Beliefs have long been recognized as a “hidden variable” in mathematics education. Epistemological beliefs are an inherent, although often implicit, component of curriculum goals in the cognitive domain. Connections between acquiring and accessing higher order cognitive strategies and epistemological beliefs are gradually becoming better understood. Israeli guidelines for mathematics teacher preparation emphasize view of mathematics as a complex body of knowledge and knowing mathematics as a dynamic process. We present a case study of Israeli preservice secondary mathematics teachers’ epistemological beliefs about mathematics, assessed via concept maps at the beginning and end of undergraduate studies. A mixed-methods approach was used to analyze maps. Results suggest that students’ beliefs shifted to align with Israeli goals. Implications for STEM curriculum design are discussed.
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Introduction:

Complex interactions between cognition, metacognition and epistemological beliefs impact selection and application of cognitive strategies (Hofer & Sinatra, 2010). Epistemological beliefs, therefore, play an inherent role in education policy; they are implicit, often hidden (Leder, Pehkonen, & Torner, 2002), components of curriculum objectives in the cognitive domain.

We present a case study assessing alignment of students’ beliefs with goals for the preparation of secondary mathematics teachers in Israel. During the three-year course of studies, beliefs that mathematical knowledge is simple and disconnected became less central; beliefs that mathematics is absolute knowledge of procedures evolved to a nuanced system of beliefs about a mathematics of procedures, concepts and processes.

Theoretical Background:

Learning objectives in undergraduate STEM education include retention of knowledge over time, the application of knowledge to solve unfamiliar problems, and commitment to lifelong learning (Fairweather, 2008) which are associated to higher order cognitive processes (Fink, 2003). Acquisition of higher order thinking skills is a necessary, although not sufficient, component of solving complex problems and responding innovatively to changing circumstances (Binkley et al., 2012). Students must also internalize a deep approach to learning (Bromme, Pieschl, & Stahl, 2010) as an active, self-driven process of deep thought and construction of knowledge and understanding (Marton & Saljo, 1976).

Students’ epistemological beliefs about the nature of knowledge, knowing and learning (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997; M. Schommer, 1990) are connected to their adoption of surface or deep learning approaches (Vermunt, Van Rossum, & Hamer, 2010) Beliefs that knowledge is absolute--facts with or without accompanying understanding--correspond to a surface, outcome-oriented approach to learning. Beliefs that knowledge is dynamically constructed and context-dependent aligns with a deep-learning, process-oriented approach (Vermunt et al., 2010).
Epistemological beliefs and metacognition are connected (Schraw & Moshman, 1995); the ability to access the cognitive tools needed to engage in critical thinking and problem solving is mediated through beliefs about knowledge and knowing (Hofer & Sinatra, 2010; Kuhn, 1991). Holding non-availing beliefs impedes acquisition of higher cognitive skills (Schraw, Crippen, & Hartley, 2006) and limits the range of cognitive strategies that are accessed (Hofer, 2004; Louca, Elby, Hammer, & Kagey, 2004). Since beliefs impact the acquisition and application of higher order cognitive skills (Hofer & Sinatra, 2010; Schraw et al., 2006), they are an inherent, although often hidden (Leder, Pehkonen, & Torner, 2002) component of curriculum objectives.

In mathematics, higher order cognitive skills include discovery, making connections and building understanding, which characterize (deep) conceptual knowledge (Hiebert & Lefevre, 1986; Star, 2005). Mathematics-related beliefs are strongly related to the cognitive processes of mathematics (McLeod & McLeod, 2002). For example, students who believe that knowledge is simple, isolated facts (M. Schommer, 1990) are less likely to use higher level cognitive strategies and have lower levels of achievement (Cano, 2005); a belief that knowledge is simple affects self-regulation in learning (Muis, 2007) and has been shown to negatively impact student achievement in remedial mathematics courses in university (Briley, Thompson, & Iran-Nejad, 2009). Fostering dynamic beliefs about mathematics as process of discovery (Ernest, 1991; Grigutsch & Törner, 1998) is an inherent component of cognitive curriculum goals; neglecting epistemological beliefs as a component of mathematics education goals is a potential source of inequity of access to career and educational opportunities for which mathematics is a gateway (Leder, Pehkonen, & Törner, 2002).

Epistemological beliefs of mathematics education students have been widely studied (e.g., Ball, 1990; Schmidt et al., 2008) because mathematics teachers’ beliefs impact their teaching practice (Beswick, 2005; Blömeke & Delaney, 2012; Thompson, 1992), student learning (Staub & Stern, 2002) and student achievement (Tatto et al., 2008). While some countries, for example the United States, explicitly include belief-related goals in guidelines for mathematics teacher preparation (CBMS, 2012), the guidelines of other countries, e.g., Israel do not contain explicit belief-goals (Gutfreund & Rosenberg, 2012).

Despite the absence of explicit belief-related goals, the importance of addressing belief-development in programs for mathematics teacher preparation has long been recognized (Brownlee, Purdie, & Boulton-Lewis, 2001; Wilkins, 2008). For example, a cross-country study of 23,000 pre-service mathematics teachers from six countries examined the structure of mathematics teacher training programs and the mathematics-related beliefs of the programs’ students at the end of their studies. Following Grigutsch (1998) beliefs were characterized as static/absolute and/or dynamic. End-of-program beliefs varied by country and by program across all six countries graduates held dynamic beliefs, but the extent to which graduates also held absolute beliefs varied by country (Schmidt et al., 2008). In addition, preliminary research indicates that the number and type of mathematics and mathematics education courses in mathematics teacher preparation programs impact beliefs (Blömeke, Buchholtz, Suhl, & Kaiser, 2014) with more opportunities to learn mathematics education courses leading to more dynamic beliefs. The connection between programs’ explicit or implicit belief goals and graduates’ beliefs was not examined, raising the question of the role implicit or explicit expectations play in belief development.

Israeli guidelines for preparation of secondary mathematics teachers (Gutfreund & Rosenberg, 2012), referred to as “Gutfreund guidelines” in what follows, do not specifically address beliefs, however they include content goals characterizing mathematics as a process of knowledge development, which are aligned to dynamic beliefs about mathematics (Grigutsch & Törner, 1998). Pedagogical goals address higher order cognitive skills; also aligned with dynamic beliefs, and, additionally, a belief that mathematical knowledge is
complex, rather than simple (M. Schommer, 1990). Developing epistemological beliefs of mathematics as a complex body of knowledge and a dynamic process of inquiry is, therefore, an implicit goal of the Gutfreund guidelines.

**Research Goal**

The previously unexplored connection between belief expectations and students’ end-of-program beliefs provided a rationale for studying the epistemological beliefs about mathematics held by Israeli mathematics education students at the beginning and end of the program of studies and analyzing these beliefs in terms of their alignment to the Gutfreund guidelines (2012).

**Methodology**

This case-study was conducted within the framework of a regulated B.Ed. program mathematics education at an Israeli college of education; graduates are certified to teach Israeli secondary mathematics.

**Sample**

Twenty-five students began the mathematics education program in the 2014-15 academic year. Data was collected before students began the course of studies. A second set of data was collected 3.75 years later at conclusion of the program. Twenty-two of the 25 students completed the program. All students who completed the program agreed to participate in the study. The initial data of the students who did not complete the program was excluded.

**Data Collection**

Various methods have been employed to collect data on beliefs of pre-service mathematics teachers, including interviews and classroom observation (e.g., Ball, 1990) and Likert-type surveys assessing level of agreement with statements reflecting a pre-determined set of mathematics-related beliefs (e.g., Tarto et al., 2008). Interviews and observations provide an in-depth picture of beliefs, but they are time intensive in terms of both data collection and data analysis. Likert surveys are an important tool for gathering and analyzing large data sets, but they cannot access beliefs that are not included in the survey (Grigutsch & Törner, 1998) and may yield “false-positive” agreement with some beliefs (Philipp, 2006).

We employed concept maps (Novak & Gowin, 1984), which visually represent abstract knowledge and understanding, to collect students’ beliefs about knowing mathematics. Primarily used to assess knowledge and understanding of content, concept maps have also been used to capture meta-cognitive views about thinking (Ritchhart, Turner, & Hadar, 2008). We adopted Ritchhart’s methodology to collect students’ epistemological beliefs: they were asked to reflect on what it means to know mathematics; to generate a list of words and phrases that came to mind; to arrange their ideas in a hierarchy of importance/centrality to the notion “knowing mathematics”; to connect related ideas with lines and to briefly describe the connections. Students created concept maps before beginning the course of studies and again 3.75 years later at the completion of the program course-work.

**Data Analysis**

We used a two-step process to analyze the items (words and phrases) on the two sets of concept maps. First-stage qualitative analysis used a constant comparative paradigm; students’ responses were read and reread to discover commonalities and recurring themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This inductive process uncovered a structured system of categories describing different ways of knowing mathematics. Student maps included many items. When a single item seemed to relate to more than one way of knowing, it was
categorized under each of the appropriate categories. Each item on a map was assigned a rank from 1 to \( n \) indicating its distance from the center of the map, with items closest to the center assigned a rank of one. The items were coded by category and rank.

The coded maps were used to define “beginning of program” and “end of program” matrices. Each category was assigned to a variable and each map was assigned to two rows in the appropriate matrix; each item on a map corresponded to two matrix entries-- the first denoting its category and the second, its rank. The ranking was used to assign a weight to each item; On a map with \( n \) ranks, rank \( n \) items (those items furthest from the center) were assigned a weight of \( \frac{1}{n} \), rank \( n-1 \) items were assigned a rank of \( \frac{2}{n} \), items closest to the center (rank one) received a weight of one.

For each map, the sum of the weights of the items in the category was computed, labeled as the \([\text{category name}]\)-belief score. A \([\text{category-name}]\) average weight was computed for each map by dividing the belief score by the number of map items in the category. Ratios of each belief score to the sum of all belief scores were computed both for the complete set of categories and for various subsets. Subset ratios will be described in the findings. The belief scores, average weights and belief ratios are dependent variables of the maps. For each student, differences between beginning-of-program and end-of-program values were computed, defining dependent variables of the students in the program.

Findings

Students related to knowing mathematics in complex and varied ways. Two main ways of knowing mathematics, \( i.e., \) epistemological beliefs, emerged from the categorical analysis of the maps: knowledge of mathematical content comprised of topics (such as algebra) or skills (such as addition); and attitudes toward mathematics. Students’ attitudes were expressed in terms of cognitive, behavioral and affective components, \( e.g., \) perseverance (behavioral), satisfaction (affective), and success (cognitive). The categorical structure is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Categorical structure of beliefs](image)

In the initial stage of quantitative analysis, four belief scores were computed corresponding to the content category (content) and the three components of the attitude category (affective, behavioral, cognitive.) The ratio of each score to the sum of the four scores was then computed. Mean ratios at the beginning and end of the program are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Differences in belief ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief Ratios</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innate ability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students at both the beginning and end of the program related to knowing mathematics as attitudes towards the subject more strongly than knowing specific mathematical skills and topics. Due to the small sample size and wide variation between students, effect size and statistical significance do not provide meaningful data. None-the-less, the results suggest that trend was stronger at the end of the program; the content ratio at the beginning of the program was 0.355 (σ = 0.245) and the content ratio at the end of the program was 0.149 (σ = 0.189). Same-student comparisons confirm this finding; the content ratio of 77% (n=17) of the students decreased over the course of studies.

**Mathematical Content**

Mathematical content was included on most maps: 86% (n=19) of the beginning-of-program maps and 64% (n=14) of the end-of-program maps. There were three categories of mathematical content: pre-academic content such as geometry, solving equations and order of operations; horizon content, which in Israel bridges secondary and post-secondary mathematics, such as three-dimensional geometry and vectors; and academic content such as cyclic groups and infinity. (Note: In Israel, high school encounters with infinity, such as horizontal asymptotes, are algorithmic and are not associated to the symbol or concept of infinity.) Four students included horizon content and four students included academic content. One of the four included both horizon and academic content. For only one student did the number of academic items exceed the number of pre-academic items. This finding suggests that program graduates do not relate to academic mathematics, i.e., the mathematics of mathematicians (Beswick, 2011).

Students did not connect different areas of mathematics on their maps, suggesting that at both the beginning and end of the program students’ viewed mathematics content as a disjoint set of skills and topics rather than as a connected system (e.g., Beswick, 2005), i.e., they had a simple knowledge belief about the structure of mathematics (M. Schommer, 1990).

The mean weight of the content items changed over the course of studies. The mean weight was 0.68 (σ = 0.32) on the initial maps and 0.32 (σ = 0.26) on the final maps. Items closest to the center of a map have a weight of one, therefore the results suggest that content became less central to students’ views about knowing mathematics over the course of studies. Same-student comparisons confirm this finding; for 82% (n=18) of the students, the mean content weight of the second map was less than the mean content weight of the first. These findings suggest that the strength of students’ belief in simple mathematical knowledge decreased over the course of studies.

**Attitudes toward mathematics**

Students’ attitudes toward mathematics included cognitive, affective and behavioral components (Figure 1). Statistical analysis indicated that and behavioral components of attitudes became less central to students’ epistemological beliefs about mathematics over the course of studies; the centrality of cognitive beliefs was stable.

**Cognitive Beliefs**

Four distinct sub-types of cognitive beliefs emerged from the data: three categories of
cognitive processes associated to knowing mathematics and one relating to who knows mathematics. The three sub-types of cognitive processes are listed below:

- **Procedures and answers:** Mathematical knowledge consists of procedures; it is absolute. Knowledge is demonstrated by implementing mathematical procedures and achieving correct outcomes. “Correct” presentation is (sometimes) included.
- **Concepts and explanations:** Mathematical knowledge consists of understanding the concepts underlying procedures. It is absolute. Knowledge is demonstrated by an ability to explain or understand explanations of procedures and concepts.
- **Processes:** Mathematical knowledge is based on concepts which can be intuited, and discovered (or rediscovered). New knowledge can be constructed from existing knowledge. Knowledge is demonstrated by connecting concepts, relating mathematics to real life, asking and answering questions about mathematics, and creating (or recreating) new ways to solve problems.

The fourth sub-type cognitive belief, labeled **innate-ability**, describes a belief that knowing mathematics requires a certain type of intelligence (C. Dweck, 2006; C. S. Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995). Thirty-six percent of the students \((n=8)\) began the program holding a belief that knowing mathematics requires “intelligence” or a “mathematical head.” No students expressed this belief at the end of the program, indicating that these future teachers had, indeed, internalized the idea that intrinsic ability is not a pre-requisite for learning mathematics.

Fostering dynamic beliefs is implicit in the guidelines for Israeli mathematics teacher preparation (Gutfreund & Rosenberg, 2012). We therefore separately analyzed map items in the three categories of cognitive processes that emerged from our data, computing procedures-and-answers, concept-and-explanations and processes beliefs scores as well as the ratio of each of these belief scores to the sum of the three scores. Differences between beginning- and end-of-studies mean ratios are shown in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Beginning of studies</th>
<th>End of studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures and answers</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts and explanations</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Cognitive process ratios*

Cognitive beliefs expressed by beginning students were overwhelmingly focused on procedures and answers. By the end of the program, students’ cognitive beliefs had shifted to process; 52% of their beliefs expressed mathematics-as-processes. The mean weights for items in each of the three categories of cognitive processes support this finding. On the initial maps, the mean weight of procedures-and-answers items was \(0.775 (\mu = 0.166)\); on the final maps the mean weight was \(0.480 (\mu = 0.316)\). Same-student comparison showed that the mean weight of procedures-and-answers beliefs decreased for 77% \((n=17)\) of the students. In contrast, the mean weight across all students of process beliefs increased from \(0.338 (\mu = 0.388)\) to \(0.829 (\mu = 0.152)\) and the mean weight of process beliefs increased for 77% \((n=17)\) of the students. These findings indicate that over the course of studies students’ views
shifted from mathematics as procedures to mathematics as processes.

**Discussion**

This study analyzed pre-service secondary mathematics teachers’ beliefs about knowing and learning mathematics at the beginning and end of their studies, as expressed through concept maps. Our findings document how their epistemological beliefs about mathematics changed over the course of studies, evolving to align with beliefs that support the cognitive objectives detailed in the Israeli guidelines for the preparation of secondary mathematics teachers (Gutfreund & Rosenberg, 2012). Prior research indicates that education impacts beliefs about the structure and stability of knowledge (Marlene Schommer, 1998), therefore the overall picture that emerged supports the idea that the program of studies impacted student beliefs about the complexity of mathematical knowledge and the cognitive components of mathematics. Other factors, such as age, may also have impacted beliefs.

Our results indicate that a view of knowing mathematics as knowing isolated content (simple knowledge) decreased over the course of studies. This has positive implications for these students’ abilities to access and apply higher order cognitive strategies (Cano, 2005) and self-regulate their learning (Muis, 2007). The Gutfreund guidelines (2012) highlight these abilities as main components of mathematical literacy, deemed an essential component of teacher preparation. Our findings indicate that end-of-program beliefs align with the goals for mathematical literacy expressed in the guidelines.

Gutfreund guidelines (2012) for content knowledge of mathematics include understanding mathematics as a creative process rather than a finished, polished product; guidelines for pedagogical knowledge guidelines include supporting learning of both low and high order cognitive processes and stress equity of opportunities to learn mathematics vis a vis gender and differing abilities. These goals are aligned with dynamic, process-oriented beliefs about mathematics (e.g., Blömeke & Delaney, 2012; Briley et al., 2009). Our findings document that students’ beliefs changed dramatically from an almost exclusive focus on mathematics as procedures and outcomes to a nuanced set of beliefs where mathematics includes procedures, concepts and dynamic processes.

The connection between the structure of mathematics teacher preparation programs and graduates’ beliefs have shown that differences in opportunities to learn mathematics education courses impact graduates’ beliefs. Our findings indicating post-program alignment with (implicit) belief goals present another avenue of exploration: the connection between program goals and epistemological beliefs. As a first step belief-alignment to the Gutfreund guidelines (2012) of other Israeli mathematics teacher preparation programs should be assessed. Belief-alignment in other countries should also be evaluated, including comparing alignment when belief goals are explicitly stated and alignment when they are implied.

**Conclusion**

This case study showed that the epistemological beliefs of students completing a three-year undergraduate program in mathematics education are consistent with goals in the guidelines for the preparation of Israeli secondary mathematics teachers (Gutfreund & Rosenberg, 2012) and are aligned with belief expectations implicit in the goals.

The attention paid to the epistemological beliefs of graduates of mathematics education programs (e.g., Blömeke & Delaney, 2012) should be expanded to other undergraduate STEM programs. Connections between acquisition and application of higher cognitive strategies and epistemological beliefs (Hofer & Sinatra, 2010) suggest a role for beliefs in setting and meeting STEM goals of complex problem solving and lifelong learning (Fairweather, 2008).
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