

# UC Berkeley

## UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

### Title

Neurodevelopment of relational reasoning: Implications for mathematical pedagogy

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6rz9j3xg>

### Journal

Trends in Neuroscience and Education, 3(2)

### ISSN

2211-9493

### Authors

Miller Singley, AT

Bunge, SA


### Publication Date

2014

### DOI

10.1016/j.tine.2014.03.001

Peer reviewed



# Neurodevelopment of relational reasoning: Implications for mathematical pedagogy



Alison T. Miller Singley\*, Silvia A. Bunge

Department of Psychology & Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute, University of California, Berkeley, USA

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 15 October 2013

Received in revised form

4 March 2014

Accepted 17 March 2014

### Keywords:

Reasoning

Mathematics

Development

Child

Elementary school

Algebra

## ABSTRACT

Reasoning ability supports the development of mathematics proficiency, as demonstrated by correlational and longitudinal evidence, and yet this skill is not emphasized in traditional elementary mathematics curricula. We propose that targeting reasoning skills from elementary school onward could help more students succeed in advanced mathematics courses. Here, we review the links between reasoning and mathematics, discuss the neural basis and development of reasoning ability, and identify promising school curricula.

© 2014 Elsevier GmbH. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Mathematics achievement in school acts as a gatekeeper for academic and career success [1], preventing students who fail courses such as algebra from entering careers in science, technology, and many areas of business. This issue is cause for concern at a global scale [2], and so it is vital that we understand and address the factors that determine why some students succeed in mathematics while others fail. Educational research has identified several key factors, from choice of curriculum and teacher quality [3,4,5] to home environment and cultural dynamics [6,7,8,9].

We argue here that an additional factor that influences proficiency in mathematics is a student's capacity for *relational reasoning*, or the ability to jointly consider multiple sets of relations between mental representations. Relational reasoning is essential to algebra [10] and helpful in learning many elementary mathematical concepts [11,12]. In this paper we review the theoretical and psychometric links between relational reasoning and mathematics, and present neurodevelopmental evidence for the importance of emphasizing relational reasoning in elementary mathematics instruction.


## 2. Relational reasoning and its role in mathematics

Relational reasoning is a fundamental aspect of what psychologists traditionally call fluid reasoning, or the ability to solve problems in novel situations [13]. The study of relational reasoning distinguishes between first-order and second-order (or higher-order) relationships. A first-order comparison describes the relation between two individual mental representations, whereas a second-order comparison integrates two (or more) sets of first-order relations. A propositional analogy is a good example: in determining whether chain is to link as bouquet is to flower, one must first identify the relationships between each pair, and then compare the nature of those relationships to each other. Semantic and spatial relationships can be structured similarly to create tasks that elicit the same essential relational reasoning skill (Fig. 1 A and B).

Cognitive scientists have long studied relational reasoning in these domain-general contexts, under the assumption that domain-general skills carry over to domain-specific contexts. We hypothesize that the capacity for relational reasoning is a critical foundation for learning mathematical concepts. To illustrate the role of relational reasoning in mathematics, we take the example of algebra. A key difference between advanced and average algebra learners is whether they view the equal sign (=) relationally or operationally [10]. A relational definition of the equal sign emphasizes the *equivalent relationship* between the expressions on either side of the equal sign (Fig. 1 C). An operational definition involves only the computational aspect. For example, when completing a calculation

\* Corresponding author

E-mail address: [atms@berkeley.edu](mailto:atms@berkeley.edu) (A.T. Miller Singley).



**Fig. 1.** Three examples of relational reasoning tasks, with first-order relationships highlighted in green and second-order in blue. (A) Verbal analogy in which each first-order relationship describes one section of a larger entity. Because these relationships match across the two pairs, the analogy is valid. (B) The shapes in these two pairs do not have the same first-order relationship. (C) Expressions of mathematical equivalence. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

indicated by an expression on the left, the equal sign announces the answer on the right, as in  $5 \times 10 + 27 - 35 = 42$ .

The problem with an operational understanding of the equal sign is that it is insufficient for solving complex algebraic functions, which may have more than one solution, and must be solved by manipulating both sides of the equation. These algebraic calculations are meaningful only if the student holds a relational view of the equal sign [14]. However, traditional elementary math curricula rarely present the equal sign in a relational context [15], and thus many students struggle when introduced to the concept in algebra [16].


### 3. Evidence of correlation between reasoning and mathematics

Understanding of the equal sign is but one illustration of the centrality of relational reasoning in mathematics. There is strong evidence for a more general correlation between these skills. Several studies involving broad batteries of cognitive ability found relational reasoning to be strongly correlated with mathematics performance, above effects of other cognitive factors [17], and across various age ranges [18,19]. These data are strengthened by recent longitudinal analyses that indicate a developmental link between reasoning skills and math achievement. For example, Primi, Ferrão and Almeida [20] found that 11–14-year-olds who had higher relational reasoning scores than their peers at the outset of the study showed greater annual rates of improvement in an independent mathematics assessment. Relational reasoning skill has similarly been shown to be a significant predictor of mathematical skill nine months later in 6-year-olds [21] and 18 months later in 6–18-year-olds [22].

### 4. A relational account of the link between reasoning and mathematics

The data reviewed above provide strong empirical support for a link between relational reasoning and mathematics performance. According to Cattell’s investment hypothesis (1987), the link is due to relational reasoning, a component of ‘fluid intelligence,’ providing a scaffold on which to build all domain-specific skills. Yet we posit a more concrete explanation for the correlation between relational reasoning and mathematics. White, Alexander, and Daugherty [23] point out that from an information-processing perspective, analogical and mathematical reasoning require the same elemental cognitive functions, which could explain the correlations between reasoning and mathematics performance observed at a given point in time. However, as noted above, longitudinal data go beyond this conclusion by showing that current reasoning ability is a good predictor of mathematics performance several years later, even after accounting for the strong relationship between reasoning ability measured at the two time-points [22,20].

We theorize that the emerging ability to reason relationally forms the foundation for mathematical conceptual development



**Fig. 2.** Theoretical model depicting how the development of relational reasoning supports the acquisition of mathematical knowledge. Learning the meaning of number words is a process of comparing a number to the next one in the sequence. Understanding fractions requires the representation of 1st-order relations between numerators and denominators. Comparing fractions requires evaluation of a 2nd-order relation. Pre-algebra tasks require representation of complex relations between known values, unknown values, and operations. Algebra problems include variables and complex systems of equations that must be solved in relation to each other.

throughout the school years (Fig. 2). To learn the meaning of number words, young children must grasp the differences in magnitude and order that the number words imply [24]. They do so through a process of learning to distinguish “one” from “more than one”, and iteratively adding “two” and “three” to their repertoire before grasping the mapping between number word order and increasing magnitudes [25]. Thus, learning the meaning of number words requires first-order comparison of each number and the next one in the sequence. Four to six years later, when students encounter fractions, this comparison becomes even more explicit; fractions are defined and notated by a first-order relationship between the numerator and the denominator. Comparing two fractions requires evaluation of a second-order relationship by determining how the relationship between one numerator and its denominator differs from that between another numerator-denominator pair.

The next major milestone is pre-algebra, such as the task to solve for an unknown number. Even simple equations such as the one shown in Fig. 2 depict somewhat complex relationships between the known and unknown numbers, and suggest the use of an operation (subtraction) that is inversely related to the one displayed (addition). These relationships become higher-level in algebra, with complex expressions and systems of equations required to find the value of two unknown numbers. To master algebra, a student must grasp the concept of a variable, which represents any number that satisfies specific relational arguments. Therefore, over the course of mathematical development, children progress from defining numbers as first-order relationships, to making second-order value comparisons, to resolving complex systems of first- and second-order relations involving known, unknown and variable quantities and inverse operations.

Thus, we hypothesize that improvements in relational reasoning over childhood and adolescence support students’ ability to reason about increasingly complex mathematical relations:

magnitudes, then expressions, and then variables. This framework makes Cattell's investment hypothesis more concrete, and extends the claim of information-processing theorists regarding how relational reasoning supports the development of mathematics knowledge. In the next section, we review evidence from cognitive neuroscience that provides preliminary support for this perspective.

## 5. Neurodevelopment of reasoning

It is well-established that a lateral fronto-parietal network supports relational reasoning in adults [26,27,28]. Neuroimaging research has shed light on the distinct contributions of different regions in the lateral frontoparietal network to reasoning. The lateral aspect of the parietal lobe is broadly implicated in lower-order reasoning, as shown by fMRI tasks utilizing magnitude [29], ordination [30], pattern [31], and spatial attention [32], to name a few domains. We consider all of these domains to be forms of first-order relational reasoning because they all involve comparison between items on some dimension. Indeed, Van Opstal and Verguts [33] argue that the primary role of lateral parietal cortex is to make these first-order comparisons along any dimension, numerical magnitudes and quantities included.

Consistent with this perspective, our group has found that lateral parietal activation during performance of a Raven-like matrix reasoning task scales with the number of relations to be considered [34]. Further, lateral parietal cortex is engaged more strongly when fMRI study participants represent ordered relations (e.g.,  $x$  is larger than  $y$ ) than associative relations (e.g.,  $x$  and  $y$  are related) on a test of transitive inference [35] – i.e., when the nature of the relationships must be considered to solve the problem.

In contrast, activity in prefrontal cortex increases when second-order relations must be integrated [36,35]. These findings and many others (e.g., [37,38]) have implicated the prefrontal cortex – or, more specifically, rostralateral prefrontal cortex (RLPFC) – in higher-order relational reasoning. There is some evidence that mathematical reasoning follows the same pattern [39,40], indicating that the frontoparietal reasoning network may be domain-general [41].

The differentiation in brain activity between lower- and higher-order reasoning is not observed in children, however. Prior to adolescence, RLPFC is engaged to about the same extent for both first-order and second-order relational tasks; as children mature the RLPFC becomes selectively engaged in second-order tasks only

(Fig. 3; [42]). Additionally, children show less activity in parietal regions than do adults during relational reasoning tasks [43]. These results show that children engage the same network of brain regions for relational reasoning tasks as do adults, but less selectively.


Selectivity is one hallmark of brain maturation [44]; another is cortical thinning [45]. By adding a measure of cortical thinning along with task-related activation to a structured equation model, Wendelken et al. found cortical thinning in the inferior parietal lobule (IPL) to be associated with decreasing RLPFC activation for first-order relations [42]. Furthermore, IPL cortical thinning predicted future relational reasoning skill to a greater degree than thinning in any other region tested (18 months later; Fig. 3). These results suggest that structural development in the parietal lobe promotes RLPFC selectivity for higher-order problems, perhaps in that a more mature parietal cortex can complete lower-order tasks without taxing frontal regions.

The educational implications of these neurodevelopmental findings are multifaceted. First, building facility with lower-order relations may assist in developing higher order reasoning skills. For example, emphasizing the relational aspect of elementary mathematical concepts may promote proficiency in later mathematical reasoning such as algebra. Second, although the previous sections established that children are capable of higher-order reasoning, the brain regions engaged in those tasks do not mature until adolescence. Therefore they may need instructional support in using and generating relationships to help them comprehend mathematical concepts.

## 6. Current directions in educational research

Many elementary curricula do not emphasize the relational aspect of mathematics, focusing instead on computational proficiency with algorithms [46]. Furthermore, early initiatives to emphasize conceptual development over computations were met with criticism in the popular press [47,48]. However, the correlational and neurodevelopmental evidence presented here emphasizes the need for additional research assessing the utility of explicitly incorporating relational reasoning into elementary mathematics curriculum.

Indeed, one such mathematical research program under way is called 'early algebra', in which children as young as 6 years old start working with non-traditional number sentences and simple linear functions. Non-traditional number sentences are equations



**Fig. 3.** Two regions in the frontoparietal reasoning network. Rostralateral prefrontal cortex (RLPFC) becomes selective for second-order relations as the brain matures. Cortical thinning indicates maturity, and thinning in the inferior parietal lobule predicts relational reasoning skill. Graphs reprinted with permission from [42].

such as “ $8=8$ ” and “ $8=8+5-5$ ” for which the purpose is to familiarize children with the equal sign as indicator of equivalence. Early successes with this approach include the following example. In answering the question ‘ $8+4= \_\_\_ +5$ ’ one student explained her answer of ‘7’ by saying: “Well, I saw that the 5 over here [pointing to the 5 in the number sentence] was one more than the 4 over here [pointing to the 4 in the number sentence], so the number in the box had to be one less than the 8. So it’s 7” [49]. In this wholly relational strategy, the student analyzed the component relationships between numbers on opposite sides of the equation, figured out the direction of compensation, and identified the correct answer without doing any calculations.

A different approach to early algebra, called the ‘functional approach’, uses numeric or geometric patterns to explore the relationships between quantities, variables and representations. One classic example is figuring out how many people could sit at restaurant tables made up of one, two, three or nine square tables pushed together [50]. Students readily understand the function and can iteratively calculate the number of people in each case. With guidance, they learn to generalize the pattern so that the outcome can be found for any instance in the series. Although both of these approaches have shown initial successes in student learning [51], it remains to be seen whether they help students make the transition to algebra and more complex mathematical concepts later in their academic careers.

Investigations of analogy in mathematics teaching also point to promising areas for future research. In a study of videotaped classroom discussions, Richland and colleagues [12] noted that many teachers use analogies, such as that of a balance scale in working with complex equations, but they tend to vary in procedural or conceptual emphasis based on their assessment of students’ immediate cognitive needs. Procedural supports help in the moment, but laboratory research on analogy shows that this may come at the cost of long-term understanding, if those students miss the chance to consider the conceptual relationships [52]. The disparity between laboratory and classroom analogy use warrants additional research into what types of analogies are most useful to students.

## 7. Conclusion

Relational reasoning ability is positively associated with both current and future mathematics proficiency during childhood. Yet, relational reasoning is not typically emphasized in traditional mathematics curricula [46]. We propose that a greater emphasis on reasoning skills in elementary math curricula would help students to clear conceptual hurdles when they take upper-level mathematics courses.

Early algebra is one research program addressing this curricular gap that has shown initial success, and evidence from analogical reasoning generates additional ideas for innovation. Developmental cognitive neuroscience findings indicate that new educational research should focus on building proficiency with lower-order relations very early in elementary curriculum, and support higher-order thinking over the period in which the frontoparietal network is maturing. Further longitudinal research on the efficacy of incorporating relational reasoning in elementary math curriculum is needed to evaluate our claim that helping students build relational reasoning skills from a very young age would ease the transition to algebra and boost mathematics proficiency.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Carter Wendelken for insightful editing and permission to feature his work in Fig. 3.

## References

- [1] Moses RP, Cobb Jr. CE. *Radical equations: civil rights from Mississippi to the algebra project*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press; 2001.
- [2] World Economic Forum. & Boston Consulting Group. *Global talent risk – seven responses*; 2011.
- [3] Ball DL, Lubienski ST, Mewborn DS. Research on teaching mathematics: the unsolved problem of teachers’ mathematical knowledge. In: Richardson V, editor. *Handbook of research on teaching*. 4th ed.. New York: Macmillan; 2001.
- [4] Boaler J. Learning from teaching: exploring the relationship between reform curriculum and equity. *J Res Math Educ* 2002;33(4):239–58.
- [5] Wu H. Basic skills versus conceptual understanding. *Am Educ* 1999;23(3):14–22.
- [6] Farah MJ, Betancourt L, Shera DM, Savage JH, Giannetta JM, Brodsky NL, et al. Environmental stimulation, parental nurturance and cognitive development in humans. *Dev Sci* 2008;11(5):793–801, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00688.x>.
- [7] Martin DB, Gholson ML, Leonard J. Mathematics as gatekeeper: power and privilege in the production of knowledge. *J Urban Math Educ* 2010;3(2):12–24.
- [8] Nasir NS, Hand V, Taylor EV. Culture and mathematics in school: boundaries between cultural and domain knowledge in the mathematics classroom and beyond. *Rev Res Educ* 2008;32(1):187–240, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0091732x07308962>.
- [9] Steele CM. A threat in the air: how stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *Am Psychol* 1997;52(6):613–29.
- [10] McNeil NM, Alibali MW. Knowledge change as a function of mathematics experience: all contexts are not created equal. *J Cogn Dev* 2005;6(2):285–306, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327647jcd0602\\_6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327647jcd0602_6).
- [11] Carpenter TP, Fennema E, Franke ML. Cognitively guided instruction: a knowledge base for reform in primary mathematics instruction. *The Elementary School Journal* 2013;97(1):3–20.
- [12] Richland LE, Holyoak KJ, Stigler JW. Analogy use in eighth-grade mathematics classrooms. *Cogn Instr* 2004;22(1):37–60, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532690Xci2201>.
- [13] Cattell RB. *Intelligence: its structure, growth and action*. North Holland; 1987.
- [14] Kieran C. The learning and teaching of school algebra. In: Grouws DA, editor. *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: a project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics*. New York, NY: Macmillan; 1992. p. 390–419.
- [15] McNeil NM, Grandau L, Knuth EJ, Alibali MW, Stephens AC, Krill DE. Middle-school students’ understanding of the equal sign: the books they read can’t help. *Cogn Instr* 2006;24(3):367–85, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532690Xci2403>.
- [16] National Research Council. *Adding it up: helping children learn mathematics*. In: Kilpatrick J, Swafford J, Findell B, editors. *Mathematics learning study committee, center for education, division of behavioral and social sciences and education*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press; 2001.
- [17] Fuchs LS, Fuchs D, Compton DL, Powell SR, Seethaler PM, Capizzi AM, et al. The cognitive correlates of third-grade skill in arithmetic, algorithmic computation, and arithmetic word problems. *J Educ Psychol* 2006;98(1):29–43, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.29>.
- [18] Keith TZ. Effects of general and specific abilities on student achievement: similarities and differences across ethnic groups. *School Psychol Quarterly* 1999;14(3):239–62.
- [19] Taub GE, Floyd RG, Keith TZ, McGrew KS. Effects of general and broad cognitive abilities on mathematics achievement. *School Psychol Quarterly* 2008;23(2):187–98.
- [20] Primi R, Ferrão ME, Almeida LS. Fluid intelligence as a predictor of learning: a longitudinal multilevel approach applied to math. *Learn Individ Differ* 2010;20(5):446–51, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.05.001>.
- [21] Fuchs LS, Compton DL, Fuchs D, Paulsen K, Bryant JD, Hamlett CL. The prevention, identification, and cognitive determinants of math difficulty. *J Educ Psychol* 2005;97(3):493–513, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.3.493>.
- [22] Green CT, McKerracher A, Whitaker KJ, Ferrer E, Bunge SA. Longitudinal predictors of mathematical reasoning during development. *Cogn Neurosci Soc Present* 2011.
- [23] White CS, Alexander PA, Daugherty M. The relationship between young children’s analogical reasoning and mathematical learning. *Math Cogn* 1998;4:103–23.
- [24] Gallistel CR, Gelman R. Preverbal and verbal counting and computation. *Cognition* 1992;44:43–74.
- [25] Carey S. *The origin of concepts*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press; 2009.
- [26] Jung RE, Haier RJ. The parieto-frontal integration theory (P-FIT) of intelligence: converging neuroimaging evidence. *Behav Brain Sci* 2007;30(2):135–54, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525x07001185> (discussion 154–87).
- [27] Krawczyk D. The cognition and neuroscience of relational reasoning. *Brain Res* 2012;1428:13–23, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2010.11.080>.
- [28] Prado J, Chadha A, Booth JR. The brain network for deductive reasoning: a quantitative meta-analysis of 28 neuroimaging studies. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2011;23(11):3483–97, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/jocn>.
- [29] Piazza M, Izard V. How humans count: numerosity and the parietal cortex. *Neuroscientist* 2009;15(3):261–73, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073858409333073>.

- [30] Fias W, Lammertyn J, Caessens B, Orban GA. Processing of abstract ordinal knowledge in the horizontal segment of the intraparietal sulcus. *J Neurosci* 2007;27(33):8952–6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2076-07.2007>.
- [31] Watson CE, Chatterjee A. A bilateral frontoparietal network underlies visuospatial analogical reasoning. *NeuroImage* 2012;59(3):2831–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.09.030>.
- [32] Corbetta M, Kincade JM, Ollinger JM, McAvoy MP, Shulman GL. Voluntary orienting is dissociated from target detection in human posterior parietal cortex. *Nat Neurosci* 2000;3(3):292–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/73009>.
- [33] Van Opstal F, Verguts T. Is there a generalized magnitude system in the brain? Behavioral, neuroimaging, and computational evidence. *Front Psychol* 2013;4 (July):435, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00435>.
- [34] Crone EA, Wendelken C, Van Leijenhorst L, Honomichl RD, Christoff K, Bunge SA. Neurocognitive development of relational reasoning. *Dev Sci* 2009;12 (1):55–66.
- [35] Wendelken C, Bunge SA. Transitive inference: distinct contributions of rostralateral prefrontal cortex and the hippocampus. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2010;22(5):837–47, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21226>. [Transitive](http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21226).
- [36] Christoff K, Prabhakaran V, Dorfman J, Zhao Z, Kroger JK, Holyoak KJ, et al. Rostrolateral prefrontal cortex involvement in relational integration during reasoning. *NeuroImage* 2001;14(5):1136–49, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.0922>.
- [37] Dumontheil I, Thompson R, Duncan J. Assembly and use of new task rules in fronto-parietal cortex. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2011;23(1):168–82.
- [38] Wendelken C, Bunge SA, Carter CS. Maintaining structured information: an investigation into functions of parietal and lateral prefrontal cortices. *Neuropsychologia* 2008;46(2):665–78, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.09.015>.
- [39] Prabhakaran V, Rypma B, Gabrieli JDE. Neural substrates of mathematical reasoning: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study of neocortical activation during performance of the necessary arithmetic operations test. *Neuropsychology* 2001;15(1):115–27, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0894-4105.15.1.115>.
- [40] Qin Y, Carter CS, Silk EM, Stenger VA, Fissell K, Goode A, et al. The change of the brain activation patterns as children learn algebra equation solving. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004;101(15):5686–91, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0401227101>.
- [41] Wendelken C, Chung D, Bunge SA. Rostrolateral prefrontal cortex: domain-general or domain-sensitive? *Hum Brain Mapp* 2012;33(8):1952–63, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21336>.
- [42] Wendelken C, O'Hare ED, Whitaker KJ, Ferrer E, Bunge SA. Increased functional selectivity over development in rostralateral prefrontal cortex. *J Neurosci* 2011;31(47):17260–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1193-10.2011>.
- [43] Eslinger PJ, Blair C, Wang J, Lipovsky B, Realmuto J, Baker D, et al. Developmental shifts in fMRI activations during visuospatial relational reasoning. *Brain Cogn* 2009;69(1):1–10, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2008.04.010>.
- [44] Finn AS, Sheridan MA, Kam CLH, Hinshaw S, D'Esposito M. Longitudinal evidence for functional specialization of the neural circuit supporting working memory in the human brain. *Journal of Neuroscience* 2010;30(33):11062–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6266-09.2010>.
- [45] Shaw P, Kabani NJ, Lerch JP, Eckstrand K, Lenroot R, Gogtay N, et al. Neurodevelopmental trajectories of the human cerebral cortex. *J Neurosci* 2008;28(14):3586–94, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5309-07.2008>.
- [46] Boaler J. Open and closed mathematics: student experiences. *J Res Math Educ* 1998;29(1):41–62.
- [47] Editorial. Mathematical unknowns. *Boston Globe*; November 8, 2004, pp. 11–13.
- [48] McCallum W, Russell SJ. We can do better at teaching kids math. *Boston Globe*; 2004, pp. 1–2.
- [49] Carpenter TP, Franke ML, Levi L. *Thinking mathematically: integrating arithmetic and algebra in elementary school*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann; 2003.
- [50] Carraher DW, Martinez MV, Schliemann AD. Early algebra and mathematical generalization. *ZDM* 2007;40(1):3–22, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11858-007-0067-7>.
- [51] Schoenfeld aH. Making mathematics work for all children: issues of standards, testing, and equity. *Educ Res* 2002;31(1):13–25, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189x031001013>.
- [52] Richland LE, McDonough IM. Learning by analogy: discriminating between potential analogs. *Contemp Educ Psychol* 2010;35(1):28–43, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2009.09.001>.