2016

Selection of Apps for Teaching Difficult Mathematics Topics: An Instrument to Evaluate Touch-Screen Tablet and Smartphone Mathematics Apps

Immaculate Kizito Namukasa
The University of Western Ontario, inamukas@uwo.ca

George Gadanidis
The University of Western Ontario

Vera Sarina
Pleasant View Public School

S Scucuglia
São Paulo State University

Kinful Lartebea Aryee
The University of Western Ontario

Selection of Apps for Teaching Difficult Mathematics Topics:

An Instrument to Evaluate Touch-Screen Tablet and Smartphone Mathematics Apps

Namukasa, I.K. – Western University

Gadanidis, G. – Western University

Sarina, V. – Pleasant View Public School

Scucuglia, S. – Universidade Estadual Paulista (São Paulo State University)

Aryee, K. – Western University

CANADA & BRAZIL

Abstract

Manipulatives—including the more recent touch-screen mobile device apps—belong to a broader network of learning tools. As teachers continue to search for learning materials that aid children to think mathematically, they are faced with a challenge of how to select materials that meet the needs of students. The profusion of virtual learning tools available via the Internet magnifies this challenge. What criteria could teachers use when choosing useful manipulatives? In this chapter, we share an evaluation instrument for teachers to use to evaluate apps. The dimensions of the instrument include: (a) the nature of the curriculum addressed in the app— emergent, adaptable or prescriptive, and relevance to current, high quality curricula—high, medium, low; (b) degree of actions and interactions afforded by the app as a learning tool— constructive, manipulable, or instructive interface; (c) the level of interactivity and range of options offered to the user — multiple or mono, or high, moderate or low; and, (d) the quality of the design features and graphics in the app—rich, high quality or impoverished, poor quality. Using these dimensions, researchers rated the apps on a three-level scale: Levels I, II, and III. Few apps were classified as Level III apps on selected dimensions. This evaluation instrument guides teachers when selecting apps. As well, the evaluation instrument guides developers in going beyond apps that are overly prescriptive, that focus on quizzes, that are text based, and include only surface aspects of using multi-modality in learning, to apps that are more aligned with emergent curricula, that focus also on conceptual understanding, and that utilize multiple, interactive representations of mathematics concepts.

Keywords: apps, evaluation criteria, integers, learning tools, mathematics thinking

Apps for Mathematics

Teachers continuously access learning materials that promise to assist children to think mathematically. On a lesson-to-lesson basis, teachers are faced with the challenge of how to select materials that best meet their teaching goals. The profusion of virtual learning tools available via the Internet magnifies the challenge of searching for materials. Moyer-Packenham, Shumway, Bullock, and Tucker (2015) assert, "An important goal for mathematics education is the design and selection of mathematics 'apps'" (p. 42). Few studies provide educationally robust reviews on apps for mathematics (Larkin, 2013, 2014, 2015a, 2015b; Moyer-Packenham et al., 2015). Several books (e.g., Dickens & Churches, 2012), web-based resources (e.g., common sense media—commonsensemedia.org, Children's technology review—childrenstech.com/), and articles in magazines offer lists of top apps and some reviews on selected apps. Reviews of apps on the app store or those Internet sources are largely based on information that advertises the apps (Larkin, 2013). Few reviews are based on evaluation of the apps. For example, Larkin (2015a) shares a list of the top 20 apps (e.g., transformations), Larkin (2013) shares the top 40 Number Sense and Numeration apps (e.g., I see!! Math 1), and Larkin (no date) provides detailed reviews of 142 math app at https://docs.google.com/file/d/0Bwd_RKnZbGDqSUtkOHZsTHdsWVE/edit. In this chapter, we share an instrument for assessing pedagogically useful apps.

Manipulatives—including the more recent touch-screen tablet/smartphone applications—belong to a broader network of learning tools. In this chapter, we refer to touch-screen tablet and smartphones as touch-screen mobile devices. The work of Namukasa, Stanley, and Tutchie (2009) explore the complementary role of physical and Information Communication Technology (ICT)-based manipulatives, also referred to as virtual manipulatives. Virtual manipulatives are

interactive and dynamic objects (Moyer, Bolyard, & Spikell, 2002). Virtual manipulatives can appear on computer screens, touch screens, holographic images, and a variety of technological environments. Apps are computer applications in which virtual manipulatives (and various end-user software) are delivered on touch-screen mobile devices. Several apps are touch-screen versions of computer and Internet-based applications. The choice of a manipulative—whether physical or virtual (i.e., a virtual manipulative on a computer, a digital board, or a touch-screen mobile device); historical or modern—is complex. It should depend on what is available, what fits the students' culture and expectations, as well as what fits the teacher's system of beliefs (Bartolini & Martignone, 2014). Teachers' choices "to use virtual manipulatives in combination with physical manipulatives were influenced by familiarity with similar physical manipulatives" (Moyer-Packenham, Salkind, & Boyland, 2008, p. 215). In addition, even among the same type of manipulatives, these "can be useful or useless depending on the quality of thinking they stimulate" among learners (Bartolini & Martignone, 2014, p. 31). According to Hitt (2002), manipulatives are also classified by the specific meaning of a given concept they address (e.g., discrete, linear, or analogical). Educators and teachers need to pay attention to the specific representation categories (e.g., graphic, analytic, or symbolic mathematics) of a given concept that any manipulative—physical or virtual—addresses (Hitt, 2002).

In the mathematics education research community, a thread of research focuses on the influence of virtual manipulatives in learning and teaching, on the design modes, and on the quality of these materials (Pepin & Gueudet, 2014; Trouche, Drijvers, Gueudet, & Sacristan, 2013). For a review of literature on the role of mathematics apps, see Calder (2015); Cayton-Hodges, Feng, and Pan (2015); Larkin (2013; 2015a); Moyer-Packenham et al. (2015); Moyer-Packenham & Westenskow (2013); L.F. Pelton and Pelton (2012); and Zhang, Trussell,

Gallegos, and Asam (2015). Some of this work focuses on specific apps: for example, Larkin (2013) focuses on apps for number sense and numeration, Larkin (2015a) on geometry apps, Moyer-Packenham et al. on apps for young children, Zhang et al. on multiplication and division apps.

Several articles (e.g., Peterson, 1972; Skip, 1990) and online forums (e.g., "negative × negative = positive" at MathForum.org) explore the use of physical, virtual, and visual strategies, among other strategies, for teaching meanings and operations of negative integers. This work builds on the long history of conversations on teaching more difficult concepts such as subtraction, fractions, and integers (e.g., Kamii, Lewis, & Kirkland, 2001). More recent conversations focus on how ICT-based technology (e.g., interactive whiteboard, and computer games) could be used to make difficult topics easier to learn.

Evaluation of Mathematics Apps

What evaluation criteria could teachers use when choosing the most appropriate teaching materials? The increase in the range of ICT-based materials for teaching, coupled with the emergence of a new culture of learning arising with these resources, is creating a need for quality, design, and diffusion criteria, and policies on these resources. Several studies (Calder, 2015; Highfield & Goodwin, 2013; Larkin, 2015; Pepin & Gueudet, 2014; Trouche et al., 2013) voice the need for criteria for evaluating ICT-based resources. Pepin and Gueudet (2014) also maintain that the teacher, even in situations where he or she only selects the resources to use, is "a designer of his/her resources" (p. 133). Trouche et al. (2013) assert that new research and policy questions are arising: "Who designs and what do the design processes look like? How to

access quality resources?" (p. 771). For Calder (2015), the question is: "What is the [major] motivation of app designers?" (p. 236). To others, the question is about the alignment between a mathematics app and mathematics curriculum for the target group. For example, Larkin (2014) examines the effectiveness of mathematics apps for the Australian curriculum.

A few studies focus on the evaluation of mathematics apps. Some studies utilize qualitative (e.g., Calder, 2015; Larkin, 2013, 2014, 2015b), and others quantitative, evaluation measures (Larkin 2014). Larkin (2015b) utilized two qualitative measures based on: whether the apps focused on conceptual (deep understanding related to the meaning of mathematics), procedural (following a set of sequential steps to solve a mathematics problem), or declarative (information retrieved from memory without hesitation) knowledge; and their relevance to the Australian curriculum. Of the 142 he fully reviewed, he observed that many of them "were little more than digital flash cards encouraging rote learning." Of the 40 worthwhile apps he evaluated, only 3 apps (Mathemagica, Areas of Rectangles, Maths Galaxy Fun) were exceptional; a majority of apps emphasized declarative or procedural knowledge; only 40 of the 142 apps were "worthwhile mathematical apps to support mathematics learning in primary classrooms" (p. 30); and only 12 apps involved conceptual knowledge. Several of the apps he reviewed were characterized by mismatches: between the mathematics terms in the app name and the mathematics content explored by the apps, between the description of the nature of knowledge (e.g., conceptual understanding) addressed in the app and the actual knowledge explored in the app, between targeted age levels and age levels at which the content of the app is taught in schools, and between the price of an app and the quality of an app. Among the apps he reviewed, the Number Sense and Numeration strands were dominant. Goodwin and Highfield (2013) found that apps for toddlers, as well as science and literacy apps, dominated their top 10 apps category.

Calder (2015), Larkin (2014), and Moyer-Packenham et al. (2015) noted that a variety of educational apps are available for elementary lessons. A majority of the educational apps available are, nonetheless, standalone apps, focusing on one specific content area, and many are drill and practice, only useful for rote learning of declarative and procedural knowledge (Larkin, 2013, 2015b). Moyer-Packenham and Westenskow (2013) note the need for research on manipulatives with students beyond Grade 6.

Larkin (2015b) used three quantitative measures in his app evaluations: The Haugland developmental software scale (Haugland, 1999); productive pedagogies (Honan et al., 2009); and Learning principles of good games (Gee, 2005). The Haugland developmental software scale is based on criteria for evaluating software for young children. It consists of three dimensions: a dimension on the child (e.g., age appropriate, child control, and non-violence), on design (e.g., clear instructions, and technical features), and on learning (expanding complexity, and transformations). Larkin adopted three of the four dimensions of the productive pedagogies identified by Queensland Education (Honan et al. 2009): intellectual quality (e.g., deep understanding, & substantive conversation), supportive classroom environment (e.g., student direction, and academic engagement), and connectedness (e.g., knowledge integration, and background knowledge). The third scale is based on learning principles (e.g., active, interaction, production, customization, agency, challenge and consolidation, critical learning, probing, multiple routes, and transfer) of good video games developed by Gee (2005). Larkin's evaluation scales range from three to ten. Fullan and Donnelly (2015) offer a scale with four ratings for evaluating digital innovations: good, mixed, problematic, and off track. They identify three dimensions including pedagogy, system change (e.g., implementation support, value for money,

and potential to diffuse widely), and technology. These studies show the need for instruments for

evaluating apps, especially instruments that emerge from studying apps.

Bos (2009b) offers an instrument for determining the degree of fidelity on a three-point

scale—low, medium, and high. Bos (2009a), Larkin (2015a), and Moyer-Packenham et al.

(2008) study the fidelity—pedagogical, mathematical, and cognitive fidelity—of technology-

based learning tools. Bos (2009a, 2009b) builds on the work of Dick and associates (2008) to

further elaborate dimensions and degrees of fidelity. To her, mathematical fidelity of a

mathematics tool is the tool's degree of conformity to mathematical properties, rules, and

conventions of the mathematical content. A tool "should reflect accurately the mathematical

characteristics and behavior that the idealized object should have" (Dick, p. 335). Mathematical

fidelity is about mathematical accuracy and precision. Cognitive fidelity is about the ability of

the tool to lead to learner actions, interactions, and thoughts that embody mathematics concepts

or processes, and, potentially, to deeper mathematics actions, interactions, and thoughts.

Pedagogical fidelity is about the elements in the tool, such as target-group appropriateness of the

content and type of learning activities that enable students to learn. Pedagogical fidelity is

"evidenced… in the organization of the user interface of a technological tool" (p. 334), in

features that support valued learning activities and features helpful for learners (Zbiek, Heid,

Blume, & Dick, 2007).

Larkin (2015a) reviewed 53 Geometry apps, evaluating them against the criteria on fidelity,

classifying the apps as low-, medium-, or high-fidelity apps in each dimension. He found the

apps to score high on pedagogical fidelity and low on cognitive fidelity. Seven (e.g., Coordinate

Geometry, Transformations) of the 53 apps scored high on the three fidelities (cognitive,

mathematical, pedagogical), and only the top three of these scored consistently high on all three

fidelities. Calder (2015) checks to see if a mathematics learning app is appropriate in intended learning and age of users (an aspect of pedagogical fidelity), is applicable to the concepts involved, to enhancing mathematical engagement and thinking (aspects of mathematical fidelity), and whether an app utilizes "visual, sound and movement elements that learners might also find highly engaging" and appealing (an aspect of technical design features) (pp. 243–244).

Design Features of Mathematics Apps

Major design features identified in the literature on design of learning apps fall under the categories: nature of the app, content, instrumental/interface design, cognitive/intellectual, sociological, and ergonomic aspects (Gadanidis, Sedig, & Lang, 2004; Sedig, Parsons, Dittmer, & Haworth, 2014). Human computer interactions (HCI) researchers, for instance, argue that well-designed digital tools (also referred to as visualizations or interfaces in HCI literature) are those designed with a deep understanding of cognition. They maintain that the levels of interaction afforded by digital tools vary from those involving minimal cognitive activities to those that involve higher cognitive skills. The levels of interaction afforded also vary from those evoking only physical (touch, feel, see, etc.) actions such as dragging, to interactions such as comparing, to tasks such as identifying and categorizing, and, further, to activities such as problem solving and reasoning. Several key characteristics offered by the digital tools influence higher-order cognitive activities: the range and adjustability of options—the flexibility; number and diversity of interactions; fitness of the interface to the task, to the user, and to the context; and type of transactions ranging from access only, to annotation, modification, construction, and combination of transactions (Sedig et al., 2014).

Digital Learning Objects and Tools

This inquiry on mathematics apps is situated within a larger framework of digital learning tools (LTs) and objects. Gadanidis and Schindler (2006) point out that the term digital learning objects (LOs) involves a variety of designs, from simple digital images or files in pdf format to complex simulations and interactive interfaces. LOs are small interactive programs that are available online and are focused on specific content topics (Gadanidis & Schindler, p. 20). Virtual manipulatives can evolve into mathematical objects (including concepts, procedures, and processes) "when acted upon," patterns perceived, and a new mathematics object emerges to deepen mathematical understanding (Bos, 2009b, p. 526). Zbiek et al. (2007) use the term cognitive tools (CTs) to refer to technologies that extend the learning and thinking activities. CTs for mathematics allow the user to act on, compute and externally represent mathematical entities, and involve a variety of designs including simulation, software, micro-world, devices and tool kits. Bos (2011) uses the term *interactive mathematical objects* to refer to the digital learning tools. The tools with a high degree of fidelity enable manipulation in an intuitive way, encourage active participation of the learner, are appropriate for the age level, are mathematically correct, "provide opportunity to construct, test, and revise to understand the patterns and structure the concepts. Manipulating the patterns leads to great depth of understanding" (p. 526).

Maddux, Johnson, and Willis (2001) identify two different types of LOs. In *Type I*, the developer determines almost everything that happens on the screen, it affords only "passive user involvement", "a limited repertoire of acceptable responses", "usually aimed at rote memory" and every thing that the software is capable of doing can be observed in about 10 minutes or less (Gadanidis & Schindler, 2006, p. 23). In Type II, the user is in charge of what happens on the screen, it affords "active intellectual involvement," the user is in charge of what happens, it is

usually aimed at "creative tasks," and many hours are necessary to exhaust what the program is capable of (p. 23). Type II affords a high number of user possible inputs and a high level of interactivity between the user and object. Gadanidis and Schindler recommend LOs involving a hybrid of Type I and Type II. Godwin and Highfield (2013) refer to Type II as constructive interfaces, with Type I as instructive, and with the manipulable interfaces lying in between. Gadanidis, Sedig and Liang (2004) argue "mathematical investigation, as a pedagogic tool, is not a simple undertaking. Facilitating investigations [by the learners] adds significantly to the complexity of instructional design" (p. 294). According to these researchers:

> Good design becomes possible when mathematics education and human–computer interaction design experts work together, rather than in isolation, taking into account pedagogical goals and interface design principles, and, of course, where there is commitment to test and revise based on feedback from educators in the field (p. 295).

Bortolossi (2012) observes that factors such as the nature of the mathematical content (mathematical fidelity), pedagogical design (pedagogical fidelity), graphic design, and interface design (technical design features) are fundamental aspects in the production of educational applications. Bortolossi recommends a combination of the best features of several ICT applications to enable, in a rapid-development environment, the creation of low-cost (but richly designed) portable, dynamic, and interactive LTs with a potential for multiple didactic activities. To Fullan and Donnelly (2015), it is important to also evaluate the "underlying digital product model design" (pp. 40) along the lines of ease to use, intuitive design, how data are managed, and what experiences it offers the end users.

Commonalities exist among criteria for designing high-quality apps and those for evaluating apps for learning mathematics. We, nonetheless, agree with Larkin (2013) that design criteria for

apps may not directly translate to criteria for evaluating high-quality apps for learning

mathematics, and with Dick (2008), that design features of learning apps should be selected to

serve pedagogical, mathematical, and cognitive principles. Further, Calder (2015) adds that it

helps when the motivation of the mathematics app developer is mathematical engagement, rather

than profit optimization. On the question raised by Trouche et al. (2013) regarding who designs

and what the design processes look like, from our interactions with the app developer on the

project, it appears that some app developers are themselves teachers, educators, and educational

researchers whose major motivation is pedagogic, or consult, partner with, and seek feedback

(or, even, endorsement) on their products from other teachers, educators, and educational

researchers. Many of these apps score lowest on cognitive and mathematics fidelity (Larkin,

2015a). Selected iTunes apps such as Rekenrek by Mathies, Touch Counts by N. Sinclair (an app

for Number Sense and Numeration for young children), and MathTappers apps by T. Pelton and

Pelton are designed by mathematics educators. L.F. Pelton and Pelton (2012) explore the

pedagogical practices in the MathTappers apps, some of which support concept development and

consolidation of understanding, and others are for fluency building. Larkin (2015a) observes that

most educational apps are designed by non-educators and for market reasons. Various

publications exist on development and marketing of apps. More work is needed on the design

features that influence the usefulness of apps and on how students use the apps.

Trouche et al. (2013) shares a questionnaire with nine different dimensions to measure the

usefulness of any Dynamic Geometry Software (DGS), including mathematical content,

pedagogical implementation, integration in a curriculum sequence, ergonomic (ease of use)

aspects, instrumental content, added value (takes advantage of new possibilities of DGS),

potential for use and further modification of the resource. Pepin and Gueudet (2014) illustrate

how studies on quality of teaching resources in general have historically focused on

mathematical, pedagogical, sociological analyses (such as analysis along the lines of patterns of

class of the target audience), or on specific mathematical knowledge, skills and practices. Studies

on ICT resources contribute to the dimension on technical, design features including ease of use,

quality and uncluttered graphics, and interactivity of the interface (Haughland, 1999; Kay &

Knaack, 2009).

    In the early 2000s, when most digital LTs were still designed for use on desktop and laptop

computers, Yerushalmy and Ben-Zaken (2004) advocated for manipulatives that could be used

on cellphones, since these devices were "an easily available tool that is already part of the culture

and daily life... and that is likely to become highly useful for both teachers and students" (p. 3).

Mathematics apps for touch-screen mobile devices are now increasingly part of many

mathematics classes. Calder asserts:

> The use of mathematics apps, across a range of contexts and age levels, enhanced
>
> learning generally, but this was determined to some extent by the appropriateness and
>
> applicability of the apps to the particular student, their learning trajectory and the
>
> suitability of the app to the particular learning situation (p. 246).

Basham, Meyer, and Perry (2010) voice that "to provide a highly mobile, flexible, efficient, and

scalable technology experience for students that could be taken outside of a school's walls...

needed to provide students with multiple means for *representation, expression, and engagement*"

(p. 340).

Constructive, Manipulable, and Instructive Apps

Goodwin and Highfield (2013) classify digital learning tools by their design features and how the learners' interact with these features into *constructive, manipulable*, and *instructive* apps. The authors define constructive tools as LTs in which learners participate in the generation of representations, tools which are used by the learners as an expressive tool, and tools which offer learners room for higher intellectual engagement, such as for reflection and thinking processes. These tools utilize significant cognitive effort on the part of the learners. Bos (2009a), Larkin (2015b), and Moyer-Packenham (2015) would refer to these as apps with both high cognitive and pedagogical fidelity. Goodwin and Highfield maintain that learning objects that are not primarily constructive may still support learning when they are manipulable.

Manipulable apps may give a predetermined context, use mostly symbolic and iconic images, but still may allow some alteration of representations through user input (i.e., they are likely to evoke moderate to high user engagement). Thus, manipulable apps offer room for experimentation and discovery. Manipulative apps use modifiable graphics. Bos (2009), Larkin (2015b), and Moyer-Packenham (2015) would refer to these as apps with medium cognitive and pedagogical fidelity.

On the other extreme of the spectrum of apps are learning objects that focus only on behavioural learning activities, use symbolic presentations, and present learning in a linear fashion, utilizing repetitive procedural tasks and thus involving very low cognitive investment on the part of the learner. These learning objects focus on the "learner's focus of control over the representations presented on screen" (Goodwin & Highfield, p. 213). Bos (2009), Larkin (2015b), and Moyer-Packenham (2015) would refer to apps that only offer drill activities as apps with low cognitive and low pedagogical fidelity. Zbiek et al. (2007) classified ICT resources

such as online textbooks and courses, which were cognitive in nature but only presented

information and had no capabilities to offer feedback on the actions of the learner as other

resources but not tools.

Emergent, Adaptable, and Prescriptive Apps

Heydon and Wang (2006) assert that curricula paradigms configure the teaching and

learning environments in ways that can limit or expand possibilities. Heydon and Wang name

three paradigms: prescriptive, adaptable, and emergent. Prescriptive curricula are in line with

behavioural psychology views of learning of scripted knowledge. Adaptable curricula involve

active interactions and varied roles for the learner to include tailoring of learning activities

according to the learner's interests. With emergent curricula learning is co-constructed with

others, and learners are also inventors. For Heydon and Wang, constructive apps would support

emergent curricula. Manipulable apps would support adaptable curricular. Instructive apps would

only support prescriptive curricula.

Students in Goodwin and Highfield's studies substantially benefited from constructive and

manipulative multimedia in terms of depicting multiple representations of concepts and forming

sophisticated concept images (Pirie & Kieren, 1994). Calder (2005) agrees that the multi-modal

representations provide stimulus and novelty "but it is the subsequent thinking that is key to the

learning process" (p. 238). The appealing factor is secondary to appropriateness and

applicability, to use Calder's terms. Goodwin and Highfield maintain that constructive apps

should not be mistaken to mean "busy" apps, those which include extraneous details such as

animations, which place unnecessary demands on low-achieving students, and take away from

the understanding of mathematics content. Bos (2011) and Calder (2015) observe that distracting animations and colors minimize mathematical engagement.

Levels I, II, and III Apps

The app evaluation criteria in this chapter consists of a three-point scale, Level I, II, and III, with Level III a classification of high-quality apps, and four dimensions. It is a qualitative instrument. Each dimension consists of degrees or categories which lie on a continuum of increasing complexity. That is to say, apps classified as Level III, show the highest degree on a dimension and go beyond the complexity of Level II, and Level II apps go beyond Level I apps. On a given dimension, say the curricula dimension (emergent, adaptable, & prescriptive), it is possible for an app to combine some elements of the adaptable category and a few of the prescriptive category, for example. Gadanidis and Schindler (2006) refer to apps that combine elements from different categories on a dimension as hybrid LOs. Goodwin and Highfield visualize apps that combine the middle category, manipulable elements, and the top category, constructive elements, as manipulable apps approaching the constructive category. Larkin (2013) found that whereas some apps fit only in one category on a dimension of forms of mathematical knowledge (conceptual, procedural and declarative), some apps fit in two categories (i.e., they explored both conceptual and procedural knowledge). Classifying apps by levels is in line with reviews aimed at sharing lists of top apps (e.g., Larkin, 2014). After Bos (2009b) and Larkin (2015a), we present our evaluation instrument in a chart (See Table 1) form to show the varied degrees (or, categories) on each dimension. Level III is the highest score, Level II is the medium score and Level I is the lowest score or most impoverished category, on a dimension. Level I apps are not necessarily off track but apps with characteristics from only the lowest category.

The dimensions of the classification are: (a) the nature of the curriculum addressed in the app— emergent, adaptable or prescriptive, and relevance to current, high quality curricula— high, medium, low; (b) degree of actions and interactions afforded by the app as a learning tool— constructive, manipulable, or instructive interface; (c) the level of interactivity and range of options offered to the user —multiple or mono, or high, moderate or low; and, (d) the quality of the design features and graphics in the app—rich, high quality or impoverished, poor quality. Several of the dimensions and their categories, such as in (a) and (b), emerged from the literature we reviewed, and some, such as in (c) and (d), emerged largely from the process of analyzing the apps. The fifth row is an overall dimension speculating that apps that score high on several dimensions have the potential for intense levels of intellectual/cognitive involvement, those that score high or medium on some dimension would have a limited potential, and those that score consistently low would have the potential for only low intellectual/cognitive involvement. We present details on the dimensions with the evaluation of a selection from the 80 apps we reviewed.

Table 1. *Classification of middle school apps*

Dimension	Level III Apps	Level II	Level I
Curriculum dimension			
Address:	The *emergent dimension* of curriculum (e.g., building understanding, explaining why, and reflection; this on top of the adaptive dimension) Current and high quality curriculum	The *adaptive dimension* of curriculum (e.g., meaning making, on top of the prescriptive dimension)	Only the *prescriptive* dimension of curriculum (e.g., fact masterly) Dated or no curriculum
Degree of interaction afforded by the App's interface			
Offer:	*Modifiable, constructive* interfaces	*Manipulable* interfaces	*Non-interactive, instructive*, access only interfaces
Interactivity and range of options			
Involve:	A *high number & diversity of possible user inputs* or selections A *high level of interactivity* between the user and object and with other users (*multiple* interactions)	A *moderate number & diversity of possible user inputs* or selections A *moderate level of interactivity* between the user and object *Mono* interactions	A *very low number & diversity of possible user inputs* or selections The *lowest level of interactivity* between the user and object *Mono* interactions
Technical design aspects			
Utilize:	*Multiple* media and *alternative* representations Colour, sound, animations, or 3D effects, graphics to focus learning, eliminating those that are superfluous	*Two or three* media and *alternative* representation Colour, sound, animations, and 3D effects graphics to focus learning	*Overly symbolic, linear* interfaces *Superfluous and extraneous* details, such as animations, which instead of focusing learning, distract students
Overall, Intellectual/cognitive involvement			
Have the potential for:	*Intense* (with several opportunities for) *intellectual/cognitive involvement* - also a focus on math connections, understanding, and math extensions	*Limited* (two or three opportunities for) *intellectual involvement* - also a focus on simple application of skills	*Very low* (none or one opportunity) *intellectual/cognitive involvement* - focus on individual skills and rote learning

The Inquiry

The evaluation instrument emerged from a broader inquiry that involved teachers, researchers, and a developer of iOS apps in three contexts. The first was a school context, in which a teacher (who team-taught a unit on integers), in collaboration with the researchers, planned, implemented, and offered feedback during a Grade 7 and 8 integer unit centred on using CTs that enhance pedagogical goals of using manipulatives in teaching. Finding that the materials she had available did not work well for her students, the teacher created the physical version and a virtual version of a manipulative that circumnavigated the errors created by some existing tools. The second context involved work with an industry partner, who provided the researchers with access to the apps his company had developed. The app developer also offered to train team members to design iOS apps for teaching integers. In the third context, the researchers developed an instrument to evaluate randomly selected apps for teaching integers. The results we share in this chapter are from this third context of studying the apps. The initial coding of the apps was based on content, nature of representations used, interactivity level in the apps, nature of the design of the task posed by the app, and relation of the app to other mathematics learning materials. The process was further informed by research literature on the evaluation of apps, resulting in refined categories and other dimensions.

Larkin (2015a) observes that qualitative evaluation instruments are important "for teachers in making decisions about whether or not to use an app" (p. 344). The instrument shared in this chapter could guide teachers when selecting apps that meet the learning needs of their students. As well, it would guide app developers in going beyond apps that are overly prescriptive, focus only on quizzing students, are based on print design, and include only surface aspects of using multi-modality and play in learning, to apps that are more aligned with emergent, high-quality

mathematics curricula, apps that focus on conceptual understanding, and that utilize multiple modes and interactive representations in ways that are central to learning.

The Apps: How to Tell When an App is a Useful App

We searched for apps on the desktop iTunes store because more information, including categories of apps, is displayed at the iTunes store as compared to the app store on a phone or tablet. We chose iOS apps because the app developer on the team created iOS apps. As noted by Larkin (2015), locating relevant apps at the app store is difficult by the "sheer number of apps" and "the poor structure of the iTunes app store user interface" (p. 7); the way information on an app is largely based on the developers of the apps and is often inaccurate (e.g., app names on the app store-display names may differ from names of apps when installed on a device); the way the results are organized and are displayed by icon, only giving the first 100 relevant results; plus the results continually change as new apps are added and old ones are removed or renamed.

We searched for both iPhone and iPad apps. We searched by keywords, including "integer" "negative," and "minus," by a combination of these keywords, such as "negative integer" "negative number", and by other relevant combinations of key words, such as "integer multiplication." The results for iPad apps were, at many times, more than for iPhone apps. Figures 1, 2 and 3 show screenshots of sample results. Because we are aware that app developers place apps in categories and select keywords for their apps based on market analyses, rather than on accuracy of the keywords, we also browsed the apps by categories. In the educational collections apps category, we selected the category of apps for elementary school, as well as apps for middle school and then further selected the category Math Apps. In the category Math Apps for Elementary School, we

further narrowed our search by selecting the subcategories Number System/Numbers and Quantity,

Early Operations, and Patterns. We also browsed apps under the categories Drill & Practice,

Beyond Drill – Strategy, and Beyond Drill – Brain Busters. For middle school apps, we selected the

subcategories Pre-algebra & Algebra, and Drill and Practice. Twenty or fewer apps were returned

for each of these categories. We did not browse apps for subcategories such as High School Apps,

nor the categories such as Geometry and Data, where we did not expect the content of negative

integers to be a primary focus. Goodwin and Highfield (2008) found relevant mathematics apps in

other sections of the app store such as in apps for kids and edutainment. Because we were searching

for apps for older children, we limited the scope of our search to the education section and to

searching by key words.

Figure 1. iTunes store apps results for the keyword "negative integer"—iPhone apps.

Figure 2. iTunes store apps results for the keywords "negative integer"—iPad apps.


Figure 3. iTunes store apps results for the keywords "integer multiplication"—iPad apps.

We browsed all mathematics apps to select those that focused on learning negative integers as a curriculum area. We used the U.S. regional app store, although we also browsed the Canadian app store. For each of the apps in the results, from the keyword search and categories search, we examined the names and icons, as well as pulled up the iTunes App store pages of the app, to

ascertain if the app fit the criteria of addressing negative integers. If an app showed a focus on

positive integers, we also included it. The reason for this was because for some apps, the

information available at the app store and at the app home page was not sufficient to show if an app

on positive integers would extend to include negative integers. The home pages of the apps, where

applicable, included more screenshots, detailed description of an app and, at times, video clips and

reviews on an app. We eliminated all apps that did not focus on negative nor positive integers.

Selected searches by a keyword yielded a return of up to 100 results, the maximum possible,

which pointed to the likelihood that more apps tagged with these keywords were available at the

app store. To get a sense of how many more apps were left out by the app store results of the first

100 featured apps, we browsed a third-party website that offered analytics of apps at app stores—

App Annie. App Annie returned 2024 iPhone apps and 1978 iPad apps for the search keyword

"mathematics." It also returned 189 iPhone apps and 166 iPad apps for the keyword "integer." No

apps were returned at App Annie when keywords were combined.

We selected 80 mathematics apps relevant to negative and positive integers (the Number Sense

and Numeration strand) to download, try out, and review. The screenshots, descriptions, and

information provided on an app were not always adequate for a review. We found that we had to

download an app before we could ascertain its appropriate grade range and learning outcomes.

Several app developers identified school grades, grade bands, or age groups for which the app was

appropriate. Thirty-four of the 80 Number Sense and Numeration apps were found to be relevant to

Grades 7 and 8; however, for many apps, the grades/ages indicated were not always accurate, at

least not for the mathematics curriculum in the Canadian province where the research was

conducted. Of the 34 apps that we found relevant to Grades 7 and 8 Number Sense and Numeration,

only 8 were appropriately labelled as Grades 7, 8, or middle school apps. Overall, the grade bands

indicated by the developers were not accurate. This is perhaps an indication that the developers are from varied countries where it is plausible that this content on negative numbers is addressed much earlier. Larkin (2013) interprets this as an indicator that the developers are not familiar with and do not consult a curriculum policy document when identifying grade fit of their app, or that the grade levels were selected from a marketing, rather than a curriculum, perspective. He found the targeted level to be 2–3 years younger than the ages specified by the app developer.

Dimensions for Selecting Appropriate Integer Apps

It was evident from the review of the 80 apps that several dimensions, including the nature of the curriculum addressed, were central when evaluating apps.

The Nature of the Curriculum Addressed

Emergent and adaptable activities as contrasted with overly prescriptive activities. We considered the nature of the learning that the mathematics tasks in the app could evoke. Only 3 of the apps involved what we refer to as, after Heydon and Wang (2006), emergent features (e.g., Math Alchemist Lite, and its other two versions). Math Alchemist is an example of an app that focused on a problem-solving context, the one of making 24, using any random numbers combined with number operations. A user's response became part of the inputs available for use in making 24, and the level of difficulty is increased depending on the user's success at a level. Apps with *emergent* features, ranked Level III apps on the curricula dimension, presented some rich mathematics problems that were, for instance, closely aligned with teaching through problem solving.

We labelled, again after Heydon and Wang (2006), *adaptable* apps as those 13 apps (e.g., Math Blaster Hyper Blast, Math Boosting, Interactive Integers) that posed questions or problems, which

could have involved computing answers, but at least offered ways to the user to extend the problem. The Interactive Integer app posed tasks that involved conceptual understanding (see activities with coloured tiles) in addition to drill tasks for practicing integer addition and subtraction. This app was ranked Level II on the curricula dimension.

A majority of the apps, 74 out of 80, mainly offered prescriptive tasks. *Prescriptive apps* only posed traditional, prescriptive practice tasks, such as the question "3 + (-4) =?" These focused on right/wrong responses from the learner in a manner similar to physical flash cards. These apps scored low, Level I, on the curricula dimension.

Only 4 apps (e.g., Interactive Integers, Math 24 Solver, and Math Blaster HyperBlast game) focused on building understanding of concepts, introducing a new topic, or explaining how a procedure worked, scoring high—Level III—on this dimension. A large number of apps, 58 out of 80, were for practicing earlier learned concepts, as would be the case with flash cards. That a majority of apps mainly offered prescriptive tasks was also the case in Larkin's (2014) evaluation in which they found that procedural apps dominated.

Mathematics content aligned with more recent, higher quality curricula. Each of the 80 apps, according to their developers, was for learning, practicing, or getting quizzed on mathematical topics. The mathematics topics were listed differently, fluctuating from mentioning a single topic to listing a range of up to five topics. The topics included naming of general mathematics branches, such as arithmetic, through indicating a specific mathematics topic, such as negative numbers, to, at the highest ranking, Level III, further specifying mathematics content and learning outcomes (or, expectations), such as using models with negative integers. We view the latter focus that goes

beyond naming a branch of mathematics or listing topics to specifying what is learned or practiced

by using the app as a use of language consistent with that used in more contemporary, higher

quality curricula of Canadian provinces and several other countries. In many curriculum documents,

such as the NCTM principles and standards (NCTM, 2000), the content specified goes beyond a

mere mention of a topic to specifying learning expectations.

A selection of apps (e.g., Math 1st–6th Grade Digital Workbooks – Space Board) showed

coverage for other strands, such as Geometry, in addition to Number Sense and Numeration. We

took this focus, on connections of number sense to geometric representations of number, to align

with the NCTM standards focus on connections among strands.

Actions and Interactions Afforded by the App

Constructive, Manipulable as Opposed to Largely Instructive Apps. Some adaptable apps involved

interfaces with objects such as a number line that a user could act upon, or manipulate. In Figures 4

to 10, we show screenshots of the Interactive Integer app to illustrate how the number line and

integer tiles in this app could be dragged and dropped as the user added or subtracted integers

including negative integers. The colored tiles in the interactive integer apps could be dragged to

demonstrate the identity property (e.g., $+1 + -1 = 0$): When a yellow, positive tile and a red,

negative tile were dragged close to each other they each disappeared. Many representations of

mathematics concepts in instructive apps could not be acted on or modified. Some apps only

included audio or video demonstrations of an instructor explaining a mathematics process or giving

the answer. A good number of apps did not have any objects that visually represented mathematics

concepts. Goodwin and Highfield's (2013) evaluation found that a majority apps were instructive.

The Level of Interactivity and Range of Options Offered to the User

Multiple interaction apps as opposed to mono interaction apps. Only a few apps (e.g., Math Fact Master, Math!!!, and Middle School Math Pro 7th Grade) included opportunities for multiple users, such as submission of responses or marks, and asynchronous teacher interaction with the learner. We ranked apps with multiple interactions as high, Level III, on the dimension of interactivity and range of options, to be contrasted with apps offering mono interactions. Seventy of the 80 apps, including many of the apps that ranked Level III and Level II on the other dimensions, were designed with a focus on one user—mono interaction—thus limiting interaction to one user and the interface. In reference to video games, Gee (2012) distinguishes between the piece of software together with all the social activity around it and the piece of software alone. He would refer to the social activity around an app and the app as a software as the *Big A* app in contrast to the *small a* app because the former is important for participation, production and pro-active learning.

High- and moderate-engagement and interactivity apps as contrasted with low-engagement apps. Only 3 apps (e.g., Math 1 On-Track, Math Book Pro, and Math Blaster HyperBlast) accommodated a variety of inputs and choices, and offered varied possibilities of inputs and choices so the user may insert and select options, thus ranking Level III on interactivity. We referred to apps with a range and adjustability of options as high-interactivity apps. A good number of apps (e.g., Mathopolis, Math 2112, Math 24 Solver, Math4Touch), 55 of 80, involved moderate interactivity with some opportunities for the users to input values and make choices. With the Interactive Integers app a learner was offered a choice of representation—tiles or the number line; the operation—addition or subtraction; number of questions; and level of difficulty. About a quarter, 22 of the 80 apps, involved much lower-interactivity, Level I. Many apps were limited to already

inputted values and allowing only up to two choices (e.g., check answer and a "next" button) for the user.

The Quality of the Design Interface and Graphics in the App

Multi-media, high quality apps as opposed to primarily text-based, low quality apps. Sixty-six of the 80 apps utilized visual representations and graphics in addition to numeric symbols and text. Only 20 of the apps (e.g., Math Blaster HyperBlast, Interactive Integers, Integers, and Math!!!) went beyond using numerical symbols and text to utilize other mathematical representations such as geometric, graphic, simulations, or 3D graphs. We ranked these apps as Level III apps on technical design features. Forty-four of the 80 apps utilized sound effects and music. Many of these apps utilized multiple colors. Some apps used the colors in ways that were not simple add-ons, but in ways integral to the mathematics content. For instance, in the Integer Multiplication app, an iPad only app (see Figure 11), the use of colors offered ways for the learner to identify patterns and distinguish characteristics of negative and positive integers. Still, a majority of apps, over 60 out of 80, largely utilized, at the lowest rank—Level I, only numerals and text to represent mathematics concepts. Haugland (2005) warns against this "poor use of a powerful learning tool" (p. 330).

Instrument Content and Value Added by the Instrument

Virtual-only innovations, virtual developments of, with added value on, existing instruments as opposed to digitized images of existing materials. Because virtual and physical materials complement each other (Namukasa et al., 2009), for each of the apps, we examined the relation, if any, to existing instructional material/resources. The team assessed if an app replicated already

existing mathematics resources, such as virtual manipulatives, textbooks, or web resources, or whether an app was a digital version of these materials. This was important in assessing the app's pedagogical and cognitive elements (i.e., whether, for instance, it replicated a material that focused on developing conceptual knowledge, or on test preparation). Base-Ten Blocks replicated the physical and virtual Base-Ten Blocks manipulative. According to Bos (2009b), interactive mathematics learning tools, such as virtual manipulatives that are enhanced with technology, have a higher degree of cognitive fidelity than technology-based tools that focus on games, instructional information and quizzes. The representations of colored tiles and number lines, as seen in the Interactive Integers app, reflect the use of virtual, visual, and physical representations of integers in ways that are enhanced to represent a mathematics property. We found that many apps were designed based on mathematics puzzles (e.g., Math 24 Solver). Some apps added game contexts to paper-and-pencil mathematics puzzles. Also, many apps were game based (e.g., Mathopolis). Sixty-six apps involved some recreational features and 4 of these involved role-playing games (e.g., Math Blaster HyperBlast). Certain apps (e.g., YourTeacher, Motion Math-Zoom), in a manner similar to a mathematics textbook chapter or a lesson in a course, were part of a collection of apps focusing on varied mathematics topics for the same age level. Larkin (2013, 2015a, 2015b) and Calder (2015) observed that many apps were stand-alone apps focusing on one particular kind of skill, knowledge, or content. Further, apps in bundles appeared to be aligned with curricula expectations.

The Level of Intellectual/cognitive Involvement it Evokes—Intense, Limited or Very Low

Intense as opposed to limited or very low intellectual/cognitive involvement. Overall, apps with adaptable (or, emergent) characteristics and those with manipulable (or, modifiable) elements appeared to have the potential for intense intellectual/cognitive involvement whereas apps with

instructive and prescriptive characteristics appeared to have limited to very low potential for

intense intellectual/cognitive involvement. Even among prescriptive and instructive apps, some

apps, because they scored high on other dimensions such as on interactivity and range of options

and technical design aspects, appeared to be more engaging and thus offered potential for

intellectual involvement at the procedural level.

Figure 4. Interactive Integers app—both iPhone and iPad app.

Source: www.tictaptech.net/apps/interactive-integers/

Figure 5. Interactive Integers app showing user choice on task.



Figure 6. Interactive Integers app color tile instructions.

Figure 7. Interactive Integers app hint on using color tiles.


*Figure 8*. Interactive Integers app adding 5 + -2 using dynamic counters.

Figure 9. Interactive Integers app showing the number line model.


Figure 10. Interactive Integers app explaining a rule on taking away a negative integer.

Figure 11. Integer Multiplication app showing use of color.

A good number of apps combined elements on one dimension as illustrated in Goodwin and

Highfield (2013) and Gadanidis et al. (2004). We did not find an app that ranked at level III for all

dimensions. The Interactive Integers app combined both the adaptive and instructive elements on

the curricular dimension, and it had a manipulable interface (level II on the actions and interactions

dimension). It also offered choice and provided immediate feedback, as well as written instruction

for both the lessons on understanding and for practice questions, but did not offer an opportunity for

the learner to input values or make annotations by including a keypad. One of its instructions on

how to take away a negative number was not mathematically accurate. Interactive Integers was

limited to integer subtraction and addition. The Integer Multiplication app, that scored high on the

characteristic of use of color to focus learning, covered only a single operation on integers—

multiplication.

Some apps that scored low, Level I, on one dimension scored higher, Level II or III, on other dimensions. Even when it focused on right and wrong answers— Mathopolis, a prescriptive app— also involved a game context that allowed user choice on the level of difficulty and nature of operations, scoring Level II on interactivity. One could say that Mathopolis scores high among prescriptive apps because it is a Level II app on at least one other dimension. One of the apps that appeared to involve emergent features had a game context that did not appear appropriate for middle school students. We pondered the messaging and content in the apps and its appropriateness for learners. This was also the case in Larkin (2015a), where he found apps scoring high on one dimension and low on another. For instance the apps Larkin evaluated scored higher on pedagogical fidelity, followed by mathematical fidelity, and lowest on cognitive fidelity. To Haughland (1999), children's software should be evaluated on age appropriateness and non-violence.

Apps with multiple interactions—between several users (e.g., Math Fact Master which could submit scores to an email address, as well as Math!!! with the possibility of a teacher embedding messages) have promising added value of interacting with others through the cognitive tool.

Concluding Remarks

Our evaluation instrument could guide teachers when selecting apps that meet their teaching goals. As well, the evaluation instrument could guide developers in designing apps that are more aligned with emergent and adaptive curriculum, that also focuses on conceptual understanding in addition to focusing on procedural and declarative knowledge, and that utilizes multiple and interactive modes in ways that are central to the representation of mathematics entities.

Some teachers implement and test objects, many use objects recommended by colleagues, and yet other teachers, especially those comfortable with computer programming, increasingly approach the use of learning objects from a developer's perspective. New friendly coding programs are making it easier for more teachers, and even students, to engage in designing apps. Thus, our instrument can potentially guide students, teachers, educators, and researchers when they design apps.

When mathematics apps are thoughtfully used in ways that encourage learners to do the mathematics (i.e., explore, conjecture, test, and apply), rather than only doing procedural steps, learning apps have the potential to deepen mathematical understanding and encourage students to work at higher levels of generalization and abstraction (Bos 2009). Looking to the future, with the increased focus on students of all ages learning to code, such as the mandate of coding across all grades in England's National Curriculum (UK Government News Release, 4 February 2014), we need to also consider: (1) the connection between students as coders and students as mathematics learners, and (2) the design of apps, not only as education products to be consumed, but also environments that may be edited and reprogrammed by users. For example, Gadanidis and Yiu (2014) created HTML5 apps (available at www.researchideas.ca/mathncode) that attempt to meet these conditions, respectively, by: (a) using app interfaces where users change code parameters to control a simulation or play a game, and (b) programming apps in MIT's Scratch environment, giving students full access to the code, which they can edit to create variations or new simulations and games. Explicitly incorporating coding in mathematics apps would help incorporate three pedagogical benefits of coding in mathematics learning: making concepts tangible, making relationships dynamic, and giving students more control over the learning process (Gadanidis 2014, 2015).

References

Bartolini, M. G., & Martignone, F. (2014). Manipulatives in mathematics education. In S. Lerman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 365–372). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Basham, J., Meyer, H., & Perry, E. (2010). The design and application of the digital backpack. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *42*, 339–359.

Bortolossi, H. J. (2012). Criando conteúdos educacionais digitais em matemática e estatística com o uso integrado de tecnologias GeoGebra, JavaView, HTML, CSS, MathMLe JavaScript. *Revista do Instituto GeoGebra de São Paulo, Journal od the Sao Paulo GeoGebra Institute, 1*(1), 38–39.

Bos, B. (2009a). Technology with cognitive and mathematical fidelity: What it means for the math classroom. *Computers in the Schools, 26*(2), 107–114.

Bos, B. (2009b). Virtual math objects with pedagogical, mathematical, and cognitive fidelity. *Computers in Human Behavior, 25*, 521–528.

Bos, B. (2011). Professional development for elementary teachers using TPACK. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, *11*(2), 167–183.

Calder, N. (2015, October). Apps: Appropriate, applicable, and appealing? In T. Lowrie, & R. Jorgensen (Eds.), *Digital games and mathematics learning* (pp. 233–250). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Cayton-Hodges, G., Feng, G., & Pan, X. (2015). Tablet-based math assessment: What can we learn from math apps? *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 18*(2), 3–20.

Dick, T. P. (2008). Keeping the faith: Fidelity in technological tools for mathematics Education. In G.W. Blume & M.K. Heid (Eds.), *Research on technology and the teaching and learning of*

mathematics: Vol. 2. Cases and perspectives. (pp. 333–339). Charlotte, NC: Information

   Age.

Dickens, H., & Churches, A. (2012). *Apps for learning: 40 best iPad/iPod Touch/iPhone apps for*

   high school classrooms. Vancouver, BC: 21st Century Fluency Project.

Fullan, M., & Donnelly, K. (2015). *Evaluating and assessing tools in the digital swamp.*

   Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Gadanidis, G. (2014). Young children, mathematics and coding: A low floor, high ceiling, wide

   walls learning environment. In D. Polly (Ed.). *Cases on technology integration in*

   mathematics education (pp. 312–344). Hersey, PA: IGI Global.

Gadanidis, G. (2015). Coding as a Trojan horse for mathematics education reform. *Journal of*

   Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, *34*(2), 155–173.

Gadanidis, G., & Schindler, K. (2006). Learning objects and embedded pedagogical models.

   Computers in the Schools, 23, 19–32.

Gadanidis, G., & Yiu, C. (2014). Math and code. Retrieved from www.researchideas.ca/mathncode

Gadanidis, G., Sedig, K., & Liang, H.N. (2004). Designing online mathematical investigation.

   Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 23(3), 273–296.

Gee, J. P. (2005). Good video games and good learning. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 85(2), 33- 37.

Gee, J. P. (2012). Digital games and Libraries. *Knowledge Quest,* 41(1). 61-64.

Goodwin, K., & Highfield, K. (2012). *iTouch and iLearn: An examination of "educational" apps*.

   Paper presented at Early Education and Technology for Children Conference, March 14–16,

   2012, Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A.

Goodwin, K., & Highfield, K. (2013). A framework for examining technologies and early

    mathematics learning. In L.D. English & J.T. Mulligan (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing early*

    mathematics learning (pp. 205–226). New York, NY: Springer.

Haugland, S. W. (1999). The newest software that meets the developmental needs of young

    children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 26(4), 245-254.

Haugland, S. W. (2005). Selecting or upgrading software and websites in the classroom. *Early*

    childhood Education Journal, 32(5), 329-340.

Heydon, R., & Wang, P. (2006). Curricular ethics in early childhood education programming: A

    challenge to the Ontario kindergarten program. *McGill Journal of Education, 41*(1), 29–46.

Highfield, K., & Goodwin, K. (2013). Apps for mathematics learning: A review of 'educational'

    apps from the iTunes App Store. In V. Steinle, L. Ball, & C. Bardini (Eds.) *Mathematics*

    education: Yesterday, today and tomorrow, Proceedings of the 36th annual conference of

    the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia). Melbourne, VIC: MERGA.

Hitt, F. (Ed.). (2002). *Representations and mathematics visualization*. Mexico: PME-NA,

    Cinvestav-IPN.

Honan, E., Gilbert, R., Mills, M., Keddie, A., Renshaw, P., Goos, M... Prendergast, D. (2009).

    Productive pedagogies: A redefined methodology for analysing quality teacher practice.

    Australian Educational Researcher, 36(3), 67-87.

Kamii, C., Lewis, B. A., & Kirkland, L. D. (2001). Fluency in subtraction compared with addition.

    Journal of Mathematical Behavior, *20*(1), 33–42.

Kay, R. H., & Knaack, L. (2009). Assessing learning, quality and engagement in learning objects:

    The learning object evaluation scale for students (LOES-S). *Educational Technology*

    Research and Development, 57(2), 147-168.

Larkin, K. (2013). Mathematics education. Is there an app for that? In V. Steinle, L. Ball, &

    C. Bardini (Eds.), *Mathematics education: Yesterday, today and tomorrow (Proceedings of*

    the 36th annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of

    Australasia) (pp. 426–433). Melbourne, VIC: MERGA.

Larkin, K. (2014). iPad apps that promote mathematical knowledge? Yes, they exist! *Australian*

    Primary Mathematics Classroom, 19(2), 28–32.

Larkin, K. (2015a). The search for fidelity in geometry apps: An exercise in futility? In

    M. Marshman, V. Geiger, & A. Bennison (Eds.), *Mathematics Education in the Margins.*

    (Proceedings of the 38th Annual Conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group

    of Australasia). Sunshine Coast, QLD: MERGA.

Larkin, K. (2015b). "An app! An app! My kingdom for an app": An 18-month quest to determine

    whether apps support mathematical knowledge building. In *Digital Games and Mathematics*

    Learning (pp. 251–276). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Lo, M. L., & Runesson, U. (2007). Teachers' learning from learning studies: An example of

    teaching and learning fractions in primary four. *Proceedings of the 31th PME*, Vol. 1,

    pp. 157–162). Seoul, South Korea: Seoul National University.

Maddux, C., Johnson, D., & Willis, J. (2001). *Educational computing: Learning with tomorrow's*

    technologies. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Mills, M., Goos, M., Keddie, A., Honan, E., Prendergast, D., Gilbert, R., & Renshaw, P. (2009).

    Productive pedagogies: A redefined methodology for analyzing quality teacher practice.

    Australian Educational Researcher, 36(3), 67-87.

Moyer-Packenham, P. S, & Westenskow, A. (2013). Effects of virtual manipulatives on student achievement and mathematics learning. *International Journal of Virtual and Personal Learning Environments, 4*(3), 35–47.

Moyer-Packenham, P. S., Salkind, G., & Bolyard, J. J. (2008). Virtual manipulatives used by K–8 teachers for mathematics instruction: Considering mathematical, cognitive, and pedagogical fidelity. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 8(3), 202–218.

Moyer-Packenham, P. S., Shumway, J. F., Bullock, E., Tucker, S. I., Anderson-Pence, K., Westenskow, A., . . . Jordan, K. (2015). Young children's learning performance and efficiency when using virtual manipulative mathematics iPad apps. *The Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 34*(1), 41–69.

Moyer, P. S., Bolyard, J. J., & Spikell, M. A. (2002). What are virtual manipulatives? *Teaching children mathematics*, 8(6), 372–377.

Namukasa, I. K., Stanley, D., & Tutchie, M. (2009). Virtual manipulative materials in secondary mathematics: A theoretical discussion. *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 28*, 277–307.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM). (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics.* Reston, VA: Author.

Pelton, L. F., & Pelton, T. (2012, March). Sharing strategies with teachers: iPods in math class. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (Vol. 2012, No. 1, pp. 4363–4366).

Pepin, B., & Gueudet, G. (2014). Curriculum resources and textbooks in mathematics. In S. Lerman (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 132–135). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Peterson, J. C. (1972, May). Fourteen different strategies of multiplication of integers or why   (-1)

(-1) + =1. *The Arithmetic Teacher*, *19*(5), 397–403.

Pirie, S., & Kieren, T. (1994). Growth in mathematical understanding: How can we characterize it

and how can we represent it? *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *26*(2-3), 165–190.

Sedig, K., Parsons, P., Dittmer, M., & Haworth, R. (2014). Human-centred interactivity of

visualization tools: Micro- and macro-level considerations. In W. Huang (Ed.), *Handbook*

on human centric visualization (pp. 717–743). New York, NY: Springer.

Skip, J. (1990). But everybody accepts this explanation: Operations on signed numbers. In J. Fauvel

(Ed.), *History in the mathematics classroom. (The IREM papers)* (Vol. 1). London, England:

Mathematical Association.

Tarasewich, P. (2003). Designing mobile commerce applications. *Communications of the ACM, 46*,

57–60.

Trouche, L., Drijvers P., Gueudet, G., & Sacristan, A. I. (2013). Technology-driven development

and policy implications for mathematics education. In A.J. Bishop, M.A. Clements,

C. Keitel, J. Kilpatrick, & F.K.S. Leung (Eds.), *Third international handbook of*

mathematics education (pp. 753–790). New York, NY: Springer.

UK Government News Release. (4 February 2014). *Year of Code and £500,000 fund to inspire*

future tech experts launched. Retrieved from www.gov.uk/government/news/year-of-code-

and-500000-fund-to-inspire-future-tech-experts-launched

Yerushalmy, M., & Ben-Zaken, O. (2004). *Mobile phones in education: The case for mathematics*,

Haifa. Retrieved from http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~michalyr/celular%20report.pdf

Zbiek, R. M., Heid, M. K., Blume, G. W., & Dick, T. P. (2007). Research on technology in

mathematics education: A perspective of constructs. In F. Lester (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning*, Vol. 2, (pp. 1169-1207). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Zhang, M., Trussell, R. P., Gallegos, B., & Asam, R. R. (2015). Using math apps for improving student learning: An exploratory study in an inclusive fourth grade classroom. *TechTrends, 59*(2), 32–39.