristics that played a role during their individual work on the problem and which were addressed during the small-group and plenary discussions. The participants believed that while working individually on the task, recognizing and applying mathematics in situations and being focused on appropriate numbers and on accuracy and completeness, were mostly present. While working together on the problem, being focused on alternative problem approaches, using mathematical language in collaboration with others, and being critical of the use of mathematics were more evident.

Participants also discovered how important the choice of an appropriate problem is in developing a mathematical attitude. The problem they had to solve was intriguing, required knowledge of the world, and appealed to higher-order thinking skills.

In the second part of the morning, participants analyse the primary school students' work working on the same toilet paper problem. Students' problem approaches show many differences, especially in the ways they note their thinking. Participants experienced that it places high demands on the teacher to understand how students reason in rich meaningful problems, and especially conducting classroom discussion supporting students' are learning mathematical attitude.

Finally, several participants decide to apply the toilet paper problem, the primary school student materials, and the article, to a lesson on mathematical attitude in their own teacher education program as well. The aspects of the activities made them think about the development of mathematical attitude, and they hope to trigger this thinking process in their own preservice teachers as well. Perhaps this will subsequently encourage their preservice teachers to experiment with the problem in primary school practice.

Reflection on the morning session

This example clearly shows how the four design criteria for the trajectory work out. The content theme is mathematical attitude, the participants grow in their mathematical knowledge for teaching by reading the article and by the input in the meeting. They also further construct their own knowledge by sharing and reflecting on experiences during the meeting. The three levels – teacher educators,

preservice teachers, and primary school students – are intermittently or simultaneously in the spotlight. While working on the toilet paper problem, participants become aware of characteristics of mathematical attitude needed for educators. They are challenged to think about the required teacher skills to develop a mathematical attitude. What should their preservice teachers know and be able to do? Finally, they analysed the work of primary school students and how primary school students can develop their mathematical attitude. Learning from and with each other takes place during small group work and plenary discussion. Thus, participants work collectively on their own mathematics skills and their views on the aims of mathematics education. The fourth design principle – practice-based research as a developmental tool – comes into play at the many moments during the meeting when participants are invited, individually or together, to systematically explore, describe, and evaluate their own and the primary school's practice, using the knowledge and experiences gained before and during the meeting. This encouragement to research-based thinking about their own teacher education and the primary education effectively inspired the participants, evidenced by the fact that during the practice-oriented research in the second year of the course several participants chose to do a practical research project concerning the development of their preservice teachers' mathematical attitude.

Conclusion and discussion

This research uncovered characteristics of a professional development trajectory for starting mathematics teacher educators. The professional development trajectory based on formulated design principles, clearly contributed to participants' further professionalization. Concretely, the trajectory provided them with more profound knowledge of the domain, by inspiring them with theoretical insights, and use these to investigate practical situations. Also by discussing with their teacher education colleagues and trying to get a grasp of their vision on mathematics education, and by doing practice-oriented research into a particular subject. Additionally the exchanges between teacher educators have clearly contributed to a broader perspective on education, educational settings, and the content. The mathematics teacher educators in the professional development trajectory became a professional learning community and formed a network, on which they can continue to rely after finishing the trajectory. Finally, they have been learning from the diverse contexts of teacher education institutes in their practice-oriented research project in the second year.

As such we can conclude that the knowledge gains we aimed for using the design criteria were indeed achieved. The participants also provided their feedback on this to us:

“I found it especially interesting to read articles from different mathematics education journals and discuss these with the peer group” (cf. design principle 1)

“Already in the first meeting it became clear that everyone's background and level was taken into account. Differentiation. I really appreciated that.”

“I really found it of added value to exchange ideas and especially experiences. As I work in a small institute these exchanges with mathematics teacher educators are rare.” (cf. design principle 3)

Notwithstanding the second quote, a challenge for the trajectory remains to really cater to the needs of all participants. Different participants gave different feedback on the different themes dealt with

in the trajectory. As described above, due to the differences in previous experiences and knowledge the participants' needs differed greatly. Although we strived to incorporate different foci and levels in each meeting, participants did sometimes feel that things went too slowly, or too quickly. All in all it is clear that participants and the course leaders were positive about the content of the professional development trajectory and the development of the participants' mathematical knowledge for teaching therein. The designed professional development trajectory with a content-specific focus clearly contributes to the professionalization of new mathematics teacher educators.

References

- Bakker, A. (2018). *Design research in education. A practical guide for early career researchers*. Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Ball, D.L., Thames, M., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59, 389–407.
- Goffree, F., & Dolk, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Proeve van een nationaal programma rekenen-wiskunde & didactiek op de pabo [Standards for primary mathematics teacher education]*. Instituut voor Leerplanontwikkeling / NVORWO.
- Hill, H., Ball, D., & Schilling, S. (2008). Unpacking pedagogical content knowledge: Conceptualizing and measuring teachers' topic-specific knowledge of students. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 39, 372–400.
- Kool, M., Van Doornik-Beemer, H., Keijzer, R., Veldhuis, M., & Van Zanten, M. (2023). Kwaliteitscriteria voor de lerarenopleiding rekenen-wiskunde [Quality criteria for primary mathematics teacher education]. *Volgens Bartjens - Ontwikkeling en Onderzoek*, 42(4), 41–53.
- Loughran, J. (2014). Professionally developing as a teacher educator. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(4), 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533386>
- Oonk, W. (2009). *Theory-enriched practical knowledge in mathematics teacher education*. Universiteit Leiden.
- Oonk, W., & De Goeij, E. (2006). Wiskundige attitudevorming [Developing mathematical attitude]. *Reken-wiskundeonderwijs: Onderzoek, Ontwikkeling, Praktijk*, 25(4), 37–39.
- Oonk, W., Van Zanten, M. A., & Keijzer, R. (2007). Gecijferdheid, vier eeuwen ontwikkeling [Four centuries of development: mathematical literacy]. *Reken-wiskundeonderwijs: Onderzoek, Ontwikkeling, Praktijk*, 26(3), 3–18.
- Remillard, J.T., & Geist, P.A.K. (2002). Supporting teachers' professional learning by navigating openings in the curriculum. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 5, 7–34. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013862918442>
- Simon, M. A. (1995). Reconstructing mathematics pedagogy from a constructivist perspective. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education* 26(2), 114–145.
- The Design-Based Research Collective. (2003). Design-based research: An emerging paradigm for educational inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 5–8.