Reasoning-Rich Mathematics Tasks for the Intermediate Grades

Jhing Urdusa

Abstract

Prospective elementary teachers need more than the ability to obtain correct answers. They must identify the mathematical structure of a problem, anticipate how learners may interpret it, select and connect representations, preserve productive cognitive demand, guide discussion, and use evidence from student work to revise instruction. This conceptual-pedagogical article analyzes an instructional worktext for Teaching Mathematics in the Intermediate Grades and develops the Build-Reveal-Interpret-Design-Guide-Evaluate (BRIDGE) framework for converting content review into teachable mathematical tasks. The framework asks a prospective teacher to Build a precise learning goal and verify the mathematics; Reveal the underlying quantities, relationships, units, and generalizable structure; Interpret the concept through connected representations and likely student strategies; Design a contextual task that permits reasoning without hiding the target idea; Guide classroom discourse by anticipating, monitoring, selecting, sequencing, and connecting student responses; and Evaluate evidence, feedback, and task revision. BRIDGE integrates pedagogical content knowledge, mathematical proficiency, task-cognitive-demand research, formative assessment, and official curriculum expectations. Two practical tools accompany the framework: a stage-by-stage design map linking teacher products to quality checks, and a domain audit illustrating its use with fractions, decimals, measurement, polygons, and geometric measurement. The article argues that a completed lesson plan is insufficient evidence of readiness if its objectives, tasks, representations, questions, and assessments are not mathematically aligned. Strong teacher-education work should expose common misconceptions, require explanations and comparisons, distinguish contextual realism from decorative word problems, and preserve units and referents throughout computation. The proposed framework is an instructional design contribution rather than an empirical claim about learning gains. It offers a transparent basis for coursework, microteaching, lesson study, portfolio assessment, and future research on how prospective teachers transform subject-matter knowledge into instruction that supports conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, strategic competence, adaptive reasoning, and productive disposition.

Keywords: mathematics teacher education; pedagogical content knowledge; mathematical tasks; intermediate grades; lesson design; formative assessment

Introduction

Knowing how to calculate with fractions, decimals, units of measure, and geometric quantities is necessary for teaching intermediate-grade mathematics, but it is not sufficient. A teacher must also explain why a procedure works, recognize when an answer is unreasonable, choose an example that exposes the intended relationship, interpret an unconventional student strategy, and decide what question will advance rather than replace the learner's thinking. These are mathematical acts performed for the work of teaching.

The distinction matters in prospective-teacher preparation. A conventional content review can improve accuracy while leaving the instructional transformation implicit. A conventional lesson-plan requirement can produce complete headings and activities while leaving the mathematical goal, anticipated thinking, and evidence of understanding weakly connected. Shulman (1986) described pedagogical content knowledge as the distinctive blending of content and pedagogy needed to represent subject matter for learners. Ball, Thames, and Phelps (2008) later articulated a practice-based account of mathematical knowledge for teaching, emphasizing that teaching requires specialized mathematical judgments beyond simply solving school exercises.

The Philippine K to 12 mathematics curriculum includes number and number sense, measurement, geometry, patterns and algebra, and statistics and probability, and is intended to guide the development of learning materials and assessment of progress (Department of Education, 2017). Within this setting, prospective elementary teachers need repeated opportunities to turn curriculum content into tasks that elicit reasoning. The instructional worktext analyzed here reviews operations on fractions and decimals, systems of measurement, polygons and quadrilaterals, and geometric measurement. It also asks learners to examine teaching methods, construct lesson plans, solve contextual problems, and complete projects such as a unit-conversion scavenger hunt, a polygon city, and a dream school building (Balmaceda, 2023).

This architecture has considerable potential because it joins content review with pedagogical application. Its central challenge is that the bridge between the two is not automatic. Correct computation does not determine which representations should be connected. A real-life setting does not guarantee a worthwhile problem. Listing teaching strategies does not establish why one strategy fits a particular mathematical goal. Completing an activity does not reveal whether learners understood the concept or merely followed instructions. The argument advanced here is that prospective teachers need an explicit design routine for transforming content into teachable ideas.

Purpose of the Article

This article has three objectives: (a) to distinguish mathematical content performance from mathematical work for teaching; (b) to develop the BRIDGE framework as a reusable design routine for intermediate-grade mathematics tasks; and (c) to propose observable evidence for evaluating task quality and instructional alignment. The guiding question is: How can prospective elementary teachers transform familiar mathematical topics into tasks that preserve accuracy, conceptual structure, learner reasoning, productive discussion, and responsive assessment?

Conceptual-Pedagogical Approach

Instructional Source and Unit of Analysis

The article uses conceptual synthesis and instructional design analysis. The source worktext supplies the sequence of content review, pre-assessment, discussion, assessment activities, lesson planning, reflection, and culminating projects. Scholarship on pedagogical content knowledge, mathematical proficiency, task demand, representation, discourse, modeling, and formative assessment supplies criteria for strengthening that sequence. No student sample, classroom intervention, achievement comparison, or learning-effect estimate is reported.

The unit of analysis is the teachable task: a bounded set of prompts, representations, tools, participation structures, teacher moves, and expected student products organized around a mathematical goal. The task is broader than a worksheet item and narrower than an entire unit. It can be enacted during one lesson or across a short investigation. Its quality is judged not by visual attractiveness or activity level alone, but by the mathematics learners are invited to notice, represent, justify, and connect.

From Content Knowledge to Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching

Shulman's account of teacher knowledge rejects a separation in which subject matter and generic method are learned independently and combined only during practice (Shulman, 1986). In mathematics, Ball et al. (2008) show why this integration is specialized. Teachers inspect the mathematical validity of student explanations, select examples that isolate a property, interpret errors that arise from overgeneralization, and compare nonstandard algorithms. A prospective teacher who can divide fractions correctly may still be unprepared to explain why multiplying by the reciprocal preserves the quotient relationship or to diagnose a learner who reverses the wrong fraction.

A design framework must therefore keep content verification and learner interpretation together. Mathematical accuracy is non-negotiable, including correct formulas, units, definitions, and assumptions. Yet an accurate explanation can still be instructionally weak if it begins with a rule before establishing meaning, uses only one representation, or prevents learners from making choices. Conversely, an engaging activity can be mathematically weak when decoration overshadows the target relationship or when the answer can be obtained without using the intended idea.

Mathematical Proficiency as an Integrated Goal

The National Research Council describes mathematical proficiency through five interwoven strands: conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, strategic competence, adaptive reasoning, and productive disposition (National Research Council, 2001). These strands provide a useful corrective to lessons that equate success with speed or answer production. A fraction task may involve a fluent procedure, but it should also reveal how quantities are partitioned, why operations are appropriate, how a result can be estimated, and whether the learner views sense-making as worthwhile.

Integration does not mean that every short task must assess all five strands equally. It means that a sequence should not repeatedly privilege one strand while treating the others as optional enrichment. A teacher educator can ask which strand is foregrounded, which strands support it, and what evidence the student product will provide. This shifts planning from selecting an activity to engineering a coherent opportunity to learn, consistent with the NCTM emphasis on interconnected content and process standards (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2000).

The BRIDGE Framework

BRIDGE organizes task design into six recursive stages: Build the goal and verify the mathematics; Reveal the structure; Interpret through representations and anticipated thinking; Design the task and context; Guide discourse and participation; and Evaluate evidence and revise. The stages are not a rigid lesson script. Evaluation may expose an imprecise goal, while anticipated misconceptions may require a different representation or number choice. Moving backward is part of disciplined design rather than evidence of failure.

Build the Goal and Verify the Mathematics

The designer states what learners should understand or be able to reason about, not merely what activity they will complete. 'Solve ten fraction items' identifies work; 'explain and compare strategies for adding unlike fractions using equivalence' identifies mathematical learning. The designer then solves the task in more than one way, checks definitions and formulas, identifies required prior knowledge, estimates reasonable answers, and records units and referents. Verification is especially important in measurement and geometry, where an omitted dimension, mismatched unit, or ambiguous diagram can invalidate the task.

Reveal the Mathematical Structure

The designer identifies the quantities, relationships, invariants, constraints, and generalizations that make the task mathematically significant. In fraction comparison, the structure may concern relative size and common wholes rather than a mechanical common-denominator routine. In unit conversion, it concerns multiplicative equivalence and dimensional consistency rather than moving a decimal point. In area and perimeter, it concerns distinct attributes that can vary independently. Revealing structure prevents the context or procedure from concealing the idea to be learned.

Interpret Representations and Anticipate Thinking

The designer selects and connects representations such as concrete materials, diagrams, number lines, tables, equations, verbal explanations, and digital tools. Representation is not a sequence in which concrete objects are abandoned as soon as symbols appear. Each form highlights some relationships and obscures others. The teacher should specify what a learner can see in one representation, how it corresponds to another, and where an interpretation may fail (Carpenter et al., 1997; Van de Walle et al., 2019).

Anticipation includes plausible correct strategies, partial strategies, and characteristic misconceptions. A learner may treat numerator and denominator as independent whole numbers, align decimal digits by the left edge rather than place value, convert square units with a linear factor, or infer that a larger perimeter guarantees a larger area. Anticipating these responses is not predicting individual children. It is preparing mathematically purposeful questions and examples so that student thinking can become material for instruction.

Design the Task and Context

The designer chooses values, constraints, tools, and prompts that make the intended reasoning necessary. Stein, Grover, and Henningsen (1996) found that tasks differ in cognitive demand and that high-level demands can decline during enactment. A task that initially invites comparison or justification may become procedural if the teacher supplies the method, fragments the work into tiny steps, or accepts answers without explanation. Design must therefore include both the written prompt and safeguards for maintaining demand; this is central to teaching that supports conceptual understanding (Hiebert & Grouws, 2007).

A context is mathematically productive when quantities, decisions, and constraints are credible and consequential to the solution. Merely placing names, prices, or objects around a routine computation creates a dressed-up exercise. Strong contexts allow learners to interpret information, make assumptions explicit, choose a representation or strategy, and evaluate whether an answer fits the situation. Modeling tasks can be particularly useful because learners construct, test, and refine representations of situations rather than search for a hidden school procedure (Lesh & Doerr, 2003).

Guide Discourse and Participation

The designer plans how student ideas will be elicited and connected. Smith and Stein's five practices - anticipating, monitoring, selecting, sequencing, and connecting - provide a disciplined alternative to calling on volunteers at random (Smith & Stein, 2011; Stein et al., 2008). The teacher anticipates responses before the lesson, monitors work for mathematically useful differences, selects examples that advance the goal, sequences them to expose relationships, and connects them explicitly.

Discussion questions should press for meaning without taking over the reasoning. Useful prompts include: What quantity does this number represent? Where is that relationship visible in the diagram? How are these strategies alike? Under what condition would this method fail? Which answer is reasonable before exact computation? Participation structures should also allow thinking time, written or visual expression, pair rehearsal, and access to tools. Confident speech should not be mistaken for mathematical understanding.

Evaluate Evidence and Revise

The designer specifies what student work would count as evidence of the goal. A correct answer alone may be insufficient when the goal concerns reasoning, representation, or transfer. Evidence may include an annotated model, comparison of strategies, explanation of an error, justification of a unit, or revision after feedback. Black and Wiliam (1998) characterize formative assessment by the use of evidence to adapt teaching and learning. Evaluation therefore includes a decision: what will the teacher do if learners show different patterns of understanding?

Revision operates at two levels. Learners revise explanations, models, or solutions in response to evidence and feedback. Teachers revise examples, questions, sequencing, tools, and timing when the task does not elicit the intended mathematics. Deliberate comparison and modification of tasks can expose how small design changes alter the reasoning required (Swan, 2005). A lesson plan becomes a testable design rather than a ceremonial document completed before teaching and ignored afterward.

Table 1

BRIDGE stages, design products, and quality checks

Stage	Prospective-teacher product	Quality-check question	Common design failure
Build	Precise learning goal; verified solution paths; prerequisites; units and assumptions	What mathematical idea, beyond task completion, should learners understand?	Activity objective or unchecked mathematics
Reveal	Map of quantities, relationships, invariants, constraints, and generalization	What structure makes the task worth doing?	Procedure presented without its mathematical basis
Interpret	Connected representations; anticipated strategies and misconceptions	What does each representation show, hide, or invite learners to infer?	One representation treated as self-explanatory
Design	Context, values, tools, constraints, prompts, and demand-preservation safeguards	Can the task be completed without using the intended reasoning?	Decorative context or teacher-supplied method

Stage	Prospective-teacher product	Quality-check question	Common design failure
Guide	Anticipated discourse path; monitoring notes; selection, sequence, and connection plan	Which student ideas should be compared, and why in this order?	Random sharing without mathematical synthesis
Evaluate	Evidence criteria; feedback prompts; response plan; learner and task revision	What evidence would change the next instructional move?	Answer checking without interpretation or revision

Applying BRIDGE Across Intermediate Mathematics

Fractions and Decimals

For fractions, prospective teachers should preserve the whole to which a fraction refers, connect part-whole, measure, quotient, operator, and ratio interpretations when appropriate, and use number lines alongside area or set models. A useful comparison task asks learners to justify which of two fractions is greater using at least two representations and then determine when each strategy is efficient. This supports conceptual understanding and adaptive reasoning without excluding procedural fluency.

For decimals, place value and magnitude should precede rules based on visual movement of digits. Money can provide familiarity but should not become the only model because currency conventions may conceal thousandths or relationships beyond two decimal places. Tasks can connect base-ten representations, number lines, fraction equivalents, and computation. Error analysis is especially useful: learners can examine why aligning decimal numbers by the leftmost digit changes place-value relationships and revise the work.

Measurement and Unit Conversion

Measurement tasks should identify the attribute, unit, instrument, precision, and reason for measuring. Unit conversion is not merely substitution into a memorized factor; it is multiplication by a form of one while preserving the represented quantity. Prospective teachers should use dimensional reasoning to detect impossible conversions and distinguish linear, square, and cubic units. A task can ask learners to compare two conversion paths, explain why both preserve the quantity, and estimate before calculating.

The worktext's scavenger-hunt idea can be strengthened by requiring groups to select appropriate instruments, record measurement uncertainty, convert for a stated purpose, and defend whether precision is sufficient. Technology may support calculation, but learners should verify unit choice and reasonableness. A converter that returns a number without a unit or produces an implausible magnitude should become an object of critique rather than an authority.

Polygons and Geometric Measurement

Geometry instruction should connect definitions, properties, classification, measurement, and spatial reasoning. A polygon city can become more than an art project when learners justify how shapes satisfy inclusive definitions, compare design constraints, calculate relevant dimensions, and revise a plan when conditions change. Teachers should anticipate common classification errors, such as treating squares and rectangles as mutually exclusive or assuming that orientation changes a shape's identity.

Area, perimeter, and volume tasks require attention to attributes and units. Learners may correctly use formulas without understanding what is being accumulated. A dream-school-building project can require a scaled floor plan, room-area constraints, perimeter-based material estimates, comparison of alternative layouts, and explanation of trade-offs. The mathematics becomes visible when the project requires decisions that depend on measurement rather than simply attaching calculations to a drawing.

Table 2

BRIDGE domain audit for representative intermediate-grade tasks

Domain	Structural focus	Evidence-rich task move	Diagnostic issue to anticipate
Fractions	Magnitude, equivalence, common whole, and operation meaning	Compare strategies with number-line and area-model justification	Treating numerator and denominator as unrelated whole numbers
Decimals	Base-ten place value, magnitude, and fraction connections	Analyze and repair a misaligned computation using two representations	Reading digits without attending to place value
Measurement	Attribute, unit iteration, equivalence, precision, and dimensional consistency	Measure for a purpose, estimate, convert, and defend precision	Applying a linear conversion factor to area or volume
Polygons	Definitions, properties, hierarchy, and invariance	Classify disputed examples and justify inclusion or exclusion	Treating categories as exclusive or orientation-dependent
Area/perimeter	Distinct attributes, composition, conservation, and unit structure	Design two figures under a shared constraint and compare attributes	Assuming greater perimeter always means greater area
Volume	Three-dimensional unit iteration and multiplicative structure	Compare packing, layer, and formula representations	Using a formula without interpreting cubic units

Assessment in Prospective-Teacher Education

Assess the Mathematical Design, Not Only the Lesson-Plan Form

A lesson plan can include objectives, materials, procedures, and evaluation yet still provide little evidence of pedagogical content knowledge. Assessment should examine whether the goal names meaningful mathematics; solutions and units are correct; representations are connected; misconceptions are anticipated; task demand is preserved; discourse moves serve the goal; and student products provide interpretable evidence. A portfolio should include the task, anticipated responses, enactment notes or microteaching evidence, samples of feedback, and a revised version.

Rubric levels can describe increasingly integrated performance. An emerging design identifies a topic and routine exercise. A developing design states a concept and adds a representation but gives learners little strategic choice. A proficient design aligns goal, task, representations, questions, and evidence while anticipating more than one response. An extending design explains why choices fit the mathematics, maintains demand during enactment, uses student thinking to connect ideas, and revises the task based on evidence.

Use Feedback That Names the Next Design Decision

General comments such as 'make the lesson interactive' or 'add technology' do not identify what should improve. Feedback should name a mathematical or pedagogical decision: Which representation exposes equivalence? What misconception does this example address? Why are these numbers chosen? What will learners produce that demonstrates the objective? How will the teacher respond if most students use the same procedure? Hattie and Timperley (2007) distinguish feedback about goals, current performance, and next steps; these dimensions can make task revision purposeful. Embedding such evidence use in routine instruction also distributes assessment across the learning process rather than reserving it for the end (Wiliam, 2011).

Peer review can also be structured through BRIDGE. Reviewers solve the task independently, mark ambiguities, identify the intended structure, predict at least two responses, and test whether the assessment would distinguish understanding from answer production. The designer then records which critique was accepted, rejected, or investigated. This creates an auditable design history and treats professional judgment as reasoned, revisable work.

Discussion

A Bridge Is Needed Because Content and Pedagogy Do Not Combine Automatically

The source worktext appropriately places mathematics review beside lesson planning, teaching strategies, reflection, and projects. BRIDGE makes the connecting work explicit. Build and Reveal protect mathematical integrity. Interpret translates structure into representations and anticipated thinking. Design safeguards cognitive demand and contextual meaning. Guide treats student ideas as resources for collective sense-making. Evaluate closes the loop through evidence and revision. None of these stages can be replaced by a generic method label.

The framework also clarifies the role of technology. A digital tool is useful when it makes relationships inspectable, supports iteration, broadens representation, or allows learners to test conjectures. It is not an instructional improvement merely because it accelerates calculation or decorates a presentation. The prospective teacher must still determine the mathematical goal, validate outputs, anticipate interpretation, and decide what evidence the tool will make available.

Balancing Guidance and Productive Struggle

Preserving demand does not mean withholding all assistance. It means choosing support that advances access while leaving the central reasoning with learners. Teachers can clarify language, provide a representation, ask a focusing question, reduce irrelevant computation, or invite comparison without announcing the method. NCTM's effective teaching practices emphasize goals, reasoning-rich tasks, representations, discourse, purposeful questions, procedural fluency grounded in understanding, productive struggle, and evidence of student thinking (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2014). BRIDGE organizes these commitments within prospective-teacher design work.

Research Agenda

BRIDGE can be investigated through design-based research, lesson study, rubric validation, portfolio analysis, microteaching observations, and think-aloud task design. Researchers could examine which stages prospective teachers omit, whether structured anticipation improves responses to student errors, how representation mapping affects explanation quality, and whether task audits preserve cognitive demand during enactment. Studies should report prompts, task versions, feedback, scoring criteria, and samples of reasoning rather than relying only on confidence surveys.

Comparative studies could test BRIDGE across fraction, decimal, measurement, and geometry units; face-to-face and technology-supported lessons; and individual and collaborative design. Longitudinal work could investigate whether the framework helps prospective teachers transfer from university coursework to practicum teaching. The framework is offered as a testable pedagogical proposition, not as evidence that any particular implementation improves achievement.

Conclusion

Prospective elementary teachers must learn to do more than solve the mathematics they will teach and more than complete the conventional parts of a lesson plan. They must transform content into tasks that reveal structure, elicit interpretations, sustain reasoning, organize productive discourse, and generate evidence for instructional response. The BRIDGE framework names six recursive responsibilities: Build, Reveal, Interpret, Design, Guide, and Evaluate.

Applied to fractions, decimals, measurement, polygons, area, perimeter, and volume, BRIDGE preserves the valuable content-to-practice orientation of the source worktext while making alignment and revision explicit. Its central claim is deliberately modest: stronger task design becomes possible when the mathematical idea, anticipated learner thinking, instructional decisions, and assessment evidence are made visible enough to examine. Teacher educators can then evaluate not only whether a prospective teacher has written a lesson, but whether the lesson creates a defensible opportunity for learners to understand and use mathematics.

References

Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? Journal of Teacher Education, 59(5), 389-407. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108324554

Balmaceda, L. (2023). Teaching mathematics in the intermediate grades (E-Math 2) [Instructional worktext].

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Carpenter, T. P., Fennema, E., Fuson, K. C., Hiebert, J., Murray, H., Olivier, A., & Wearne, D. (1997). Making sense: Teaching and learning mathematics with understanding. Heinemann.

Department of Education. (2017). K to 12 curriculum guide: Mathematics. DepEd Learning Resources Management and Development System. https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph/detail/5455

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hiebert, J., & Grouws, D. A. (2007). The effects of classroom mathematics teaching on students' learning. In F. K. Lester Jr. (Ed.), Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning (pp. 371-404). Information Age Publishing.

Lesh, R., & Doerr, H. M. (Eds.). (2003). Beyond constructivism: Models and modeling perspectives on mathematics problem solving, learning, and teaching. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607713

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2000). Principles and standards for school mathematics. Author.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematical success for all. Author.

National Research Council. (2001). Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics (J. Kilpatrick, J. Swafford, & B. Findell, Eds.). National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/9822

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2), 4-14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004

Smith, M. S., & Stein, M. K. (2011). 5 practices for orchestrating productive mathematics discussions. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Stein, M. K., Engle, R. A., Smith, M. S., & Hughes, E. K. (2008). Orchestrating productive mathematical discussions: Five practices for helping teachers move beyond show and tell. Mathematical Thinking and Learning, 10(4), 313-340. https://doi.org/10.1080/10986060802229675

Stein, M. K., Grover, B. W., & Henningsen, M. (1996). Building student capacity for mathematical thinking and reasoning: An analysis of mathematical tasks used in reform classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 33(2), 455-488. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312033002455

Swan, M. (2005). Improving learning in mathematics: Challenges and strategies. Department for Education and Skills Standards Unit.

Van de Walle, J. A., Karp, K. S., & Bay-Williams, J. M. (2019). Elementary and middle school mathematics: Teaching developmentally (10th ed.). Pearson.

Wiliam, D. (2011). Embedded formative assessment. Solution Tree Press.