Networking Theories by Iterative Unpacking

Boris Koichu

An iterative unpacking strategy consists of sequencing empirically-based theoretical developments so that at each step of theorizing one theory serves as an overarching conceptual framework, in which another theory, either existing or emerging, is embedded in order to elaborate on the chosen element(s) of the overarching theory. The strategy is presented in this paper by means of reflections on how it was used in several empirical studies and by means of a non-example. The article concludes with a discussion of affordances and limitations of the strategy.

Keywords: Iterative unpacking; Networking; Problem posing; Problem solving; Theories in mathematics education

Teorías de conexión mediante análisis iterativo

Una estrategia de análisis iterativo consiste en una secuenciación de avances teóricos con base empírica. Así, cada avance en una teoría sirve para organizar un marco conceptual, en el que otra teoría, existente o emergente, queda embebida con el propósito de ampliar los elementos de la teoría global. En este artículo, presentamos esta estrategia por medio de reflexiones sobre cómo se utilizó en varios estudios empíricos y por medio de un no-ejemplo. El artículo concluye con una discusión sobre los puntos fuertes y las limitaciones de la estrategia.

Palabras clave: Análisis iterativo; Conexión de redes; Invención de problemas; Resolución de problemas; Teorías en Educación Matemática

A long-term program of our research group focuses on identifying and characterizing learning that possibly occurs when individuals or groups of individuals are engaged in problem solving and problem posing. In several of our studies, a typical data set consists of a series of recorded observations of how a learner or a small group of learners approaches an insight problem or tries to openly generalize a known theorem or pose a mathematical problem, which would be interesting to solve also to the posers. Many

Koichu, B. (2014). Networking theories by iterative unpacking. *PNA*, *8*(4), 151-161.

events, interactions and developments occur in such situations, so we, as many other research groups, repeatedly face the following research choices.

- Which of the observed developments are worthwhile enough in order to call them "learning"?
- The learners' successes and failures with problem-solving and problem-posing tasks are functions of many conditions and variables, some of which are out of our reach. So, which variables and conditions should become a focus of our attention, if we wish not only to describe the learners' actions and learning, but also to explain what stipulated them?

These questions presume different theoretically-laden answers in different circumstances. Though individual studies in our group heavily rely on selected theories, their elements or their combinations, our group is not adhered to a particular theory or conceptual framework[1]. Thus, the need to develop certain strategies of calling into play several theories in one study as well as in a sequence of studies emerged for us. The goal of this paper is to introduce one of such strategies, which I would like to term *networking by iterative unpacking*.

Iterative Unpacking Strategy: An Introductory Example

Let me introduce an iterative unpacking strategy by an example taken from a recent article by Simon, Saldanha, McClintock, Akar, Watanabe, and Zembat (2010). These authors present a novel approach to studying learning through mathematical activities. The approach is developed for capturing subtle processes of transition the learners come through when progressing from one conceptual step of knowledge construction to a subsequent one. The scholars contrast their approach with an approach developed by Thompson (1994) and Steffe (2003). That approach includes identifying sequences of developmental steps in students' mathematical actions and analysing them, in particular, in Piagetian terms of perturbation, accommodation, and reflective abstraction. To further situate their approach in the literature, Simon et al. (2010) asserted what follows.

> *Our work also builds on the work of Hershkowitz, Schwartz, and Dreyfus (2001) who took on the challenge of explicating the formation of abstractions. Toward this end they described three epistemic actions in the process of abstraction: construction, recognition, and building with. They emphasize that construction is the key part of the process.* (p. 80)

Our work can be seen as attempting to unpack construction in terms of Simon et al. (2010). Notably, these authors refer to a previous work of Hershkowitz et al. (2001) in a dual way. On one hand, they refer to it as a theory, which unpacks a particular ele-

[1] The notions "theory" and "conceptual framework" are used interchangeably in this paper.

ment of a previously developed theory. To this end and consistently with the terminology of Bikner-Ahsbahs and Prediger (2006), the former theory can be seen as a foreground one, and the latter as a background one. On the other hand, they use the work of Hershkowitz et al. (2001) as a background theory or as an overarching framework, in which their own foreground theory is embedded. Simon et al. (2010) specifically point out which theoretical construct of the overarching framework they are going to unpack. They then perform the unpacking by developing an elaborate kit of tools for analysing the process of construction/transition in terms of seeing commonalities between the tasks in a sequence of tasks and anticipating solutions.

My point is that Simon et al. utilize two networking strategies, one of which had been explicated in the literature (e.g., Bikner-Ahsbahs & Prediger, 2006; Prediger, Bikner-Ahsbahs, & Arzarello, 2008) and another was not. First, they utilize a comparison strategy by pointing out the differences between their approach and the Piagetian-oriented approach developed by Steffe (2003) and Thompson (1994). The main difference is that Simon et al. (2010) suggest exploring learning without necessarily focusing on perturbation. Second, Simon et al. (2010) do not use the "construction, recognition, and building with" language in their analysis. They consider it as an overarching conceptual framework for their own theorizing. To this end, their contribution is in unpacking one of the key constructs of the theory of Hershkovitz et al. (2001); therefore, *unpacking strategy*. Furthermore, the whole process of theorizing presented by Simon et al. (2010) includes the following chain of iterations: (a) from focusing on perturbation, accommodation, and reflective abstraction to unpacking the formation of abstraction in terms of construction, recognition, and building with; and then (b) to unpacking construction in terms of seeing commonalities between the tasks and anticipating the solutions; therefore, *iterative unpacking strategy*.

In sum, iterative unpacking strategy consists of sequencing empirically-based theoretical developments so that at each step of theorizing one theory serves as an overarching conceptual framework, in which another theory, either existing or emerging, is embedded in order to elaborate on the chosen elements(s) of the overarching theory. Note that different ways to embed an additional theory into an overarching theory may exist. For example, the way of unpacking construction offered by Kidron, Bikner-Ahsbahs, and Dreyfus (2010) is very different from the way offered by Simon et al. (2010). It is also of note that, though an overarching theory and an embedded theory are, in a way, complementary, iterative unpacking does not necessarily imply that all the constructs of the overarching theory are to be preserved. In other words, the use of iterative unpacking strategy may influence also an overarching theoretical framework, as follows: unpacking a particular aspect of a theory may shed new light on the role of the rest of its aspects. For instance, the role of perturbation—one of the main concepts of the highest-level overarching theory in the above example—is reconsidered in the second iteration.

Additional Examples

In this section, I illustrate an iterative unpacking strategy through two sequences of studies, in which I have been involved during the last years. The first example concerns problem solving; and the second one, problem posing.

Example 1: Iterative Unpacking of Problem Solving

Problem solving as a research field is being attracting keen attention of the mathematics education community for more than 50 years. Foreground models of problem-solving are originated in seminal work of Pólya (1945/1973) and developed in the eighties (e.g., Schoenfeld, 1985). Generally, the models attempt to show how learners solve mathematical problems in terms of phases and attributes. For instance, a model offered by Carlson and Bloom (2005) postulates four problem-solving phases: (a) orientation, (b) planning, (c) executing and (d) checking. These phases operate with five problem-solving attributes: conceptual knowledge, heuristic knowledge, metacognition, control, and affect.

First Iteration

A heuristic knowledge component was chosen to be unpacked in the study reported in Koichu, Berman, and Moore (2007). The study includes a five-month teaching experiment in two Israeli 8th grade classes. The aim of the experiment was to test a particular approach to develop students' heuristic literacy. By heuristic literacy we mean an individual's capacity to use the shared names of heuristic strategies in classroom discourse and to approach—not necessarily to solve—mathematical problems by using a variety of heuristics. We explore changes in students' heuristic literacy in three rounds of thinking-aloud interviews conducted at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of the experiment. The interviews were based on so-called seemingly familiar problems, that is, problems that looked similar to the problems previously offered in the students' mathematics classrooms, whose solutions, however, were essentially different. The following problem is an example.

> *The sum of the digits of a two-digit number is 14. If you add 46 to this number the product of digits of the new number will be 6. Find the two-digit number.*

Indeed, at first glance the problem has a solution by means of a system of equations, as many similarly looking problems approached by the students in the classroom have had. However, composing a system of equations appears ineffective at a second glance. Such problems were used as opportunities to elicit as many heuristics as possible from the students' thinking-aloud speech without discouraging the students from the beginning by facing unfamiliar problems. The interview protocols were segmented into content units and coded in terms of 10 pre-defined heuristic processes.

- Planning, which includes thinking forward, thinking from the end to the beginning, and arguing by contradiction.
- Self-evaluation, which includes local self-evaluation, and thinking backward.

- Activating a previous experience, which includes recalling related problems, and recalling related theorems.
- Selecting problem representation, which includes denoting and labeling, and drawing a picture.
- Exploring particular cases, which includes examining extreme or boundary values, and partial induction.
- Introducing an auxiliary element.
- Exploring a particular datum.
- Finding what is easy to find.
- Exploration of symmetry.
- Generalization.

Success or failure in solving the interview problem was obviously dependant on circumstances under which the problems were dealt with as well as the whole bunch of problem-solving attributes. Consequently, the rates of success were considered irrelevant to unpacking a heuristic component of problem solving. Instead, we introduced a notion of relative *heuristic richness* of solutions. We used the following comparison criterion: One solution was called heuristically richer than another if the number of different heuristic processes indicated in the first solution was greater by three or more than in the second solution. Given that 10 different heuristics were considered in our study, we considered the criterion "… 3 or more" very demanding and, in turn, sufficiently robust. This criterion was applied to each student individually, for comparison of her or his solutions by pairs of corresponding problems given in the first, second and third interviews. We then developed an integrative measure of individual heuristic literacy development based on the number of the pairs of the corresponding problems, in which a solution to the second problem was heuristically richer than a solution to the first one.

The measure helped us to adequately account for some of the learning effects of the teaching experiment. One of the central findings was that positive changes in heuristic literacy occurred in most of the students, yet they were unequally distributed among the students, who were defined as stronger and weaker with respect to their achievements in Scholastic Aptitude Test in Mathematics (SAT-M), administered at the beginning of the experiment. In particular, those students, who were weaker at the beginning of the experiment, demonstrated more significant heuristic literacy development than their stronger peers. We explained this result by suggesting that the heuristic content of the teaching experiment was more novel and useful for the weaker students, whereas the stronger students might have possessed the strategies prior to the experiment. The novelty of this result was in the exposure of the role and the learnability of the heuristic component of mathematical problem solving, which was identified in (relative) isolation from the rest of problem-solving components. In addition, this result enabled us to formulate some pedagogical implications.

Towards the Second Iteration

To recap, the study quoted above attempted to unpack the heuristic component of problem solving in terms of selected heuristic processes. Heuristic literacy was chosen as an object of learning. However, though the developed measure of heuristic literacy worked well for describing some of the learning effects of the experiment, it was too simplistic in order to capture how particular heuristics are called into play. This was particularly evident when we looked at the students' solutions containing comparable numbers of heuristics, which however differed in some other respects, such as the appearance of repetitions and cycles in the students' reasoning and the nature of their decisions when facing dead ends. Thus, we felt the need for further unpacking. Specifically, we were interested in unpacking a heuristic richness notion. To achieve this goal, we went in depth with three interrelated ideas.

Ovadia (2014) focus on how particular heuristics come into play depending on how the students perceive similarities and differences between problems that were discussed in a classroom and new ones. In particular, her study pays attention to the ways by which the students learn to make connections between known and new mathematical problems at the level of common heuristics needed for solving these problems. To this end, her study can also be seen as an attempt to unpack the process of seeing commonalities between the tasks pointed out by Simon et al. (2010) as one of the processes underlying the construction process.

Another study of Koichu (2010) was conducted in order to better understand why those students who possess all necessary strategic and conceptual knowledge for solving given problems sometimes miss within-the-reach solutions. In this work, I consider alternative explanations of this well-documented phenomenon in terms of three theories developed within mathematics education research, pointing out the limitations of these explanations with respect to a particular data set and offer an explanation in terms of the Principle of Intellectual Parsimony. This principle states that when solving a problem, one intends not to make more intellectual effort than the minimum needed. In other words, one makes more effort only when forced to do so by the evidence that the problem cannot be solved with less effort. The explanation is built on that efforts in problem solving can have different nature.

Finally, Koichu and Leron (submitted) focus on heuristic component of mathematical problem solving, and on proving and applying cognitive science theories to mathematics education have fruitfully intersected in our common work "Proving as problem solving: The role of cognitive decoupling". In this work, we re-analyse two thinking-aloud protocols from Koichu et al. (2007) in terms of a conceptual framework representing the increasing importance attached to working memory capacity by researchers in cognitive psychology working on problem solving and decision making. The key notion of the framework is that of cognitive decoupling (i.e., the human ability to form more than one mental model of the problem situation and attempt to hold them at the same time in working memory, all the time resisting the tendency for the models to be mixed and confused). Unpacking the heuristic component of problem solving in terms of cognitive decoupling seems to us instrumental for better under-

standing the appearance of cycles in repeated problem-solving attempts and for the use of multiple representations.

Example 2: Iterative Unpacking of Problem Posing

Koichu and Kontorovich (2012) conducted a study in which a group of pre-service mathematics teachers was asked to pose interesting mathematical problems based on a particularly rich problem-posing situation, the Billiard Task. Our goal was to identify those traits of problem-posing processes which are involved in the posers' attempts to formulate interesting problems.

A coherent conceptual framework which would be sensitive to the subtleness of the problem-posing processes and simultaneously applicable to a broad range of problem-posing tasks is not yet established. However, the literature offers several conceptualizations of problem posing which could be utilized in our study. We decided to adopt a definition of problem posing by Stoyanova and Ellerton (1996) as an overarching conceptual framework. The definition states that problem posing is "the process by which, on the basis of mathematical experience, students construct personal interpretations of concrete situations and formulate them as meaningful mathematical problems" (p. 518). This definition required a great deal of unpacking and, as will be evident shortly, we saw this fact as an opportunity rather than as a limitation. I present here our attempts to unpack two key components of the definition: (a) the process of constructing personal interpretations of a given situation, and (b) the notion of a mathematically meaningful problem.

Iterative Unpacking of the Process of Problem Posing

Problem posing is a natural companion of problem solving, so we decided to unpack it in terms of attributes and stages, as it had been fruitfully done regarding problem solving. In line with our earlier research (Kontorovich & Koichu, 2009; Kontorovich, Koichu, Leikin, & Berman, 2012), we focused on three aspects: (a) mathematical knowledge base, (b) problem-posing strategies, and (c) individual considerations of aptness.

The mathematical knowledge base for posing problems includes the knowledge of mathematical definitions, facts, routine problem-solving procedures and relevant competencies of mathematical discourse and writing. In addition, it requires knowledge of mathematical problems that can serve as prototypes. Recalling and using a system of prototypical problems relies, in turn, on three components of the problem-solving ability, which were pointed out by English (1998): the ability to recognize the underlying structure of a problem and to detect corresponding structures in related problems, the ability to perceive mathematical situations in different ways, and the ability to favour some problems over others in routine and non-routine situations. Notably, this conceptualization of mathematical knowledge base for problem posing can be seen as a result of iterative unpacking by itself.

The problem-posing strategies that emerged in our data—but had also been pointed out in prior studies—included constraint manipulation, symmetry, chaining, data-

driven reasoning and hypothesis-driven reasoning. Part of our analysis was directed to unpacking the chaining strategy.

The considerations of aptness are conceptualized as the poser's comprehensions of explicit and implicit requirements of a situation within which a problem is to be posed; they also reflect her or his assumptions about the relative importance of these requirements. Three types of considerations of aptness showed up in our data: (a) aptness to the posers, (b) aptness to the potential evaluators, and (c) aptness to the potential solvers of a posed problem. In the framework of Kontorovich and Koichu (2009), considerations of aptness are indicated but not further unpacked. Their unpacking is one of the goals of a PhD research of Kontorovich. Furthermore, one of the findings of this study was the identification and characterization of four problem-posing stages: (a) warming-up, (b) searching for an interesting mathematical phenomenon, (c) hiding the problem-posing process in the problem formulation, and (d) reviewing. Further refining and unpacking of these stages is another goal of a PhD research of Kontorovich.

Interpreting a Mathematically Meaningful Problem Notion—a Non-Example

For some time, we looked for a way of interpreting a mathematically meaningful problem notion among the existing ways of unpacking the closely related notions, such as beautiful problem and interesting problem. However, the resulting interpretation has not been done by an iterative unpacking strategy. Thus, the chain of theoretical considerations presented below can be seen as a non-example of iterative unpacking strategy.

On one hand, the literature on aesthetic aspects of mathematics informed us that an agreement about what constitutes a beautiful problem is elusive, but offers quite stable lists of general characteristics of such problems and their solutions, such as clarity, mathematical deepness and complexity, cleverness, novelty and surprise. Second, we accepted the argument that problems' descriptors such as meaningful belong to the rarefied discourse of mathematicians rather than that of learners (Crespo & Sinclair, 2008). These authors suggested that the learners' normative understanding of what qualifies as a worthwhile problem may develop around the notions of mathematically interesting or tasty. Third, we decided to build on the Goldin's (2002) idea that general characteristics of problems, such as meaningful, beautiful or interesting, should be seen as instantiations of one's internal multiply-encoded cognitive/affective configurations, to which the holder attributes some kind of truth value, and not as objective qualifiers of the problems.

Consequently, we decided to treat the descriptor meaningful in the manner that they have been developed in past research for attending the descriptors interesting or beautiful. Namely, we operationally considered a posed problem mathematically meaningful (or interesting or beautiful) if it was evaluated as such by the poser of the problem, its readers or solvers. This decision suited our research needs, but could not be seen as unpacking, in the meaning specified in the rest of the examples. We rather bypassed delving in the cognitive and affective mechanisms underlying one's use of

the descriptors and just explicated how the posed problems were operationally qualified in our data.

Affordances and Limitations

In terms of Kuhn (1962/2012), the growing interest of the mathematics education community in networking theories might suggest that mathematics education, as a research field, is in transition from the pre-paradigm phase to the "normal" science phase. The iterative unpacking strategy discussed in this article is reminiscent of the accumulation-by-development strategy considered by Kuhn as the main developmental force of science during normal science periods. Indeed, the "further elaborating on…" discourse is typical of the periods of normal science, but not of the periods of paradigmatic shifts and scientific revolutions.

The presented strategy can also be seen as a particular case of the strategies of coordinating and combining (Prediger et al., 2008), as a case that emphasizes accumulation of knowledge on local phenomena by establishing a specific connections between background and foreground theories. The specificity of the strategy is, in particular, in the dynamic relationship between the theories: One theory may serve as an overarching framework in one case, and as a source of conceptual tools for elaborating on elements of another theory in another case. These observations provide a background for pointing out some of the affordances and limitations of the strategy.

From a practicing researcher perspective, an iterative unpacking strategy can be instrumental for

- situating a study in the literature and highlighting its theoretical contribution;
- wording research questions in terms of a particular conceptual framework, without suppressing the possibility to further use additional conceptual frameworks in a coherent manner; and
- justifying the chosen level of granularity in data analysis.

In general, an iterative unpacking strategy can be helpful for "better collective capitalization of research results, [adding] more coherence at the global level of the field… gaining a more applicable network of theories to improve teaching and learning and finally guiding design research" (Prediger et al., 2008, p. 170).

As mentioned, one limitation of the iterative unpacking strategy is that it stops being important outside of the normal science periods (cf. Kuhn, 1962/2012). At the pre-paradigm periods, the strategies of ignoring, comparison or contrasting are typically in use. At revolutionary science periods, further elaborating on the elements of previously developed theories falls out of the mainstream. The use of the iterative unpacking strategy is limited also within the normal science periods. Briefly, all the conditions for the use of the strategies of coordinating and combining discussed in Prediger et al. (2008) apply.

REFERENCES

Bikner-Ahsbahs, A., & Prediger, S. (2006). Diversity of theories in mathematics education–how can we deal with it? *ZDM, 38*(1), 52-57.

Carlson, M., & Bloom, I. (2005). The cyclic nature of problem solving: An emergent multidimensional problem-solving framework. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *58*(1), 45-75.

Crespo, S., & Sinclair, N. (2008). What makes a problem mathematically interesting? Inviting prospective teachers to pose better problems. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 11*(5), 395-415.

English, L. D. (1998). Children's problem posing within formal and informal contexts. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *29*(1), 83-106.

Goldin, G. A. (2002) Affect, meta-affect, and mathematical belief structures. In G. C. Leder, E. Penkonen, & G. Torner (Eds.), *Beliefs: A hidden variable in mathematics education?* (pp. 59-72). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Hershkowitz, R., Schwarz, B., & Dreyfus, T. (2001). Abstraction in context: Epistemic actions. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 32*(2), 195-222.

Kidron, I., Bikner-Ahsbahs, A., & Dreyfus, T. (2011). How a general epistemic need leads to a need for a new construct: A case of networking two theoretical approaches. In M. Pytlak, T. Rowland, & E. Swoboda (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education* (pp. 2451-2461). Rzeszów, Poland: University of Rzeszów.

Koichu, B. (2010). On the relationships between (relatively) advanced mathematical knowledge and (relatively) advanced problem solving behaviours. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, *41*(2), 257-275.

Koichu, B., Berman, A., & Moore, M. (2007). Heuristic literacy development and its relation to mathematical achievements of middle school students. *Instructional Science*, *35*(2), 99-139.

Koichu, B., & Kontorovich, I. (2012). Dissecting success stories on mathematical problem posing: A case of the billiard task. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *83*(1), 71-86.

Koichu, B., & Leron, U. (submitted). Proving as problem solving: The role of cognitive decoupling.

Kontorovich, I., & Koichu, B. (2009). Towards a comprehensive framework of mathematical problem posing. In M. Tzekaki, M. Kaldrimidou, & C. Sakonidis (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 33rd Conference of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (Vol. 3, pp. 401-408). Thessaloniki, Greece: PME.

Kontorovich, I., Koichu, B., Leikin, R., & Berman, A. (2012). A framework for handling the complexity of students' mathematical problem posing in small groups. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, *31*(1), 149-161.

Kuhn, T. (1962/2012). *The structure of scientific revolutions. 50th anniversary* (4th ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ovadia, T. (2014). *Learning mathematical problem solving strategies and their implication in solving similar problems: the case of "weak" high school female students*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel.

Pólya, G. (1945/1973). *How to solve it*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Prediger, S., Bikner-Ahsbahs, A., & Arzarello, F. (2008). Networking strategies and methods for connecting theoretical approaches: First steps towards a conceptual framework. *ZDM, 40*(2), 165-178.

Schoenfeld, A. H. (1985). *Mathematical problem solving*. Clinton, NY: Academic Press.

Simon, M., Saldanha, L., McClintock, E., Akar, G. K., Watanabe, T., & Zembat, I. O. (2010). A developing approach to studying students' learning through their mathematical activity. *Cognition and Instruction*, *28*(1), 70-112.

Steffe, L. P. (2003). Fractional commensurate, composition, and adding schemes: Learning trajectories of Jason and Laura: Grade 5. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, *22*(3), 237-295.

Stoyanova, E., & Ellerton, N. F. (1996). A framework for research into students' problem posing in school mathematics. In P. Clarkson (Ed.), *Technology in mathematics education* (pp. 518-525). Melbourne, Australia: Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia.

Thompson, P. W. (1994). The development of the concept of speed and its relationship to concepts of rate. In G. Harel & J. Confrey (Eds.), *The development of multiplicative reasoning in the learning of mathematics* (pp. 179-234). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

This document was originally published as Koichu, B. (2013). Networking theories by iterative unpacking. In B. Ubuz, Ç. Haser, & M. A. Mariotti (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education* (pp. 2840-2849). Ankara, Turkey: Middle East Technical University.

Boris Koichu
Technion-Israel Institute of Technology
bkoichu@tx.technion.ac.il

Received: January 2014. Accepted: February 2014.