Institute of Cognitive Science

Technical Report

University of Colorado, Boulder

The Symbol Precedence View of Mathematical Development: A Corpus Analysis of the Rhetorical Structure of Textbooks

Mitchell J. Nathan & Scott D. Long
University of Colorado

Martha W. Alibali
University of Wisconsin- Madison

Technical Report 00-07

The Symbol Precedence View of Mathematical Development: A Corpus

Analysis of the Rhetorical Structure of Textbooks

Mitchell J. Nathan and Scott D. Long

University of Colorado

Martha W. Alibali

University of Wisconsin — Madison

Correspondences should be directed to: Mitchell J. Nathan, School of Education and Institute of Cognitive Science, University of Colorado CB 249, Boulder, CO 80309-0249. Voice (303) 492-6122, Fax. (303) 492-7090 mitch.nathan@colorado.edu.

Abstract

This study examined a corpus of 10 widely used pre-algebra and algebra textbooks, with the goal of investigating whether they exhibited a <u>symbol precedence view</u> of mathematical development as is found among high school teachers. The textbook analysis focused on the sequence in which problem-solving activities were presented to students. As predicted, textbooks showed the symbol precedence view, presenting symbolic problems prior to verbal problems. Algebra textbooks showed this pattern more strongly than pre-algebra textbooks aimed at middle school, paralleling grade-level differences found among teachers. Finally, textbooks published after 1990 contained far fewer symbol-only sections, as expected from recent mathematics education reform documents. We interpret these findings in light of research on learning from texts and on the role of textbooks in shaping teachers' instructional practices and students' learning.

The Symbol Precedence View of Mathematical Development: A Corpus Analysis of the Rhetorical Structure of Algebra Textbooks

Textbooks serve as a major resource for learning, but analyses of their composition and organization are often neglected in research on learning from text. Learning from text depends on several interacting factors, including the nature of the learning context, the prior knowledge and processing strategies available to the learner, and the design of the learning materials (Britton & Gugolz, 1991; Kintsch, Franzke & Kintsch, 1996; McNamara, Kintsch, Songer, & Kintsch, 1996). Structural aspects of texts are particularly important, such as coherence at the micro- and macrostructural levels (e.g., E. Kintsch, 1990; van Dijk, 1980; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). Text coherence has a powerful influence on problem-solving performance, inference making, and later retention (Kintsch, 1998). For example, when text coherence is improved by adding bridging inferences (Britton & Gugolz, 1991) or causal connections and background information (Beck, McKeown, Sinatra, & Loxterman, 1991) recall, understanding, and inference-making also improve.

McNamara and her colleagues (McNamara et al., 1996; McNamara & Kintsch, 1996) showed that text coherence also interacts with readers' prior knowledge to produce differences in reading comprehension and inference making. They found that improvements in local and global coherence for a passage on the human heart showed comprehension gains for low-knowledge readers. Unlike low-knowledge readers, high-knowledge readers could spontaneously make the necessary inferences that were missing in the low coherence text. The low coherence texts led to better performance in problem-solving and inference-making tasks for high-knowledge readers (see also Mannes & Kintsch, 1987). Evidence from reading times suggested that the deeper

3

processing needed to comprehend the impoverished texts helped high-knowledge readers formulate richer situation models (McNamara & Kintsch, 1996).

In addition to text coherence, rhetorical structure has also been shown to influence text comprehension processes. Rhetorical structure refers to the differences in hierarchical organization found in different types of passages, such as compare and contrast texts, that help link to readers' common schemas and guide their expectations (e.g., Mannes and Kintsch, 1987; Meyer, 1977; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983) and their preferences (Nolen, Johnson-Crowley, & Wineburg, 1994). We seek to add to this literature with an analysis of rhetorical structure of a set of texts designed for algebra and pre-algebra instruction. For this study we apply the term "rhetorical structure" rather narrowly, confining ourselves to the organizational sequence of problem-solving activities in mathematics textbooks.

We address three specific objectives: (a) to examine aspects of the rhetorical structure of algebra textbooks that govern the ordering of problem-solving activities, (b) to investigate whether this structure differs for pre-algebra and algebra textbooks, and (c) to examine whether this structure has changed over a ten-year span that includes a major educational reform initiative. We first briefly review research on the influences of textbooks on learning and teaching practices. Then, we present two competing views of mathematical development suggested by teacher and student data. These two views guided our analyses of the rhetorical structure of a sample of algebra and pre-algebra textbooks. Specifically, we examined textbooks for the presence of implicit organizational patterns commensurate with views of mathematical development that are commonly found among teachers but at odds with student data. We interpret these findings in light of research on learning from texts and on the role of textbooks in shaping teachers' instructional practices and students' learning. Because the views shown within

4

textbooks are also found among mathematics teachers, we speculate on the causal role that textbooks may play in the development of teachers' beliefs about learning and development.

The Influences of Textbooks

This present study involved a corpus analysis of algebra and pre-algebra textbooks. Corpus analyses have become an increasing priority in the study of discourse processes for models of text comprehension (e.g., Landauer & Dumais, 1997) and, more commonly, in studies of spoken language (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998; Jurafsky, Shriberg, & Biasca, 1997; MacWhinney, 2000). But systematic analyses of textbook corpora are lacking despite the potential influence of textbook structure on student learning. For example, Mayer (1981, 1982) found that students' memories of algebra story problems were distorted, such that problem types that occurred with low frequency in textbooks were often mis-recalled as high-frequency items. Raman (1998) attributed differences in beliefs about mathematics held by students enrolled in high school and in college calculus courses to the disparate treatments of mathematical definitions in high school and college level mathematics textbooks "which, for better or for worse, tend to have a strong influence on the way mathematics is taught and learned" (p. 1). Brenner and colleagues (Brenner, Herman, Ho, & Zimmer, 1999) found that achievement differences in Asian and American students' uses of mathematical representations were paralleled in differences between Asian and American textbooks.

Investigators have also identified ways that textbooks shape teachers' instructional practices and curriculum planning (Borko & Livingston, 1989; Borko & Shavelson, 1990; Cooney, 1985; Ornstein, 1994). For example, Flanders (1994) reported that teachers had higher performance expectations for students on items covered by textbooks than items taught solely on the basis of teachers' own content knowledge. And in a review of the literature, Johnsen (1993) found that

5

"all available investigations from the 1980s indicate that teachers largely follow the teaching plans incorporated into the textbooks" (p. 287).

Links Between Teachers' Views and Student Performance

Our focus in the present study is on algebra and pre-algebra textbooks. The time is ripe for such an analysis because of recent advances in our knowledge base both about students' algebraic thinking (Hegarty, Mayer & Monk, 1995; Koedinger, Alibali, & Nathan, 2000; Koedinger & Nathan, 1999; Reed, 1999), and about teachers' views of students' algebraic thinking (Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-a, 2000-b).

Not surprisingly, teachers sometimes hold inaccurate views about students' preferences and students' thinking. For example, in reading, Orange and Horowitz (1999) found that high school teachers misperceived African-American and Mexican-American students' preferences for literature and language arts activities. In the domain of mathematics, first-grade teachers underestimated the frequency with which students used more basic problem-solving strategies (e.g., counting), and overestimated their use of more advanced strategies (e.g., derived facts and direct modeling methods; Carpenter, Fennema, Peterson, & Carey, 1988).

The current investigation was guided by recent research on educators' beliefs about students' developmental trajectory from arithmetic to algebra. Nathan and Koedinger (2000-a) asked high school mathematics teachers (n = 67) to rank order a set of mathematics problems from easiest to hardest, to reflect their expectations about the problem-solving difficulties of their students. The participants were volunteers recruited from a summer workshop for dedicated mathematics teachers. These teachers taught in the southeastern United States in a wide range of settings, including predominantly minority-based inner-city schools, rural communities, and middle-income suburban areas. The majority of teachers (70%) ranked verbally presented problems

6

(such as story problems and word-equations) as more difficult than symbolic equations. Rarely did teachers offer the reverse ordering when making their predictions.

This finding was replicated with another sample of teachers from the western portion of the US (Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-b). As part of that replication, mathematics teachers from elementary, middle, and high school levels (n = 105) participated in the difficulty ranking task. They also responded to a 42-item survey that assessed teachers' views about student learning and development, mathematics teaching, and the effectiveness of students' solution strategies.

The high school teachers in this second sample (n = 39) replicated the earlier finding. They ranked verbal problems as harder for their students than symbolic problems. In the survey, high school teachers also tended to dismiss the effectiveness of students' invented, non-algebraic solution methods (such as guess-and-test) and tended to agree with statements such as "Using algebra for story problem solving is the most effective approach there is" and "Solving math problems presented in words should be taught only after students master solving the same problems presented as equations." These ranking data and survey responses led Nathan and Koedinger (2000-b) to conclude that high school teachers tended toward a symbol precedence view of algebra development, whereby students must first master symbolic representations and procedures before moving on to verbally presented problems. Teachers' level of agreement with the symbol precedence items was highly correlated with their difficulty rankings of symbolic and verbal problems, $p < .0001$.

High school students' performance data, however, did not follow high school teachers' expectations. Ninth grade students in two different samples (n1 = 76, n2 = 171; Koedinger & Nathan, 1999), each with a year or more of formal algebra instruction, correctly solved fewer than 30% of the symbolic equations. In contrast, they successfully solved approximately 50% of

7

the mathematically matched verbal problems. Analyses of solution strategies revealed that students tended to successfully apply informal strategies when solving verbally presented story and word-equation problems, but they unsuccessfully applied symbol manipulation methods when solving equations, and they showed high no-response rates for equation items. The investigators compared verbal problems with a situational context (story problems) and verbal problems without a context (word-equations) to symbolic equations, and showed that it was in fact the verbal aspects of the items rather than the problem context that led to strategy differences and the resulting performance advantage.

In addition, students who could solve verbal problems could not necessarily solve matched symbolic problems, while students who accurately solved symbolic problems were very likely to solve the matched verbal problems (Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-a). This led the investigators to suggest that, in contrast to high school teachers' beliefs, algebra students follow a verbal precedence model (VP) of mathematical development. According to this view, verbally based reasoning about quantitative relations (such as reversing the events of a story problem, which suggests inverting the mathematical operations) precedes symbolic reasoning. This pattern of results is consistent with findings by Case and his colleagues on the primary role of verbal representations in early number development (Case, 1991; Case & Okamoto, 1996), rational number processing (Moss & Case, 1999), and reasoning about functions (Kalchman, 1998; Kalchman & Case, 1998). More recent research on algebra problem-solving has shown the existence of a symbolic advantage on more complex problems (e.g., problems in which the unknown occurs twice; Koedinger, Alibali, & Nathan, 2000). However, in the present study, we limit our investigation to pre-algebra and basic algebra textbooks that consist primarily of simpler problems that do not typically show the symbol advantage.

8

In contrast with high school teachers, middle school teachers (n = 30) were more accurate at predicting the order of students' problem-solving performance difficulties. Middle school teachers' predictions were significantly correlated with the problem-solving performance of students, $p < .05$. Surprisingly, the rank ordering provided by high school teachers was not significantly related to student performance at all, despite the high school teachers' more extensive mathematics education. Responses to the belief survey also showed that middle school teachers held students' intuitions in higher regard than did high school teachers, and tended to believe more strongly that students could invent effective problem-solving methods that were not symbol based (Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-b). Nathan and Koedinger (2000-b) suggest that the differences between middle and high school teachers' beliefs may be based on their classroom experiences. Many students at the middle school level have not had formal algebra training and so they may be more likely than high school students to use invented methods freely in classrooms. Thus, middle school mathematics teachers may actually have more opportunities than high school teachers to observe the power of these informal methods and the role these strategies play during the transition from arithmetic to algebraic reasoning.

Hypotheses of the Study

The present study examined the rhetorical structure of algebra textbooks, and in particular, the sequence of activities presented in individual textbook sections. We believe that sequencing is an essential aspect of the rhetorical structure of mathematics texts, just as sequencing is important in other complex reading activities (e.g., Perfetti, Britt, & Georgi, 1995; Wineburg, 1991). Our specific focus here is on the organization of categories of problem-solving activities in the written exercises portion of each textbook section.

9

Because of the strong relationship between classroom curriculum and textbook content reported in the literature, our analysis was guided by teachers' beliefs about student learning. Specifically, we wished to determine whether problem-solving activities presented in textbooks are organized in accordance with the symbol precedence view of algebra development. We hypothesize that textbooks will tend to reflect the symbol precedence view exhibited by high school mathematics teachers. This is the belief that symbolic problems are easier for students to solve than verbally presented problems and should therefore be presented first. Greeno, Collins, and Resnick (1996) suggest a similar claim in their review of Behaviorist/Empiricist theories of learning.

> Typical sequences of instruction begin with training in a procedure, facts, or vocabulary in a simplified context, followed by presentation of the material in somewhat more complicated settings. Standard mathematics textbooks are examples, in that procedures for calculating are presented and practiced, followed by word problems. (p. 33)

If the claim is true and symbolic reasoning is thought to developmentally precede verbal reasoning, then we would expect to find that symbolically presented problems such as equations should be presented before verbal reasoning tasks like story problems within the same textbook sections. We term this the symbol precedence hypothesis.

As a second question, we asked whether the tendency for the symbol precedence organization varies between pre-algebra and algebra level textbooks. Based on the documented differences in middle-school and high school teachers' beliefs (Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-b), we hypothesize that pre-algebra level textbooks will show the symbol precedence organization less strongly than algebra textbooks produced by the same publishers.

10

Finally, we asked whether the prevalence of symbol precedence organization in textbooks has changed over time. To address this question, we examined differences between textbooks that preceded and followed reform-oriented reports such as the NCTM Curriculum Standards (NCTM, 1989) and Everybody Counts (NRC, 1989). In the terminology of current educational reform, mathematics is to be presented as a multi-faceted tool for solving problems and reasoning, as well as a medium for communication (NCTM, 1989). Contemporary mathematics instruction seeks to instill in students a conceptual understanding of numbers, symbols, diagrams, and procedures that is robust enough to promote mathematical and scientific learning and reasoning in novel settings. For algebra, this implies a curriculum that encourages uses of a variety of representational forms beyond just the symbolic, and emphasizes verbal reasoning about unknown quantities, generalized quantitative relationships and procedures, and modeling of situations. In light of these recent mathematical reform ideas (e.g., NCTM, 1989; NRC, 1989, 1990; OMELC, 1989), we hypothesize that the symbol precedence organization will be less common among the textbooks published after 1990.

Method

Materials

The textbooks used in the study were chosen because they were used by the teachers who participated in Nathan & Koedinger's (2000-b) algebra problem ranking study. This set of textbooks was initially determined by examining the district textbook adoptions list, and cross-referencing that list with teachers (n = 25) who attended a university workshop on mathematics instruction. The final corpus of textbooks contained ten volumes that spanned a decade (1986-1995), and that were produced by five publishing companies: Glencoe/MacMillan/McGraw-Hill (Glencoe); Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. (HBJ); Houghton/Mifflin (HM); McDougal, Littell

(ML); and The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project (UCSMP). As shown in Table 1, two textbooks were chosen from each publisher, a pre-algebra edition, designed for the middle grades, and an algebra edition, designed for the early high school grades.

Place Table 1 about here

The sample contained a total of 1,083 sections across the ten textbooks. There was a range of 77 to 149 sections for each textbook and a range of 3 to 5 pages per section. Pre-algebra textbooks included topics such as arithmetic, introducing the vocabulary of algebra, integers, solving one-step equations, factors and fractions, operations on rational numbers, solving and graphing equations and inequalities, proportion and percent, probability and statistics, introductory analytic geometry, area and volume, and polynomials. Algebra textbooks additionally covered the following areas: symbol manipulation, 2-step problem solving, general problem-solving strategies and reasoning skills, using technology (e.g. calculators, computers) for computation, data analysis, graphing systems of linear equations, discrete mathematics, geometry, trigonometry, and applications of algebra in authentic settings.

Procedure

We analyzed the organizational structure of the pre-algebra and algebra textbooks to address our three research questions. Textbooks were coded for the frequencies of certain patterns of presentation by examining the "written exercises" portions of each section of a chapter. Written exercises contain the problem-solving activities for the new topics introduced in each section. They are often assigned to students as homework or classroom seatwork, and teachers often draw from them when constructing lessons and course examinations. Pattern codes were determined by looking at the pattern of problems within each section. Sections devoted to the review of prior

content were excluded from the analyses so the pattern that emerged from the coding process represented only those curricular items that were newly introduced.

Pattern codes. Codes were assigned in the following manner. First, the presentation format of the first written exercise in each section was coded as either symbolic (e.g., an algebraic equation) or verbal (e.g., an algebra story problem). If a written exercise was presented only in Arabic numbers or algebraic notation it was coded as symbolic. If a written exercise contained words and phrases, it was coded as verbal. Table 2 shows the problem codes that were administered along with example problems taken from the textbooks under study.

Place Table 2 about here

A written exercise that addressed an activity outside of solving an arithmetic or algebraic problem was coded as a symbolic or verbal "other." Examples of these problems are: naming arithmetic operations, expressing numbers in scientific notation, questions about the history of mathematics, reading graphs, using a number line, doing mathematical operations on polynomials without solving for the unknown, and identifying polygons.

After the first written exercise of a section was coded (symbolic or verbal), the remaining exercises were coded to determine the pattern code for the entire section. If the first written exercise for a section was coded as symbolic, then the section was coded as Symbol-to-Symbol only if all of the remaining problems in that section were also symbolic. If a verbal problem followed the initial symbolic exercise, the section was coded as Symbol-to-Verbal. The same method was used for sections that began with verbal problems. Four mutually exclusive pattern designations were possible for the sequence of problems in a section:

- Symbolic presentation only (Symbol-to-Symbol, or SS)
- Symbolic presentation followed by verbal presentation (Symbol-to-Verbal, or SV)

13

- Verbal presentation only (Verbal -to-Verbal, or VV)

- Verbal presentation followed by symbolic presentation (Verbal-to-Symbol, or VS)

All sections were initially coded by a single coder. A second person recoded 20% of the sections and achieved complete agreement with the first set of codes.

Textbook scoring. Based on the coding of individual textbook sections, we derived two variables that characterized textbooks as a whole. These were then used in the subsequent statistical analyses. To test the symbol precedence hypothesis, a measure of the SV pattern preference displayed in each textbook was created. This SV preference measure was defined as the number of SV sections divided by the total number of sections that included both verbal and symbolic problems:

$$\text{SV\_Preference} = \text{SV} / (\text{VS} + \text{SV}) \qquad \textbf{Equation 1}$$

A measure of SS pattern preference was calculated for each textbook based on the overall proportion of symbol-to-symbol patterns among all sections:

$$\text{SS\_Preference} = \text{SS} / (\text{VS} + \text{SV} + \text{VV} + \text{SS}) \qquad \textbf{Equation 2}$$

Note that Equation 1 depends on sections with both SV and VS patterns, whereas Equation 2 considers all of the coded textbook sections. Because of this, the two measures are mathematically independent from each other, and each can vary from zero to one, irrespective of the behavior of the other variable.

Results

The data analyses were driven by three hypotheses. The first hypothesis is that problem sequencing in the textbooks under investigation adheres to the symbol precedence view. The second hypothesis is that high school level algebra textbooks exhibit the symbol precedence

pattern more strongly than pre-algebra textbooks do. The third hypothesis is that pre-reform textbooks in the sample exhibit the symbol precedence pattern more than those published after the release of national reform mandates in mathematics education. Table 3 shows the frequency of each of the four presentation patterns for each textbook, along with publication year and number of sections.

Place Table 3 about here

Test of the Symbol Precedence Hypothesis

The symbol precedence hypothesis holds that mathematics problem-solving activities will first be presented in a symbolic form followed by activities in verbal form. Presumably, this follows the belief that at first, students reason best with formal representations, and later advance to verbally presented tasks. Operationally, this hypothesis would be supported if symbol-to-verbal (SV) patterns were found to occur more frequently among sections with verbal and symbol problems than would be expected by chance.

As a test of the symbol precedence hypothesis, the measure of SV preference was compared to its expected value of .5 in a one-group t-test (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Table 3 displays the SV preference measure (equation 1) for each of the ten books. The average measure of SV preference was 0.73 (SE = .052), which is significantly greater than the expected value of 0.5, $t(9) = 4.6$, $p < .001$. As shown in Figure 1, this pattern also held for the five pre-algebra textbooks , $t(4) = 2.30$, $p < .05$, and the five algebra textbooks, $t(4) = 4.09$, $p < .01$, considered separately.

Place Table 3 about here

15

This result shows that across the corpus there is a preponderance of symbol precedence patterns. As a further test of the primacy of the SV pattern, we looked at this tendency within each individual textbook. Identifying this pattern both across and within textbooks would help to characterize the level of acceptance of the symbol precedence view within our sample.

For this analysis, each textbook was analyzed using a one-group chi-square test (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). This analysis allows us to determine specifically which books use the SV pattern more often than the VS pattern, where each pattern has an expected frequency of occurrence of 50%. As the chi-square column of Table 3 shows, 8 out of the 10 textbooks showed a reliable preference for SV patterns in structuring their written exercises. Only the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project (UCSMP) textbooks deviate from this tendency. These textbooks differ from the others because they are produced by an academic institution rather than a commercial textbook publisher and so may have different demands placed on their organization.

Taken together, these results establish the strong preferences of the publishers of textbooks in the sample to introduce algebraic activities for new learners in a symbolic form, and then move learners on to verbal problems as applications and extensions. The curricular approach exhibited here exactly parallels the one presented by high school teachers when they inaccurately judged that their algebra students would solve symbolic problems more readily than verbal problems.

As reported, middle school teachers did not support the symbol precedence view as strongly, however, and they were more likely than high school teachers to rank algebra story problems as easier than symbolically presented algebra equations (Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-b). Based on this difference, we next explored a second hypothesis: that middle school level textbooks would display the symbol precedence pattern less strongly than algebra textbooks

16

Comparing pre-algebra and algebra textbooks

The second analysis tests for differences in SV preference between pre-algebra and algebra textbooks. Because pairs of pre-algebra and algebra textbooks in this corpus are matched by publisher, a paired t-test (Glass & Hopkins, 1996) was used. Because the hypothesis is a directional one, namely that algebra level textbooks will show a higher frequency of SV patterns, a one-tailed test was used .

As expected, the SV preference measure was higher in algebra textbooks than in pre-algebra textbooks (M = 0.77 vs. M = 0.69; $\underline{M}$ of paired differences = .086), t (4) = 2.2, $\underline{p}$ < .05 (also see Figure 1). Since high school level textbooks are more likely to exhibit the symbol-precedence pattern than are middle school textbooks, it is also the case that high school teachers are more likely to work with curricular materials on a daily basis that strongly exhibit the symbol precedence view. Previous research (Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-b) established that high school teachers are more likely than their middle school counterparts to assume that facility with formal symbolic representations and procedures precedes the development of students' verbal reasoning abilities. This current finding parallels that result and suggests that the views of teachers and textbook authors are linked, and that the nature of this relationship deserves further study. We return to this issue in the Discussion section.

Comparing Pre- and Post-Reform Textbooks

In the final set of analyses we test the hypothesis that the symbol precedence pattern is more common in older textbooks that came out during or before 1990. This prediction stems from the expectation that the reform documents of 1989 and 1990 re-conceptualize mathematics as a verbal activity and state that instruction should draw on many alternative representations including verbal descriptions and situations, pictures, table, and graphs, as well as equations

17

(e.g., NCTM, 1989; NRC, 1989, 1990). For this analysis, SV preference (Equation 1) is compared for "older" (1990 and earlier) and "newer" textbooks (after 1990), based on their year of publication[1] (Table 3). An ANOVA did not reach significance, $F(1, 8) = 1.85$, though there was a trend suggesting that older algebra textbooks tended to exhibit the SV pattern more frequently ($M = .77$) than newer ones ($M = .69$).

We next examined the relative presence of symbol-only patterns over time using SS preference measure (Equation 2). An ANOVA revealed that use of symbol-only sections changed considerably over time, $F(1, 8) = 26.1$, $MSE = .005$, $p < .001$. The means confirm that textbooks published after 1990 were far less likely to use SS patterns in their written exercises ($M = .002$) than were textbooks published before 1990 ($M = .23$). It seems that algebra textbook developers did not strictly follow the word of education reformers' call for greater emphasis on verbal reasoning in algebra. However, publishers did seem to be influenced by the reform charge, and apparently interpreted this as a need to reduce the dependence on symbol-only (SS) sections. As is evident in the data of Table 3, SS patterns essentially went to zero a year after the major standards documents were made public. Even so, newer textbooks still showed a strong reliance on early exposure to symbolic forms of reasoning and representation (SV patterns).

Discussion

The current investigation illustrates a theoretically motivated analysis of the rhetorical structure of a corpus of mathematics textbooks. Prior studies revealed that high school teachers widely believed that competence with symbols precedes verbal reasoning. We set out to see if textbook structure was likewise consistent with a symbol precedence view of algebra development. Even with a sample size of only ten textbooks, the statistical analyses reached significance, indicating a large and robust effect for the organization of problem-solving

18

activities. New problem-solving activities tended to be introduced first in symbolic formats, such as algebraic equations (the Symbol Precedence Hypothesis). As the new material was elaborated or applied, the activities tended to shift to a verbal format such as an algebra story problem. Rarely were activities introduced with verbally presented problems and developed toward symbolic reasoning, even though there is evidence that suggests students' verbal reasoning abilities precede their symbolic skills (e.g., Case & Okamoto, 1996; Kalchman & Case, 1998; Nathan & Koedinger, 2000-a). Algebra textbooks were more disposed toward this pattern than pre-algebra textbooks (Hypothesis 2), as suggested by the differences among high school and middle school teachers' beliefs. Pre-reform textbooks were slightly but not reliably more inclined than newer ones to show the symbol precedence pattern (Hypothesis 3). However, newer textbooks were far more likely than older editions to abandon symbol-only patterns, suggesting that the reform mandates had some influence on textbook design. We next interpret these results in light of current research on learning and teaching from texts, and the role beliefs play in shaping teaching practices.

Research on Learning From Instructional Texts and the Role of Rhetorical Structure

A great deal of past research on learning from text has focused on text coherence (e.g., Beck, McKeown, Sinatra, & Loxterman, 1991; Britton and Gulgoz, 1991; W. Kintsch, 1998; McNamara & Kintsch, 1996). Research has also shown that these coherence effects depend strongly on the reader's prior knowledge and the match between that knowledge base and the coherence structure of the text (Beck et al., 1991; Britton and Gulgoz, 1991; McNamara et al., 1996; E. Kintsch, 1990; Mannes & Kintsch, 1987). In the present study, we suggest that the organizational sequence of problem-solving activities – the rhetorical structure – of a textbook is also an important consideration for analyzing learning materials and determining their

19

compatibility with learners. Methodologically, studies of text content and structure are complementary. Their use, both separately and in combination, should further advance our understanding of discourse processes and comprehension.

Our investigation has shown that problem-solving activities within algebra textbooks are sequenced in accordance with the symbol precedence view of mathematical development. This organization is embedded within the sequencing of problems, and thus, would not be immediately apparent from a content-level analysis. But current findings from content analyses of texts are also relevant here. They indicate that the match between a text and learner is essential for predicting success in learning (e.g., McNamara et al., 1996). Thus, as a first-order approximation, we surmise that textbooks organized around the principle of symbol precedence are not optimally tailored to the many students who appear to follow a verbal precedence trajectory of algebra development. Although much more research needs to be conducted to fine tune our understanding of the compatibility between learners and textbooks, establishing parallel structures between developmental processes and curricular organization appears to be a good starting point.

Rhetorical structure seems to be underutilized as a component to guide the design of mathematical textbooks. But it shows promise here and elsewhere. For example, Koedinger and Anderson (1998) compared the curricular sequence used by a popular algebra textbook (i.e., Forester, 1984) to an alternative sequence of their own design. The approach used in the Forester textbook assumed that students would best learn to generate algebraic expressions from patterns and relations through a deductive process. As the author described in the Foreword, there are exercises in which "students are forced to write an expression representing a variable quantity. Then they evaluate the expression for several values of the variable, and write and solve

20

equations involving the expression." (p. xi). The intention is for the student to create a symbolic representation of the varying quantities that fit a given situation, and then instantiate that general equation for instances that satisfy specific input or output constraints. Following this rationale for many of the written exercises, the book instructs students in a step-by-step manner to first write a mathematical expression in terms of the unknown of a story problem; second, compute the output (Y) value for two different input (X) values; and finally, compute an input (X) value of the expression evaluated to a specific output (Y) value.

Koedinger and Anderson (1998) compared learning with Forester's curricular sequence to an inductive approach of their own design. Here, the learner induces the formal expression (Forester's step 1) at the conclusion of a series of specific input-output relationships. Koedinger and Anderson based their instructional approach on general learning principles:

> [E]ven for mathematical experts in a decidedly deductive domain, [such as]
> geometry theorem proving, problem-solving knowledge has a fundamentally
> inductive character. While much of mathematical reasoning in its externalized
> written form is the deductive manipulation of symbols, the underlying cognitive
> processes that support effective reasoning draw on indications from prior
> perceptual experience (cf. Cheng & Holyoak, 1985). If expert mathematical
> knowledge is fundamentally organized as inductive abstractions, not deductive
> rules, then perhaps instruction that supports and encourages such inductive
> reasoning would more effectively lead to expertise. (p. 164, emphasis added).

In an instructional experiment, students (n = 30) who learned using Koedinger and Anderson's (1998) inductive support procedure gained significantly more than students who used Forester's deductive procedure (26% gains vs. 5% gains). Furthermore, students who

received inductive support were over 40% faster at solving the most difficult set of symbolization problems (mean of 28 sec vs. 48 sec) than those in the deductive condition. This study of the impact of problem organization shows how intuitively appealing certain beliefs about learning may be, and how important it is to test these beliefs in learning settings.

Textbooks and Influences on Teachers' Beliefs

To understand teaching and learning, it is essential to understand beliefs (Garner & Alexander, 1994). Indeed, understanding the beliefs held by educators is central to the improvement of instruction (Fenstermacher, 1979). However, the nature, impact, and origins of educators' beliefs are still poorly understood. Beliefs are described as "mental constructions of experience" which are taken as true regardless of the actual evidence (Sigel, 1985, p. 351; also see Thompson, 1992). It is generally accepted that such beliefs arise through enculturation and the social construction of experiential knowledge (Calderhead & Robson, 1989; Pajares, 1992). To Dewey (1933), beliefs accounted for "the matters that we now accept as certainly true, as knowledge, but which nevertheless may be questioned in the future." (p. 6). Although beliefs may be inaccurate reflections of the world, they can be an invaluable aid for the teacher tackling ill-structured tasks such as curricular planning and classroom instruction. Once formed, beliefs serve us by guiding us gracefully through areas of uncertainty, and helping us to interpret novel actions, events, and information.

Given the important role that textbooks play in teachers' planning and instructional decisions, it should not be surprising that they are considered by some to be a major influence on teaching and teachers' views of learning and instruction. Flanders (1994) reported an empirical investigation of the relationships between intended, implemented, and tested curricula of eighth-grade mathematics classes. This study showed that teachers' expectations for student success

22

were highest for test items (taken from the Second International Mathematics Study, SIMS) covered by the classroom textbooks, even though students also practiced solving items not covered in the textbooks.

Teachers' choices for topic sequencing also rely strongly on textbook organization. Borko and her colleagues, among others (e.g., Borko & Livingston, 1989; Borko & Shavelson, 1990; Cooney, 1985; Johnsen, 1993; Ornstein, 1994) have found mathematics textbooks to be a primary resource for lesson planning by both expert and novice high school teachers. The influence of textbooks on teacher instruction and subsequent student achievement is even considered as a major factor in explaining international differences among American and Asian students (e.g., Brenner, Herman, Ho, & Zimmer, 1999; Mayer, Sims, and Tajika, 1995; Stevenson et al., 1990).

Views of mathematical instruction can linger for long periods of time. In the current study, verbal problems were found to be rare as a means to introduce new topics. Similar findings were documented in the first yearbook of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM). In it, Smith (1926) described a popular mathematics textbook sampled from the previous quarter century. Smith found that "out of nearly 1600 exercises in the first 147 pages only 111 were verbal problems . . . (and) another text of that period gave about 1800 exercises in the first 128 pages; of these only 109 were of the verbal variety" (p. 21). Overman (1923), in his writings about algebra learning and instruction earlier this century, stated that "the learning of the algebraic language is, without doubt, the greatest difficulty presented to the beginner by the subject. The success of our textbook writers ... has not been very great" (p. 216). His advice was to present the symbolic form of equations prior to verbal ones, because, in his opinion, "in algebra it is easier to translate from algebra to English than from English into algebra, and such

practice should be given first as a preparation for the more difficult work to follow " (Overman, 1923, p.217). When we encounter well-ingrained beliefs we should not expect them to change easily, even in the face of overwhelming evidence (e.g., Dole and Sinatra, 1994).

The current study did not set out to establish a casual link between teachers' views and textbook structure. Indeed, we doubt that such a link could ever be established empirically given the myriad influences on both. However, there is reason to reflect on the parallels, and even speculate a bit on how such a link might be manifested.

Educators' beliefs about learning and instruction are likely to come from many sources such as teacher education and professional development programs, curricular guidelines and instructional materials, and even from one's early student experiences (e.g. Ball, 1988). Views of learning mathematics may even stem from views of learning to read, and the early role of alphabetic and phonetic decoding. Additionally, textbooks may serve as a source of enculturation for high school teachers that shapes their beliefs and educational practices. It is possible that by working so closely with textbook curricula and their sequencing choices teachers come to internalize these views, and ultimately to believe that symbolic reasoning is fundamentally easier for students than verbal reasoning, and that verbal reasoning abilities develop after, and are dependent upon, symbolic reasoning skills.

This raises the specter about the role that textbooks play in influencing curricula, enculturating teachers, and perpetuating inaccuracies about students' mathematical reasoning and development. The concern, of course, is not that textbooks influence teachers' views or school curricula. Rather, it is that textbooks may shape them in ways that are counterproductive for student learning. As the current study suggests, textbooks can be designed with questionable assumptions about student learning. Without analyses of textbook content and structure, these

24

assumptions can go unchecked and can be implemented throughout the educational system, to

the potential detriment of students and teachers.

References

Ball, D. L. (1988). Unlearning to teach mathematics. <u>For the Learning of Mathematics</u>, <u>8</u>, 40-48.

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., Sinatra, G. M., & Loxterman, J. A. (1991). Revising social-studies text from a text-processing perspective - evidence of improved comprehensibility. <u>Reading Research Quarterly</u>, <u>26</u>, 251-276.

Benson, J., Dodge, S., Dodge, W., Hamberg, C., Milauskas, G., & Rukin, R. (1991). <u>Algebra 1: An Integrated Approach</u>. McDougal, Littell & Company: Evanston , Ill.

Benson, J., Dodge, S., Dodge, W., Hamberg, C., Milauskas, G., & Rukin, R. (1994). <u>Gateways to Algebra and Geometry: An Integrated Approach</u>. McDougal, Littell & Company: Evanston, Ill.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). <u>Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use</u>. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Borko, H. & Livingston, C. (1989). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematical instruction by expert and novice teachers. <u>American Educational Research Journal</u>, <u>26</u>, 473-498.

Borko, H. & Shavelson, R. (1990). Teacher decision making. In B. F. Jones & L. Idol (Eds.), <u>Dimensions of Thinking and Cognitive Instruction</u>. 311-346.

Brenner, M. E., Herman, S., Ho, H-Z, & Zimmer, J. M. (1999). Cross-National Comparison of Representative Competence, <u>Journal for Research in Mathematics</u>, <u>30</u>, 541-557.

Britton, B. K., & Gulgoz, S. (1991). Using Kintsch computational model to improve instructional text - Effects of repairing inference calls on recall and cognitive structures. <u>Journal of Educational Psychology</u>, <u>83</u>, 329-345.

26

Brown, R. G., Dolciani, M. P., Sorgenfrey, R. H., & Cole, W. L. (1990). Algebra: Structure and Method, Book 1. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Brumfiel, V., Golden, N., & Heins, M. (1986). Pre-Algebra: Skills/Problem Solving/Applications. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Calderhead & Robson, (1989). Images of teaching: Student teachers' early conceptions of classroom practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 7, 1-8.

Carpenter, T.P., Fennema, E., Peterson, P. L. , Carey, D. A. (1988). Teachers pedagogical content knowledge of students problem-solving in elementary arithmetic. Journal of Research in Mathematics Education, 19, 385-401

Cheng, P. W., and Holyoak, K. J. (1985). Pragmatic reasoning schemas. Cognitive Psychology, 17, 391-416.

Cooney, T. J. (1985). A beginning teacher's view of problem solving. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 16, 324-336.

Dewey, J., (1933). How we think. Boston: D. C. Heath.

Dolciani, M. P., Sorgenfrey, R. H., & Graham, J. A. (1988). Pre-Algebra: An Accelerated Course. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dole, J. A. & Sinatra, G. M.(1994). Social psychology research on beliefs and attitudes: implications for research on learning from text. In R. Garner, and P. A. Alexander (Eds.) Beliefs about Text and Instruction with Text. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (pp. 245-264).

Fenstermacher, G. (1979). A philosophical consideration of recent research on teacher effectiveness. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of Educational Research (Vol. 6, pp. 157-185). Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Flanders, J. R. (1994). Textbooks, teachers, and the SIMS test. <u>Journal for Research in</u> <u>Mathematics Education,</u> <u>25</u>, 260-278.

Forester, P. A. (1984). <u>Algebra I: Expressions, equations, and applications</u>. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley.

Foster, A. G., Winters, L. J., Gell, J. M., Rath, J. N., & Gordon, B. W. (1995). <u>Merrill</u> <u>Algebra 1: Applications and Connections</u>. Lake Forest, Illinois: Glencoe/MacMillan/McGraw-Hill.

Garner, R. & Alexander, P. A. (1994). <u>Beliefs About Text and Instruction With Text</u>. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Glass, G. V. & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). <u>Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology</u>. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Greeno, J., Collins, A., & Resnick, L. (1996). Cognition and Learning. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), <u>Handbook of Educational Psychology</u> (pp.15-46). New York: Macmillan.

Hegarty, M., Mayer, R.E., & Monk, C. A. (1995). Comprehension of arithmetic word-problems - a comparison of successful and unsuccessful problem solvers. <u>Journal of Educational</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>87</u>, 18-32.

Jacobs, R. F. (1988). <u>Introductory Algebra 1</u>. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Johnsen, E. B. (1993). <u>Textbooks in the Kaleidoscope: A Critical Survey of Literature and</u> <u>Research on Educational Textbooks</u> (Sivesind, Linda, Trans.). Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian University Press.

Jurafsky, D., Shriberg, E., & Biasca, D. (1997). Switchboard SWBD-DAMSL Labeling Project Coder's Manual, Draft 13. University of Colorado Institute of Cognitive Science

Technical Report 97-02. Boulder, CO: The Institute. Also available as

http://stripe.colorado.edu/~jurafsky/manual.august1.html.

Kintsch, E. (1990). Macroprocesses and microprocesses in the development of summary

skill. Cognition and Instruction, 7, 161-195.

Kintsch, E., Franzke, M., & Kintsch, K. (1996). Principles of learning in multimedia

educational systems. Institute of Cognitive Science Technical Report No. 96-01. University of

Colorado. Boulder, CO: The Institute.

Kintsch, W. (1998). Comprehension. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Koedinger, K. R., and Anderson, J. R. (1998). Illustrating Principled Design: The Early

Evolution of a Cognitive Tutor for Algebra Symbolization. Interactive Learning Environments,

5(March), 161-180.

Koedinger, K. R., Alibali, M. W., & Nathan, M. J. (2000). A developmental model of algebra

problem solving: Trade-offs between grounded and abstract representations. Under review.

Koedinger, K. R., and Nathan, M. J. (1999). The story behind story problems. Under review.

Landauer, T. K. & Dumais, S. T. (1997). A solution to Plato's problem: The Latent Semantic

Analysis theory of the acquisition, induction, and representation of knowledge. Psychological

Review, 104, 211-240.

MacWhinney, B. (2000). The Childes Project : Tools for Analyzing Talk (3rd ed.). MahWah,

NJ: Erlbaum.

Mannes, S. & Kintsch, W. (1987). Knowledge organization and text organization. Cognition

and Instruction, 4, 91-115.

Mayer, R. E. (1981). Frequency norms and structural analysis of algebra story problems into

families, categories, and templates. International Science, 10, 135-175.

Mayer, R. E. (1982). Memory for algebra story problems. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 199-216.

Mayer, R. E., Sims, V., and Tajika, H., (1995). A comparison of how textbooks teach mathematical problem solving in Japan and the United States. American Educational Research Journal, 32, 443-460.

Meyer, B. J. F. (1977). What is remembered from prose: A function of passage structure. In R. O. Freedle (Ed.). Discourse production and comprehension (Vol. 1: Discourse processes: Advancements in research and theory) (pp. 307-336). Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.

McConnell, J. W., Brown, S., Eddins, S., Hackworth, M., Sachs, L., Woodward, E., Flanders, J., Hirschhorn, D., Hynes, C., Polonsky, L., & Usiskin, Z. (1990). The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project: Algebra. Glenview: Scott-Foresman.

McNamara, D. S., & Kintsch, W . (1996). Learning from texts: Effects of prior knowledge and text coherence. Discourse Processes, 22, 247-288.

McNamara, D. S., Kintsch, E., Songer, N. B., and Kintsch, W. (1996). Are good texts always better? Interactions of text coherence, background knowledge, and levels of understanding in learning from text. Cognition and Instruction, 14, 1-43.

Nathan, M. J., and Koedinger, K. R. (2000-a). Teachers' and researchers' beliefs about the development of algebraic reasoning. Journal for Research in Mathematics, 31, 168-190.

Nathan, M. J., and Koedinger, K. R. (2000-b). An investigation of teachers' beliefs of students' algebra development. Cognition and Instruction, 18(2), 207-235.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics. Reston, Virginia: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

30

National Research Council, (1989). <u>Everybody Counts: A Report on the Future of</u> <u>Mathematics Education</u>. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.

National Research Council, (1989). <u>Reshaping School Mathematics: A Framework for</u> <u>Curriculum</u>. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.

Nolen, S. B., Johnson-Crowley, N., & Wineburg, S. (1994).Who is this "I" person, anyway? The presence of a visible author in statistical text. In R. Garner, and P. A. Alexander (Eds.) <u>Beliefs About Text and Instruction With Text</u>. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (pp. 41-56).

Ohio Mathematics Education Leadership Council [OMELC]. (1989). <u>Real Routes: A</u> <u>Handbook for School-based Mathematics Leaders</u>. Oberlin, OH: Oberlin College Press.

Orange, C. & Horowitz, R. (1999). An academic standoff: Literacy task preferences of African American and Mexican American male adolescents versus teacher-expected preferences. <u>Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 43</u>, 28-39.

Ornstein, A. C. (1994). The textbook-driven curriculum. <u>Peabody Journal of Education,</u> <u>69</u>(3), 70-85.

Overman, J. R. (1923). Teaching the algebraic language to junior high pupils. <u>The</u> <u>Mathematics Teacher, 16</u>, 215-227.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. <u>Review of Educational Research, 62</u>, 307-332.

Perfetti, C. A., Britt, M. A., & Georgi, M. C. (1995). <u>Text-Based Learning and Reasoning:</u> <u>Studies in History</u>. Mah Wah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Price, J., Rath, J. N., Leschensky, W. (1992). <u>Merrill Pre-Algebra: a Transition to Algebra</u>. Lake Forest: Glencoe/MacMillan/McGraw-Hill.

Raman, M. (April, 1998). Epistemological messages conveyed by high school and college mathematics textbooks. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA).

Reed, S. K. (1999). Word Problems: Research and Curriculum Reform. Mah Wah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shepard, L.A. (1991). Negative policies for dealing with diversity: When does assessment turn into sorting and segregation? In E. Hiebert (Ed.), Literacy for a Diverse Society: Perspectives, Practices, and Policies. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sigel, I. E. (1985). A conceptual analysis of beliefs. In I. E. Sigel (Ed.), Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (pp. 345-371). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Smith, D. E. (1926). A general survey of the progress of mathematics in our high schools in the last twenty-five years. In The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (Ed.), The first yearbook: a survey of progress in the last twenty-five years (pp. 1-32) Reston, Virginia: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Stevenson, H. W., Lee, S-Y., Chen, C., Stigler, J. W., Hsu, C-C., & Kitamura, S. (1990). Contexts of achievement: A study of American, Chinese, and Japanese children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 55 (1-2, Serial No. 221).

Thompson, Alba G. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research. In Douglas Grouws (Ed.) Handbook of Research in Mathematics Teaching and Learning (pp. 127-145). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Usiskin, Z., Feldman, C. H., Davis, S., Mallo, S., Sanders, G., Witonsky, D., Flanders, J., Polonsky, L., Porter, S., & Viktora, S. S. (1995). The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project: Transition Mathematics. Glenview: Scott-Foresman.

Wineburg, S. S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 83, 73-87.

Endnotes

[1] It is worth noting that there is some sampling bias in aggregating the two chronological sets of older and newer textbooks. Through happenstance, the newer set had more pre-algebra textbooks, while the older set had more algebra sections. However, if the pre-algebra influence was dominant, then as a first-order prediction one would expect newer books to have fewer SV sections than older texts, but that difference was not statistically reliable.

Table and Figure Captions

Table 1. Titles and publication information for each textbook.

Table 2. Examples of problem codes used for the analyses.

Table 3. Percentages (and frequencies) of the section order patterns for each textbook, and results of the chi-square analysis of symbol precedence for each textbook.

Figure 1. The SV preference measure (equation 1) for pre-algebra and algebra books compared against chance. (Note that the error bars are for the one-sample comparisons of each type of textbook as compared to chance, and not the paired comparison of pre-algebra versus algebra textbooks.)

Table 1. Titles and publication information for each textbook.

Publisher	Pre-Algebra Text	Algebra Text
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich	Pre-Algebra: Skills/ Problem Solving/ Applications (Brumfiel et al. 1986)	Introductory Algebra 1 (Jacobs, 1988)
Houghton/ Mifflin	Pre-Algebra: An Accelerated Course (Dolciani et al., 1988)	Algebra: Structure and Method, Book 1 (Brown et al., 1990)
UCSMP	University of Chicago School Mathematics Project: Transition Mathematics (Usiskin et al., 1995).	University of Chicago School Mathematics Project: Algebra (McConnell et al., 1990)
McDougal, Littell	Gateways to Algebra and Geometry: An Integrated Approach. (Benson et al., 1994)	Algebra I: An Integrated Approach (Benson et al., 1991)
Glencoe	Merrill Pre-Algebra: A Transition to Algebra (Price et al., 1992)	Merrill Algebra 1: Applications and Connections (Foster et al., 1995)

Table 2. Examples of codes issued and representative problems.

Code Issued	Example Problems (with Textbook Source)
Symbolic	56 – 49 = ? (HBJ, 1986)
	X – 7 = 13 (Houghton, 1990)
Verbal	The product of a number and 15 is 105. Find the number. (Glencoe, 1992)
	The price of a 4-fluid ounce bottle of perfume is $29.95. Find the unit price of
	the perfume to the nearest tenth of a cent. (HBJ, 1988)
Symbolic Other	Graph the ordered pair (4,2) on a coordinate plane . (HBJ, 1986)
Verbal Other	17 = n - 4 is called an _____. (Glencoe, 1995)

Table 3. Summary of textbook data, including publication year, and percentages (and frequencies) of pattern codes.

Textbook	Year	Curriculum	Age	No. Sections	Symbol-first patterns		Verbal-first patterns		SV Measure SV/(SV+VS)	Chi-Sqr (SV)	SS Measure SS (all sections)
					SS	SV	VS	VV			
HBJ[a] Pre-Alg.	1986	Pre-algebra	Older	107	35% (37)	35% (37)	7% (8)	23% (25)	.82	18.69*	.35
HBJ Alg.	1988	Algebra	Older	112	28% (31)	39% (44)	5% (6)	28% (31)	.88	28.88*	.28
Houghton Pre-Alg.	1988	Pre-algebra	Older	98	20% (20)	37% (36)	14% (14)	29% (28)	.72	9.68*	.20
Houghton Alg.	1990	Algebra	Older	109	23% (25)	51% (56)	6% (6)	20% (22)	.90	40.32*	.23
UCSMP[b] Alg.	1990	Algebra	Older	113	8% (9)	38% (43)	34% (38)	20% (23)	.53	0.31	.08
McDougal Alg.	1991	Algebra	Newer	84	0% (0)	69% (58)	24% (20)	7% (6)	.74	18.51*	0
Glencoe Pre-Alg.	1992	Pre-algebra	Newer	149	0% (0)	54% (80)	9% (13)	38% (56)	.86	48.27*	0
McDougal Pre-Alg	1994	Pre-algebra	Newer	77	0% (0)	60% (46)	34% (26)	6% (5)	.64	5.56*	0
Glencoe Alg.	1995	Algebra	Newer	121	0% (0)	54% (65)	12% (15)	34% (41)	.81	31.25*	0
UCSMP Pre-Alg.	1995	Pre-algebra	Newer	113	1% (1)	25% (28)	37% (42)	37% (42)	.40	2.80	.01
Total				1083	11% (123)	45% (492)	17.5% (189)	25.8% (279)	.73		.12

[a]HBJ stands for Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. [b]UCSMP stands for University of Chicago School Mathematics Project.

* p < .05