Journal of Educational Studies in Science and Mathematics (JESSM) 2024

Volume 3 (2) Page 77 - 86

https://doi.org/10.29329/jessm.2024.1110.2

Exploring Institutional and Partial Meanings in Mathematics: A Model of Structure and Dynamics

Victor Oxley [1]

Abstract

This paper explores the dual nature of "institutional" and "partial" meanings associated with mathematical entities in an educational setting. The institutional meaning represents the formal understanding endorsed by the mathematical community, while the partial meaning pertains to the limited and evolving comprehension that students possess. Through a theoretical perspective, this research examines how students' progress from partial knowledge toward institutional knowledge, emphasizing the importance of the teacher's role and the educational context in facilitating this transition. The conclusion suggests that the shift to institutional knowledge relies heavily on effective pedagogical mediation and social interaction, which are essential for students to fully grasp mathematical objects.

Keywords: Institutional Meaning, Partial Meaning, Mathematical Objects, Cognitive Development, Mathematics Education.

Received: 26.10.2024 – **Accepted:** 08.11.2024 – **Published:** 31.12.2024

---

[1] **Victor Oxley,** Lecturer, Dirección De Investigación, Universidad Gran Asunción Unıgran, Paraguay.

Correspondence: victoroxley@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

In mathematics education, there is an ongoing tension between what a student understands about a mathematical concept and what is considered full comprehension by the mathematical community. This study aims to explore the process by which students transition from partial understanding to institutional understanding of mathematical concepts. This transition is essential as it determines students' ability to apply mathematical concepts across various contexts and tackle problems with greater autonomy. Understanding the differences between partial and institutional knowledge in mathematics is crucial for improving teaching practices, as it is not just about memorizing rules but also about developing a deep understanding of concepts.

The distinction between a student’s partial knowledge and institutional understanding has been widely discussed in educational literature (Carpenter & Fennema, 1996; Sfard, 2008). Institutional meaning refers to a complete and rigorous understanding of a concept, as established by the conventions of the mathematical community (Lakatos, 1976). On the other hand, partial meaning signifies an intermediate learning phase, where the student has grasped only certain aspects of the concept but has not yet fully understood it (Piaget, 1952; Vygotsky, 1978). Recent literature emphasizes the importance of positive mindsets in mathematics learning, as well as research-based teaching practices (Boaler, 2016; Stein & Smith, 2011; Franke & Kazemi, 2001; Rosa & Orey, 2019; Tall, 2013; Smith & Stein, 2011; Mason & Spence, 2013; Hattie, 2012). These studies underscore the need for pedagogical mediation and structured intervention in the transition process toward institutional knowledge, highlighting the fundamental role of teachers in guiding students toward a complete understanding of mathematical concepts.

The objective of this paper is to explore the process through which students move from partial to institutional understanding. This transition is crucial in mathematics education as it determines a student's ability to apply mathematical concepts across various contexts. In this regard, both the teacher’s role and pedagogical mediation are critical elements that facilitate this development (Lampert, 2001). This research is relevant because learning mathematics is not only about memorizing rules but also about developing a deep understanding of concepts. The transition toward institutional knowledge requires structured pedagogical intervention to help students overcome the limitations of their initial understanding.

METHODOLOGY

In this theoretical research, an extensive review of fundamental works in the fields of cognitive development and mathematics education was conducted to build a solid framework explaining how students progress from "partial" knowledge to "institutional" knowledge of mathematical concepts. This review process included a careful selection of key authors whose theories offer relevant perspectives on cognitive development within the educational context.

In particular, the theoretical frameworks of Jean Piaget (1952), Lev Vygotsky (1978), and Anna Sfard (2008) were utilized. Piaget provides insight into how students build knowledge through direct experiences and stages of cognitive development. Vygotsky, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of social interaction and pedagogical mediation, highlighting the importance of social context in learning. Sfard, in a more recent approach, addresses the process of "mathematization" and the development of mathematical discourse, emphasizing how language and social practices shape students' understanding.

Additionally, the review included Jerome Bruner's discovery learning theory (1966) and David Ausubel's meaningful learning theory (1968), considering that these modern contributions are essential for understanding how students internalize mathematical concepts and transfer that knowledge to new contexts. The review also pays special attention to the role of the teacher and the learning environment as key factors in the transition toward institutional meaning, following the approaches of Carpenter and Fennema (1996), who emphasize how teachers' knowledge and teaching strategies directly impact students' cognitive development and understanding.

This comprehensive approach allows for establishing a robust theoretical framework to analyze how partial meanings evolve into institutional meanings in mathematics learning.

RESULTS

Understanding institutional and partial meanings in mathematical concepts

The institutional meaning of mathematical concepts is embedded in the practices and conventions of the mathematical community. Lakatos (1976) and Hersh (1997) have emphasized how mathematical concepts evolve through critique and discourse, eventually becoming accepted as truths within the academic community. In contrast, partial meaning represents a limited understanding that students develop throughout their learning process. This partial understanding is not incorrect but incomplete, reflecting a developmental stage in learning (Piaget, 1952; Sfard, 2008).

In the early stages of mathematical learning, students acquire basic notions of mathematical concepts through hands-on interaction with objects and situations (Bruner, 1966). At this stage, partial meaning dominates their understanding, allowing them to apply certain mathematical rules without fully grasping the broader connections between concepts. This limitation is evident in their struggle to transfer knowledge to new contexts or more complex problems (Carpenter & Fennema, 1996).

Within the realm of logical reasoning, a formal framework can be proposed to model these phenomena, wherein "institutional" and "partial" meanings are treated as functions or relationships that link mathematical entities to their respective meanings.

The set of mathematical entities can be defined as follows: Let E represent the set that contains all the considered mathematical entities. Likewise, the set of "institutional" meanings is defined: Let S_c denote the set of all "institutional" meanings connected to mathematical entities. On the other hand, the set of "partial" meanings is established as: Let S_p represent the set that encompasses all "partial" meanings associated with mathematical entities. Finally, a function or relationship is defined to connect each mathematical entity with its respective institutional meaning.

$$f_c: E \rightarrow S_c$$

A function or relationship is defined to link each mathematical entity to its partial meaning.

$$f_p: E \rightarrow S_p$$

In this formal system, f_c represents the institutionalization of a mathematical entity's meaning by the mathematical community, while f_p symbolizes the partial and evolving construction of meaning by students.

To formalize the idea that "institutional" meanings are unique to each mathematical entity but "partial" meanings can be diverse and varied, the following is defined:

E is the set of all considered mathematical entities.

S_c is the set of all "institutional" meanings tied to mathematical entities.

S_p is the set of all "partial" meanings related to mathematical entities.

To formalize that each mathematical entity has a unique "institutional" meaning, an injective function is used, assigning a unique, unambiguous meaning to each mathematical entity.

$$f_c: E \rightarrow S_c$$

Where f_c is an injective function, indicating that it assigns each mathematical entity a singular, unambiguous meaning. In contrast, to represent that "partial" meanings may be varied for the same mathematical entity, a non-injective function can be used.

$$f_p: E \rightarrow 2^{Sp}$$

Where 2^{Sp} represents the set of all subsets of S_p, meaning that f_p associates each mathematical entity with a range of possible partial meanings, allowing for multiple interpretations of a single entity. Through these functions, it is established that "institutional" meanings are unique to each mathematical entity, while "partial" meanings can be numerous and varied. The concept of a mathematical limit can be employed to describe how partial meanings converge toward the complete meaning. We can visualize a sequence of partial meanings approaching the institutional meaning as learning progresses. Let's consider a sequence of partial meanings $s_1, s_2, s_3,$ linked to a mathematical entity e. A function f can be defined that connects these partial meanings to the institutional meaning as follows:

$$f : \mathbb{N} \to S_c$$

Let S_c represent the set of institutional meanings, and let $\mathbb{N}$ be the set of natural numbers representing different levels of learning. The idea is that, as students advance through the sequence (i.e., as they acquire more knowledge and experience), the partial meanings s_n approach the institutional meaning c. This can be formally expressed as:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} f(n) = c$$

This implies that function f approaches the institutional meaning c as index n tends to infinity, symbolizing how partial meanings converge toward the institutional meaning as students gain deeper understanding and experience in the subject. Logical operations can be incorporated to represent the relationships between the sets of "institutional" and "partial" meanings, as well as between the functions that connect them. The intersection of two sets results in a set of elements common to both sets. In this context, the intersection can be used to identify meanings shared between the "institutional" and "partial" sets.

$$S_c \cap S_p$$

The union of two sets produces a set that includes all elements from at least one of the sets. This can be employed to represent all possible meanings, both "institutional" and "partial."

The difference between two sets generates a set that contains elements that belong to the first set but not the second. This can be used to represent meanings that are exclusive to either the "institutional" or "partial" sets.

$$S_c \cup S_p$$

The complement of a set in relation to another produces a set that contains elements in the second set but not in the first. This can represent meanings that are not shared between the "institutional" and "partial" sets.

$$S_c - S_p$$

$$S_p - S_c$$

These logical operations provide a model for understanding the relationship between "institutional" and "partial" meanings, as well as how they evolve over time and with student experience. These tools can help analyze how partial meanings converge on institutional meanings as learning progresses. To formalize the condition of an element being in the intersection of two sets, meaning it shares properties with both sets, let x be a generic element and $P(x)$ a property applicable to x. Therefore, the condition for an element x to be in the intersection of the sets S_c and S_p would be:

$$S_p^c = S_c - S_p$$

$$S_c^c = S_p - S_c$$

This indicates that x is in the intersection of S_c and S_p if and only if it belongs to both S_c and S_p meaning property $P(x)$ holds true for x in both sets. This can be more generally expressed using predicate notation. Let $P(x)$ denote the property that applies to elements of S_c, and $S_p(x)$ denote the property that applies to elements of S_p. Hence, the condition can be expressed as:

$$x \in S_c \cap S_p \iff (x \in S_c \wedge x \in S_p)$$

This formalizes the idea that an element belongs to the intersection of two sets if it satisfies the properties relevant to both. In the context described, it can be said that a students knowledge becomes institutional when their partial interpretation of a mathematical object aligns with the institutional meaning established by the mathematical community. This could be expressed as follows: a student's knowledge becomes institutional when their partial interpretation belongs to the intersection of the "institutional" and "partial" meaning sets. Formally, if we represent a student's partial interpretation as x, and the intersection of the sets of "institutional" and "partial" meanings as then the condition can be expressed as:

$$x \in S_c \cap S_p \iff (P_c(x) \wedge P_p(x))$$

This formalizes the idea that an element belongs to the intersection of two sets only when it satisfies the properties relevant to both. It suggests that the student's partial interpretation fits within both the institutional and partial meaning sets, showing that their knowledge now aligns with the institutional meaning.

$$x \in S_c \cap S_p$$

It suggests that the student's partial interpretation fits within both the institutional and partial meaning sets, showing that their knowledge now aligns with the institutional meaning. It can be asserted that the students knowledge is institutional once their partial interpretation corresponds to the meaning established by the mathematical community. If a student has reached an institutional understanding of a mathematical concept, the learning process has been successful. Likewise, it can be concluded that the teacher has effectively guided the student to this understanding by employing suitable pedagogical strategies and offering the necessary support. Furthermore, the teacher is considered efficient if these outcomes have been achieved in a timely manner, optimizing the teaching and learning process in terms of time and resources (Oxley, 2024).

Facilitating the transition to institutional meaning

The teacher plays a pivotal role in facilitating the transition from partial to institutional meaning. Vygotsky (1978) underscores the significance of the social environment and pedagogical mediation in the cognitive development of students (Oxley & Rolón, 2017). In this framework, teachers serve as mediators, offering direction and structuring learning so that students can internalize more abstract and formal concepts. Lampert (2001) points out that engaging students in authentic mathematical reasoning and problem-solving in the classroom is an effective strategy for helping students move toward institutional understanding.

Guided learning and social interaction enable students to not only apply mathematical rules but also to comprehend the reasoning and meaning behind those rules (Vygotsky, 1978). Mathematics education should focus on guided discovery, as proposed by Bruner (1966), where students actively engage with the concepts and construct their own understanding. This approach allows students to acquire institutional meaning more effectively, as they understand the underlying logic behind mathematical procedures.

The role of learning in achieving institutional understanding

Ausubel's (1968) theory of meaningful learning emphasizes the necessity of connecting new concepts with a student's prior knowledge. In mathematics, this theory suggests that abstract concepts should be introduced in a way that students can relate to their previous experiences or knowledge. This strategy is crucial in aiding students as they progress toward institutional understanding, as they need to build on what they already know to achieve a more complete and formal understanding.

When students are able to relate new mathematical concepts to their existing cognitive structure, they experience deeper, more lasting learning (Ausubel, 1968). This type of learning not only enhances retention but also facilitates the transfer of knowledge to new contexts, signaling that the student has attained institutional meaning of the mathematical concepts.

DISCUSSION

The transition from a partial meaning to an institutional meaning of mathematical concepts is a multifaceted process influenced by various factors (Oxley, 2020), including the quality of pedagogical mediation and the structure of the learning environment. Both Piaget (1952) and Vygotsky (1978) agree that students do not learn passively; their understanding of mathematical concepts evolves through interaction with their environment and support from knowledgeable adults. This interaction aids not only in the acquisition of basic mathematical skills but also in the internalization of more abstract concepts that define institutional meaning. However, this process can be hindered by factors such as a lack of teacher training or the use of methodologies that do not promote active student participation, which can lead to a superficial understanding of concepts. Kitcher (1983) also notes that inadequate teaching can lead to persistent misunderstandings that become obstacles to later learning.

A key element of this process is the teacher's ability to recognize and address the differences between partial and institutional meanings. Teachers must be able to determine where students are in their learning trajectory and adjust their teaching strategies accordingly. Lampert (2001) and Carpenter & Fennema (1996) emphasize the importance of fostering genuine mathematical discussions in the classroom, as this allows students to explore and question their ideas, thereby supporting their progression toward a more formal and complete understanding. However, some teachers may feel insecure or pressured by rigid curricula that do not allow the necessary flexibility to adapt their methods to the individual needs of their students. This can result in standardized teaching that ignores the diversity of student learning, as Bruner (1966) warns, asserting that a one-dimensional approach to teaching limits students' potential.

Furthermore, meaningful learning plays a vital role in reinforcing mathematical knowledge. Ausubel (1968) argues that students learn better when they can relate new concepts to their existing knowledge. In mathematics, this implies that teachers must provide students with opportunities to connect new ideas to what they already know, thus facilitating the transition to institutional meaning. However, a lack of a contextualized approach may result in isolated learning, where students struggle to apply concepts in practical situations, underscoring the need for teaching strategies that integrate theory with real practice. Sfard (2008) emphasizes that communication in the classroom should not only focus on mathematical content but also on the ways in which students express their ideas and reasoning, which can facilitate their deeper understanding of concepts.

Additionally, Hersh (1997) posits that the nature of mathematics involves a process of discovery and discussion that goes beyond mere knowledge transmission. Students' ability to engage in this type of mathematical dialogue may be limited by a lack of confidence in their abilities, a problem that can be exacerbated by a negative learning environment. Therefore, it is essential for teachers to create a classroom atmosphere that fosters curiosity and intellectual risk-taking, so that students feel secure in sharing their thoughts and asking questions.

In conclusion, the transition from a partial meaning to an institutional meaning of mathematical concepts is a complex process that depends on multiple factors, including pedagogical mediation, the structure of the learning environment, and teachers' ability to adapt their teaching to students' needs. For this process to be successful, it is crucial to promote a culture of genuine and meaningful mathematical discussion, as well as to provide a context in which students can relate new concepts to their prior knowledge. This will not only facilitate their understanding of mathematical concepts but also promote a positive attitude toward learning mathematics.

Conclusions

This paper has examined the duality between institutional and partial meanings of mathematical concepts, as well as the transition students experience as they deepen their understanding of these concepts. It has been demonstrated that this transition is not automatic; it requires effective pedagogical mediation and a well-structured learning environment. Teachers are essential in this process, guiding students toward a more comprehensive and formal understanding of mathematical ideas.

The study also underscores the significance of meaningful learning in the acquisition of institutional meaning. Students learn more effectively when they can connect new concepts to their previous knowledge, and this connection is fundamental to achieving a complete and lasting understanding of mathematical objects. The progression from partial to institutional meaning is a gradual process that depends on the quality of teaching, pedagogical mediation, and the social environment in which learning occurs.

Declarations

Publication Information of the Manuscript

This research is the result of the development of ideas, as an extension of the original concepts related to the topic, which the author has outlined in a published book of his authorship, referenced in this paper as belonging to the author and published in 2024.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research was carried out with self-funding.

Ethical Issues

This research has no conflicts of interest**.**

REFERENCES

Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Boaler, J. (2016). *Mathematical Mindsets: Unleashing Students' Potential through Creative Math, Inspiring Messages and Innovative Teaching*. Jossey-Bass.

Bruner, J. (1966). *Toward a Theory of Instruction*. Harvard University Press.

Carpenter, T. P., & Fennema, E. (1996). *Cognitively Guided Instruction: Building on the Knowledge of Students and Teachers*. Heinemann.

Franke, M. L., & Kazemi, E. (2001). *Teaching with Vision: The Role of a Vision in Learning to Teach*. In D. J. C. (Ed.), Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education (Vol. 2, pp. 709-716).

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible Learning for Mathematics, Grades 1-5*. Corwin Press.

Hersh, R. (1997). *What Is Mathematics, Really?* Oxford University Press.

Kitcher, P. (1983). *The Nature of Mathematical Knowledge*. Oxford University Press.

Lakatos, I. (1976). *Proofs and Refutations: The Logic of Mathematical Discovery*. Cambridge University Press.

Lampert, M. (2001). *Teaching Problems and the Problems of Teaching*. Yale University Press.

Mason, J., & Spence, J. (2013). *Mathematical Thinking: How to Develop It in Your Classroom*. Mathematics Teacher Education and Development, 15(1), 73-91.

Oxley, V., & Rolón, V. (2017). *Capacitación docente para la enseñanza de matemática*. ACADEMO Revista De Investigación en Ciencias Sociales Y Humanidades, 4(2). https://revistacientifica.uamericana.edu.py/index.php/academo/article/view/73

Oxley Insfrán, V. M. (2020). *Complejidad ontológica y enunciados de problemas matemáticos*. Revista Científica Estudios E Investigaciones, 9(1), 17-39. https://doi.org/10.26885/rcei.9.1.17

Oxley Insfrán, V. (2024). *Educación Matemática Escolar y otros ensayos. Filosofar la realidad en clave analítica*. Bubok.

Piaget, J. (1952). *The Origins of Intelligence in Children*. International Universities Press.

Rosa, M. I., & Orey, D. C. (2019). *Challenging the Traditional View of Mathematics Teaching: The Case of Pedagogical Content Knowledge.* Educational Studies in Mathematics, 101(1), 45-61.

Sfard, A. (2008). *Thinking as Communicating: Human Development, the Growth of Discourses, and Mathematizing*. Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M. S., & Stein, M. K. (2011). *Five Practices for Orchestrating Productive Mathematics Discussions*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Stein, M. K., & Smith, M. S. (2011). *Mathematics Instruction: A Research-Based Teacher Guide*. In H. F. Boaler (Ed.), International Perspectives on Mathematics Curriculum (pp. 179-196). Routledge.

Tall, D. (2013). *How Humans Learn to Think Mathematically: Exploring the Three Worlds of Mathematics*. Mathematical Thinking and Learning, 15(1), 3-18.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.