

Children's Fractional Knowledge

Leslie P. Steffe • John Olive

Children's Fractional Knowledge

 Springer

Leslie P. Steffe
University of Georgia
Athens, GA
USA
lsteffe@uga.edu

John Olive
University of Georgia
Athens, GA
USA
jolive@uga.edu

ISBN 978-1-4419-0590-1 e-ISBN 978-1-4419-0591-8
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4419-0591-8
Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009932112

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010

All rights reserved. This work may not be translated or copied in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 233 Spring Street, New York, NY 10013, USA), except for brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis. Use in connection with any form of information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed is forbidden.

The use in this publication of trade names, trademarks, service marks, and similar terms, even if they are not identified as such, is not to be taken as an expression of opinion as to whether or not they are subject to proprietary rights.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

We dedicate this book to the memory of Arthur Middleton who was taken from us at the age of 16 by a senseless act of violence. The contributions that Arthur made to our understanding of children's powerful ways of constructing mathematical knowledge will live on in these pages. The world is a poorer place for the lack of what we know he could have accomplished. Our lives and our research are so much richer for having known and worked with him during our teaching experiment.

Preface

The basic hypothesis that guides our work is that children's fractional knowing can emerge as accommodations in their natural number knowing. This hypothesis is referred to as *the reorganization hypothesis* because if a new way of knowing is constructed using a previous way of knowing in a novel way, the new way of knowing can be regarded as a reorganization of the previous way of knowing. In contrast to the reorganization hypothesis, there is a widespread and accepted belief that natural number knowing *interferes* with fractional knowing. Within this belief, children are observed using their ways and means of operating with natural numbers while working with fractions and the former are thought to interfere with the latter. Children are also observed dealing with fractions in the same manner as with natural numbers, and it is thought that we must focus on forming a powerful concept of fractions that is resistant to natural number distractions.

In our work, we focus on what we are able to constitute as mathematics of children rather than solely use our own mathematical constructs to interpret and organize our experience of children's mathematics. This is a major distinction and it enables us to not act as if children have already constructed fractional ways of knowing with which natural number knowing interferes. Rather, we focus on the assimilative activity of children and, on that basis, infer the concepts and operations that children use in that activity. Focusing on assimilative activity opens the way for studying reorganizations we might induce in the assimilative concepts and operations and, hence, it opens the way for studying how children might use their natural number concepts and operations in the construction of fractional concepts and operations.

The question concerning whether fractional knowing necessarily emerges independently of natural number knowing is based on the assumption that the operations involved in fractional knowing have their origin in continuous quantity and only minimally involve discrete quantitative operations. In a developmental analysis of the operations that produce discrete quantity and continuous quantity, we show that the operations that produce each type of quantity are quite similar and can be regarded as unifying quantitative operations. The presence of such unifying operations is essential and serves as a basic rationale for the reorganization hypothesis.

We investigated the reorganization hypothesis in a 3-year teaching experiment with children who were third graders at the beginning of the experiment. We selected the

children on the basis of the stages in their construction of their number sequences. Our research hypothesis was that the children would use their number sequences in the construction of their fractional concepts and operations, that the nature and quality of the fractional knowledge the children constructed within the stages would be quite similar, and that the nature and quality of the fractional knowledge the children constructed across the stages would be quite distinct. We did not begin the teaching experiment with foreknowledge of how the children would use their number sequences in their construction of fractional knowledge, nor the nature and quality of the knowledge they might construct. This book provides detailed accounts of how we tested our research hypothesis as well as detailed accounts of the fractional knowledge the children did construct in the context of working with us in the teaching experiment and of how we engendered the children's constructive activity. We do not report on the children who began the teaching experiment in the initial stage of the number sequence because of the serious constraints we experienced when teaching them.

Our overall goal is to establish images of how the mathematics of children might be used in establishing a school mathematics that explicitly includes children's mathematical thinking and learning. Toward that goal, we provide accounts of how the reorganization hypothesis was realized in the constructive activity of the participating children as well as how their number sequences both enabled and constrained their constructive activity. Further, we provide models of children's fractional knowing that we refer to as children's fraction schemes and explain how these fraction schemes are based on partitioning schemes. We found that partitioning is not a singular construct and broke new ground in explaining six partitioning schemes that are inextricably intertwined with children's number sequences and the numerical schemes that follow on from the number sequences. Explaining fraction schemes in terms of the partitioning schemes provides a way of thinking about fractions in terms of children's fraction schemes rather than in terms of the rational numbers. We used our understanding of the rational numbers throughout the teaching experiment as orienting us in our various activities, but we make a distinction between our concepts of rational numbers and our concepts of children's fraction schemes. The former are a part of our first-order mathematical knowledge and the latter are a part of our second-order mathematical knowledge.

Athens, Georgia, USA

Leslie P. Steffe
John Olive

Acknowledgments

The genesis of this work took place in the project entitled *Children's Construction of the Rational Numbers of Arithmetic*, codirected by Leslie P. Steffe and John Olive, with support from the National Science Foundation (project No. RED-8954678) and from the Department of Mathematics Education at the University of Georgia. Several doctoral students in the department took substantial roles in the Teaching Experiment that provided the data for our analyses. We would like to acknowledge the particular contributions of Dr. Barry Biddlecomb, Dr. Azita Manouchehri, and Dr. Ron Tzur who acted as teachers for several of the teaching episodes contained in the data presented in this book. Dr. Barry Biddlecomb also helped with the programming of the original TIMA software. We would also like to thank Dr. Heide Wiegel for the help she provided in organizing, cataloging, and analyzing much of the data. The extensive retrospective analysis of the data was also supported by a second grant from the National Science Foundation, project no. REC-9814853. We are deeply indebted to the NSF and to the Department of Mathematics Education for their extensive support.

This work would not exist, of course, without the collaboration of the school district personnel, school principal, teachers, and students of the anonymous school in which we conducted the Teaching Experiment. We are also grateful to the students' parents and guardians who gave us permission to work with their children over the 3-year period and trusted that we would do our best to help their children move forward in their mathematical thinking.

Finally, we would like to thank our wives, Marilyn Steffe and Debra Brenner, for bearing with us and providing encouragement during our construction of the ideas contained in this book and our writing of it.

Athens, Georgia, USA

Leslie P. Steffe
John Olive

Foreword

It is a rare experience in the life of an academic to stand in awe of a body of work. I confess to having had that feeling in the midst of reading Steffe's and Olive's (SO's) account of children's development of fraction knowledge from numerical counting schemes. Their enterprise is especially important, for several reasons – some having to do with fractions and others having to do with science. I'll first say something about the latter and then speak to the former.

Science

George Johnson (2008) tells the stories of ten experiments that emanated from people questioning accepted wisdom about the physical world and the way it works. His stories are not of individual genius. Rather, the stories are about the scientific method of postulating invisible forces and mechanisms behind observable phenomena, perturbing materials to see if they respond the way your model predicts, and, most importantly, revising your model in light of the specific ways your predictions failed. The stories, above all, are a quest for *understanding*.

Whether research in mathematics education is scientific has been under heavy debate recently. Psychologists, especially experimental psychologists, tend to think it has been unscientific because of its lack of randomized sampling, experimental controls, and statistical analyses. I would argue, however, that it is those who confuse method with inquiry who are too often unscientific. Science is not about *what works*. Science is about *the way things work*. Johnson's stories repeatedly reveal that scientific advances happen when new conceptualizations of phenomena lead to greater coherence among disparate facts and theories. Lavoisier's investigations into the nature of phlogiston, the "stuff" whose release from a substance produces flames, eventually led him to the conclusion that there is no such stuff as phlogiston! After Lavoisier, no one saw combustion as entailing the hidden forces and mechanisms that everyone saw 10 years prior. Were modern psychologists dominant in 1790, they would have criticized Lavoisier for his lack of experimental control. But he had a *strong* experimental control – an initial model of how combustion is supposed to work and of the materials involved

in those processes, and it was his model of how combustion works that he investigated.

It is in this spirit that you must read this book – that SO’s enterprise is to start with, test, and refine their models of children’s fractional thinking. They also take seriously the constraints of employing a constructivist framework for their models, predictions, and explanations: Children’s mathematical knowledge does not appear from nothing. It comes from what children know in interaction with situations that they construe as being somehow problematic. To be scientific in this investigation, SO take great pains to give precise model-based accounts of the ways of thinking that children bring to the settings that SO design for them.

Which brings up another point. The significance of children’s behaviors can only be judged in the context of the tasks with which they engage and as they construe them. In fact, how a child construes a task often gives insight into the ways of thinking the child has. I urge readers to read SO’s tasks carefully and to understand the computing environment that gave context to them. The computing environment (TIMA) afforded actions to children that are not possible with physical sticks, and hence children were able to express anticipations of acting that would not have been possible outside that environment. Read the tasks slowly so as to imagine what cognitive issues might be at play in responding to them. I urge you also to read teaching-experiment excerpts slowly. SO’s models afford very precise predictions of children’s behavior and very precise explanations of their thinking, so the smallest nuance in a child’s behavior can have profound implications for the theoretical discussion of that behavior. For example, according to SO’s models of number sequences, if a child partitions a segment into 10 equal-sized parts, but has to physically iterate one part to see how long 10 of them will be, this has tremendous implications for the fraction knowledge we can attribute to him or her. The contribution of SO’s work is that their theoretical framework not only supports such nuanced distinctions, but also allows us to understand what might appear to some as uneven fraction knowledge instead as a coherent system of thinking that has evolved to a particular state (and will evolve further to states of greater coherence).

Finally, it is imperative in reading this book that you understand that *SO employ teaching as an experimental method*. Understanding this, however, requires an expanded meaning for experiment and a nonstandard meaning for teaching. The idea of a scientific experiment is to poke nature to see how it responds. That is, we start with an idea of how nature works in some area of interest, perturb nature to see whether it responds in the way our understandings would suggest, nature responds according to its own structures, and then we revise our understandings accordingly. It is in this respect – teaching as a designed provocation – that it can be used as an experimental method in understanding children’s thinking. To be used effectively as an experimental method, though, you cannot think of teaching as a means for transmitting information to children. Rather, you must think of it as an interaction with children that is guided by your models of children’s thinking and by what you discern of their thinking by listening closely to what they say and do. Of course, all this is with the backdrop that children are participating according to their ways of thinking and with the intent of understanding your, the teacher’s, actions.

Fractions

SO's basic thesis is that children's fraction knowledge can emerge by way of a reorganization of their numerical counting schemes. This might, at first blush, seem like a weak hypothesis, as in "you can devise super special methods and invest super human effort to have students create fractions from their counting schemes." I propose a different interpretation:

If allowed, children can, and in most cases will, use their counting schemes to create ways of understanding numerical and quantitative relationships that we recognize as powerful fractional reasoning.

The phrase "if allowed" is highly loaded. It does not mean that children should be turned loose, with no adult intervention, to create their own mathematics. We know that little of consequence will result. Rather, it means that the instructional and material environments must be shaped so that they are amenable to children using natural ways of reasoning to create more powerful ways of reasoning – they are designed to respect children's thinking and build from it.

There are three important aspects to SO's argument for the reorganization hypothesis. The first is that they did not start with it. Rather, it emerged from their interactions with children. In a sense, the children forced the reorganization hypothesis upon SO. Children whose number sequences did not progress to higher levels of organization simply were unable to progress in their fraction knowledge despite SO's best attempts to move them along. Children whose number sequences were limited, developmentally speaking, to early forms simply could not see fraction tasks in the ways that children with the generalized number sequence could.

Second, the reorganization hypothesis entails the claim that children's number sequences are very much at play as they develop spatial operations with continuous quantities. It is through their number sequences that children impose segmentations on continuous quantities and reassemble them as measured quantities.

Third, SO's reorganization hypothesis removes any need to think that the operation of splitting, as described by Confrey, appears independently of counting. In a very real sense, SO's explication of the reorganization hypothesis gives Confrey's work a developmental foundation. But it does more. As noted by Norton and Hackenberg (Chap. 11), the splitting operation described by Confrey is not sufficient for children to generate the highest level of fraction reasoning described by SO. More is required, and SO give a compelling argument for what that is.

Next Steps

Norton and Hackenberg (Chap. 11) give a highly useful analysis of potential connections between SO's research on fractions with other research programs in the development of algebraic and quantitative reasoning. My hope is that SO's research develops another set of connections – with pedagogy and curriculum. What sense

might teachers make of the reorganization hypothesis? What reorganizations must they make to understand it and to use it? What professional development structures could help them understand and use it? How could the reorganization hypothesis inform the development of curriculum that in turn would support teachers as they attempt to actualize the reorganization hypothesis? I look forward to SO and protégés giving us insight into these questions.

Tempe, Arizona, USA

Patrick W. Thompson

Reference

Johnson G (2008) *The ten most beautiful experiments*. Knopf, New York

Contents

1 A New Hypothesis Concerning Children’s Fractional Knowledge	1
The Interference Hypothesis	2
The Separation Hypothesis	5
A Sense of Simultaneity and Sequentiality.....	6
Establishing Two as Dual.....	7
Establishing Two as Unity	8
Recursion and Splitting.....	9
Distribution and Simultaneity	10
Splitting as a Recursive Operation.....	11
Next Steps	12
2 Perspectives on Children’s Fraction Knowledge.....	13
On Opening the Trap.....	14
Invention or Construction?.....	15
First-Order and Second-Order Mathematical Knowledge	16
Mathematics of Children.....	16
Mathematics for Children	17
Fractions as Schemes	18
The Parts of a Scheme.....	20
Learning as Accommodation	21
The Sucking Scheme.....	21
The Structure of a Scheme	22
Seriation and Anticipatory Schemes.....	24
Mathematics of Living Rather Than Being.....	25
3 Operations That Produce Numerical Counting Schemes	27
Complexes of Discrete Units	27
Recognition Templates of Perceptual Counting Schemes	29
Collections of Perceptual Items	29
Perceptual Lots.....	30
Recognition Templates of Figurative Counting Schemes.....	32
Numerical Patterns and the Initial Number Sequence	35

The Tacitly Nested Number Sequence..... 38

The Explicitly Nested Number Sequence 41

An Awareness of Numerosity: A Quantitative Property 42

The Generalized Number Sequence..... 43

An Overview of the Principal Operations of the Numerical
Counting Schemes 45

 The Initial Number Sequence 45

 The Tacitly Nested and the Explicitly Nested
 Number Sequences..... 45

Final Comments 47

4 Articulation of the Reorganization Hypothesis..... 49

 Perceptual and Figurative Length 50

 Piaget’s Gross, Intensive, and Extensive Quantity..... 51

 Gross Quantitative Comparisons 52

 Intensive Quantitative Comparisons 52

 An Awareness of Figurative Plurality in Comparisons..... 53

 Extensive Quantitative Comparisons 55

 Composite Structures as Templates for Fragmenting 57

 Experiential Basis for Fragmenting 58

 Using Specific Attentional Patterns in Fragmenting..... 59

 Number Sequences and Subdividing a Line 64

 Partitioning and Iterating 67

 Levels of Fragmenting 68

 Final Comments 70

 Operational Subdivision and Partitioning 72

 Partitioning and Splitting 73

5 The Partitive and the Part-Whole Schemes..... 75

 The Equipartitioning Scheme 75

 Breaking a Stick into Two Equal Parts 75

 Composite Units as Templates for Partitioning 76

 Segmenting to Produce a Connected Number 78

 Equisegmenting vs. Equipartitioning..... 78

 The Dual Emergence of Quantitative Operations 80

 Making a Connected Number Sequence..... 80

 An Attempt to Use Multiplying Schemes in the Construction
 of Composite Unit Fractions..... 83

 Provoking the Children’s use of Units-Coordinating Schemes 83

 An Attempt to Engender the Construction of Composite
 Unit Fractions..... 86

 Conflating Units When Finding Fractional Parts
 of a 24-Stick..... 87

 Operating on Three Levels of Units..... 89

 Necessary Errors 90

Laura’s Simultaneous Partitioning Scheme	92
An Attempt to Bring Forth Laura’s Use of Iteration to Find Fractional Parts	95
Jason’s Partitive and Laura’s Part-Whole Fraction Schemes	98
Lack of the Splitting Operation.....	98
Jason’s Partitive Unit Fraction Scheme.....	100
Laura’s Independent Use of Parts	102
Laura’s Part-Whole Fraction Scheme	107
Establishing Fractional Meaning for Multiple Parts of a Stick.....	110
A Recurring Internal Constraint in the Construction of Fraction Operations	112
Continued Absence of Fractional Numbers.....	113
An Attempt to Use Units-Coordinating to Produce Improper Fractions.....	114
A Test of the Iterative Fraction Scheme.....	116
Discussion of the Case Study.....	118
The Construction of Connected Numbers and the Connected Number Sequence	118
On the Construction of the Part-Whole and Partitive Fraction Schemes	119
The Splitting Operation.....	121
6 The Unit Composition and the Commensurate Schemes.....	123
The Unit Fraction Composition Scheme.....	124
Jason’s Unit Fraction Composition Scheme	125
Corroboration of Jason’s Unit Fraction Composition Scheme	126
Laura’s Apparent Recursive Partitioning	128
Producing Composite Unit Fractions.....	129
Laura’s Reliance on Social Interaction When Explaining Commensurate Fractions	133
Further Investigation into the Children’s Explanations and Productions.....	136
Producing Fractions Commensurate with One-Half.....	138
Producing Fractions Commensurate with One-Third	142
Producing Fractions Commensurate with Two-Thirds	147
An Attempt to Engage Laura in the Construction of the Unit Fraction Composition Scheme	148
The Emergence of Recursive Partitioning for Laura	151
Laura’s Apparent Construction of a Unit Fraction Composition Scheme	153
Progress in Partitioning the Results of a Prior Partition	157
Discussion of the Case Study.....	161
The Unit Fraction Composition Scheme and the Splitting Operation.....	162
Independent Mathematical Activity and the Splitting Operation	163

Independent Mathematical Activity and the Commensurate Fraction Scheme..... 163

An Analysis of Laura’s Construction of the Unit Fraction Composition Scheme 164

Laura’s Apparent Construction of Recursive Partitioning and the Unit Fraction Composition Scheme 169

7 The Partitive, the Iterative, and the Unit Composition Schemes 171

Joe’s Attempts to Construct Composite Unit Fractions 172

Attempts to Construct a Unit Fraction of a Connected Number..... 174

Partitioning and Disembedding Operations 176

Joe’s Construction of a Partitive Fraction Scheme 180

Joe’s Production of an Improper Fraction..... 185

Patricia’s Recursive Partitioning Operations 188

 The Splitting Operation: Corroboration in Joe and Contraindication in Patricia 188

A Lack of Distributive Reasoning..... 191

Emergence of the Splitting Operation in Patricia 193

Emergence of Joe’s Unit Fraction Composition Scheme..... 195

Joe’s Reversible Partitive Fraction Scheme 197

 Fractions Beyond the Fractional Whole: Joe’s Dilemma and Patricia’s Construction 199

Joe’s Construction of the Iterative Fraction Scheme 204

A Constraint in the Children’s Unit Fraction Composition Scheme..... 208

Fractional Connected Number Sequences 211

Establishing Commensurate Fractions..... 214

Discussion of the Case Study..... 217

 Composite Unit Fractions: Joe..... 217

 Joe’s Partitive Fraction Scheme 218

 Emergence of the Splitting Operation and the Iterative Fraction Scheme: Joe 219

 Emergence of Recursive Partitioning and Splitting Operations: Patricia 220

 The Construction of the Iterative Fraction Scheme 221

 Stages in the Construction of Fraction Schemes..... 222

8 Equipartitioning Operations for Connected Numbers: Their Use and Interiorization 225

Melissa’s Initial Fraction Schemes 225

 Contraindication of Recursive Partitioning in Melissa 227

 Reversibility of Joe’s Unit Fraction Composition Scheme 228

A Reorganization in Melissa’s Units-Coordinating Scheme 231

Melissa’s Construction of a Fractional Connected Number Sequence..... 236

Testing the Hypothesis that Melissa Could Construct a Commensurate Fraction Scheme..... 241

Melissa’s Use of the Operations that Produce Three Levels of Units in Re-presentation 247

 Repeatedly Making Fractions of Fractional Parts of a Rectangular Bar 247

 Melissa Enacting a Prior Partitioning by Making a Drawing 251

 A Test of Accommodation in Melissa’s Partitioning Operations 254

 A Further Accommodation in Melissa’s Recursive Partitioning Operations 256

A Child-Generated Fraction Adding Scheme 260

An Attempt to Bring Forth a Unit Fraction Adding Scheme 263

Discussion of the Case Study 266

The Iterative Fraction Scheme 268

 Melissa’s Interiorization of Operations that Produce Three Levels of Units 269

 On the Possible Construction of a Scheme of Recursive Partitioning Operations 271

 The Children’s Meaning of Fraction Multiplication 273

 A Child-Generated vs. a Procedural Scheme for Adding Fractions 275

9 The Construction of Fraction Schemes Using the Generalized Number Sequence 277

The Case of Nathan During His Third Grade 277

 Nathan’s Generalized Number Sequence 278

 Developing a Language of Fractions 279

 Reasoning Numerically to Name Commensurate Fractions 284

 Corroboration of the Splitting Operation for Connected Numbers 286

 Renaming Fractions: An Accommodation of the IFS: CN 288

 Construction of a Common Partitioning Scheme 289

 Constructing Strategies for Adding Unit Fractions with Unlike Denominators 291

Multiplication of Fractions and Nested Fractions 295

Equal Fractions 298

 Generating a Plurality of Fractions 299

 Working on a Symbolic Level 301

Construction of a Fraction Composition Scheme 303

 Constraining How Arthur Shared Four-Ninths of a Pizza Among Five People 304

 Testing the Hypothesis Using TIMA: Bars 307

Discussion of the Case Study 310

 The Reversible Partitive Fraction Scheme 310

 The Common Partitioning Scheme and Finding the Sum of Two Fractions 311

 The Fractional Composition Scheme 313

- 10 The Partitioning and Fraction Schemes** 315
 - The Partitioning Schemes 315
 - The Equipartitioning Scheme 315
 - The Simultaneous Partitioning Scheme 316
 - The Splitting Scheme 317
 - The Equipartitioning Scheme for Connected Numbers 319
 - The Splitting Scheme for Connected Numbers 320
 - The Distributive Partitioning Scheme 321
 - The Fraction Schemes 322
 - The Part-Whole Fraction Scheme 322
 - The Partitive Fraction Scheme 323
 - The Unit Fraction Composition Scheme 328
 - The Fraction Composition Scheme 330
 - The Iterative Fraction Scheme 333
 - The Unit Commensurate Fraction Scheme 335
 - The Equal Fraction Scheme 336
 - School Mathematics vs. “School Mathematics” 337

- 11 Continuing Research on Students’ Fraction Schemes** 341
 - Research on Part-Whole Conceptions of Fractions 342
 - Transcending Part-Whole Conceptions 344
 - The Splitting Operation 345
 - Students’ Development Toward Algebraic Reasoning 348

- References** 353

- Index** 359

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1.	A sharing situation	19
Fig. 2.2.	A diagram for the structure of a scheme	23
Fig. 3.1.	An attentional pattern: Sensory-motor item	28
Fig. 3.2.	The attentional pattern of a perceptual unit item	31
Fig. 3.3.	The attentional pattern of a perceptual lot	31
Fig. 3.4.	The attentional pattern of a figurative unit item	33
Fig. 3.5.	The attentional structure of a figurative lot	34
Fig. 3.6.	The attentional structure of a numerical pattern	36
Fig. 3.7.	The attentional structure of the initial number sequence	38
Fig. 3.8.	The attentional structure of the numerical composite “six”	38
Fig. 3.9.	Attentional structure of a composite unit of numerosity nine	40
Fig. 3.10.	The attentional structure of a composite unit containing an iterable unit	42
Fig. 4.1.	Two rows of blocks: Endpoints not coincident	52
Fig. 4.2.	Two rows of blocks: Endpoints coincident	52
Fig. 4.3.	The first subdivision of a line task	64
Fig. 4.4.	The second subdivision of a line task	64
Fig. 5.1.	Cutting a stick into two equal parts using visual estimation	76
Fig. 5.2.	Jason testing if one piece is one of the four equal pieces	77
Fig. 5.3.	Jason’s completed test	77
Fig. 5.4.	The results of Laura marking a stick into seven parts	97
Fig. 5.5.	Jason’s attempt to make a stick so that a given stick is five times longer than the new stick	99
Fig. 5.6.	Laura’s attempt to make two equal shares of a stick	104
Fig. 5.7.	Laura’s attempt to mark a stick into two equal shares	104
Fig. 5.8.	Using PARTS in partitioning	105

Fig. 6.1. Jason’s unit fraction composition scheme 127

Fig. 6.2. The situation of protocol XVII..... 157

Fig. 6.3. Laura’s introduction of vertical PARTS 160

Fig. 6.4. The result of partitioning one-ninth into thirds 160

Fig. 7.1. A set of number-sticks in TIMA: Sticks 175

Fig. 7.2. Making estimates for one-fourth of a 27-stick 177

Fig. 7.3. Joe’s estimates for one-fourth of a 27-stick 178

Fig. 7.4. Finding one-seventh of a mystery stick 179

Fig. 7.5. Find a stick that is one-fifth of the long blue bottom stick 180

Fig. 7.6. Estimating a stick that is three times as long
as a $\frac{1}{3}$ -stick 182

Fig. 7.7. Joe’s mark for four-fifths of a stick 185

Fig. 7.8. Making six-fifths of a stick 186

Fig. 8.1. Making one-eighth by partitioning one-fourth 249

Fig. 8.2. Making one-thirty-second by partitioning
one-sixteenth 249

Fig. 8.3. Making one-one-hundred twenty-eighth by partitioning
one-sixty-fourths 249

Fig. 8.4. Melissa’s partition of the first part of a nine-part
stick into three parts 253

Fig. 8.5. Melissa’s drawing of a partition a partition
of a partition 253

Fig. 8.6. Joe partitioning one-sixth of the bar into three parts 255

Fig. 8.7. Melissa’s partition of one-eighteenth of a bar into two parts 255

Fig. 8.8. Joe’s partition of a one-twelfth of a bar
into four pieces 257

Fig. 8.9. Melissa coordinating her drawing and her
notational system 257

Fig. 8.10. Melissa filling one-eighth of the bar 259

Fig. 8.11. Melissa’s partition of one-eighteenth of a bar
into two parts 262

Fig. 9.1. Sharing two bars among three mats 281

Fig. 9.2. Nathan makes five copies of two parts of a 6-part
bar to complete eight-eighths from three-eighths 282

Fig. 9.3. Nathan makes a bar that is two and a half times
as much as a unit bar 283

Fig. 9.4. Nathan gives two-thirds of a 15-part bar
to the big mat 286

Fig. 9.5. The results of partitioning three-tenths of a bar
into four parts 295

Fig. 9.6. Nathan compares one-thirteenth to one-fourth
of three-tenths of a unit bar 296

Fig. 9.7. Nathan makes one-fourth of nine-sevenths
of a unit bar 297

Fig. 9.8.	Nathan makes one-third of a $7/7$ -bar	298
Fig. 9.9.	The fraction labeler from TIMA: Sticks	302
Fig. 9.10.	Four people share three-sevenths of a pizza stick	303
Fig. 9.11.	Nine iterations of three-fourths of one-seventh of a pizza stick	304
Fig. 9.12.	Sharing four-ninths of a pizza stick among five people	305
Fig. 9.13.	Two-thirds of one-seventh of a stick	306
Fig. 9.14.	Iterating three twenty-firsts to make a whole stick	306
Fig. 9.15.	Filling one-seventh of four-ninths of a bar	309
Fig. 11.1.	Task response providing indication of a splitting operation	345