

Secondary mathematics education in the age of STEM: Tensions and possibilities for policy and practice in NSW.

by Jane Leigh Martin

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

under the supervision of Dr Kimberley Pressick-Kilborn
(Principal Supervisor) and Associate Professor Mary
Coupland (Co-Supervisor)

University of Technology Sydney
Faculty of Arts and Social Science

February, 2021

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, *Jane Leigh Martin*, declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of *DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY*, in the *SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES* at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature: Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 10 February, 2021

Acknowledgements and thanks

To my children, Madeleine and Felix, for their unwavering support and belief that I could and would complete this thesis. Your encouragement and confidence have been inspiring. The same can be said of my friends, who listened patiently, and even attentively, over the course of this research.

To my first Principal Supervisor, Associate Professor Anne Prescott, for taking my unformed ideas and leading me to rethink and reformulate until a cogent plan emerged. Guiding this plan to fruition fell to my subsequent Principal Supervisor, Dr Kimberley Pressick-Kilborne and Co-Supervisor, Associate Professor Mary Coupland. Your insightful feedback, meticulous eye for detail and logical construction pushed my writing to a higher level than it would otherwise have been.

To all the participants for being interesting and interested, and for giving me your time when I know you are busy. Without you I would not have a study and your thoughtful and honest responses were invaluable.

To my fellow doctoral students who truly understood and shared the trials and tribulations of the doctoral process. Without the encouragement, empathy and laughter, not to mention the timed-writing sessions, I am not at all sure this study would have reached conclusion. I did not anticipate that the end-result of this process would not just be a thesis, but also friendship.

Last, but by no means least, to my school teaching colleagues who continue to inspire me with their unfailing dedication and care for their students. In particular, I acknowledge my teaching colleague and friend, Melissa Silk, my collaborateur and comrade-in-arms in exploring the amazing connections between mathematics and design. Hyperbolic geometry was just a starting point.

Abstract

Models of integrated learning are commonly promoted in STEM education policies worldwide. The role of mathematics appears to sit uneasily in these models, with mathematical learning generally limited to process-driven applications offering little scope for conceptual development. With improvement in the mathematics achievement and ambition of secondary students fundamental to STEM education policies, an emerging research literature has questioned this ambiguous role of mathematics in integrated STEM. Focusing explicitly on mathematics, this study explores this tension by investigating the landscape of STEM education in NSW secondary schools that developed pursuant to the introduction of strategies promoting integrated STEM.

Using a mixed methods approach, insights into the perspectives, understandings and experiences of major stakeholders involved in secondary mathematics education – teachers, regulators, tertiary educators and external STEM providers and advisors - were gained by interviews, a web survey and document analysis. Analysis confirmed findings from previous research, including a confused understanding of integrated STEM education in the secondary school environment and a focus on technology or science in implemented programs. Mathematics content in integrated STEM was limited in quantity and scope and curriculum documents difficult to align and reconcile. Rejecting a ‘teacher deficit’ explanation of implementation challenges, this study questions the implementation assumptions of integrated STEM models, exposing vulnerabilities suggesting that they are ill-suited to discipline-specific education structures and do not represent sustainable models of change for secondary mathematics education. Further, the widespread finding that mathematics is trivialised in integrated STEM indicates that, on cost-benefit and epistemological bases, popular conceptions of integrated STEM may be inadequate to support a robust learning of mathematics. Nevertheless, although disillusioned with the role assigned to mathematics in integrated STEM, mathematics teachers recognised the benefits of the connected learning approach of STEM and sought to develop these approaches for mathematics within the mathematics classroom.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background to this research.....	3
1.2. Purpose of this research.....	7
1.3. Research questions.....	11
1.4. Structure of this thesis.....	13
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	14
2.1. Why STEM and STEM education?.....	15
2.1.1. Policy and strategy responses to STEM education.....	16
2.1.2. Overview of international responses to STEM education.....	17
2.1.2.1. <i>The UK, US and EU.....</i>	17
2.1.2.2. <i>Developing countries.....</i>	20
2.1.3. STEM education in Australia.....	20
2.2. STEM education from an education research perspective.....	22
2.2.1. Integrated STEM education.....	22
2.2.2. Challenges presented by integrated STEM education.....	24
2.2.2.1. <i>Lack of classroom-ready implementation models or frameworks.....</i>	24
2.2.2.2. <i>Transfer and development of knowledge.....</i>	25
2.2.2.3. <i>Accessing quality resources.....</i>	26
2.2.2.4. <i>Teacher challenges.....</i>	29
2.2.2.5. <i>The continued need for single discipline instruction.....</i>	31
2.2.2.6. <i>Whole school challenges.....</i>	32
2.2.2.7. <i>Curriculum and structural challenges.....</i>	33
2.3. Achievement in mathematics in STEM education programs.....	36
2.4. STEM as a change initiative in education.....	37
2.4.1. The theories of change approach.....	38
2.4.2. Teacher change.....	39
2.4.3. The teacher's voice in education initiatives.....	40
2.5. Concluding remarks.....	41
Chapter 3. Methodology.....	43
3.1. Research design and methodology.....	44
3.1.1. Choice of stakeholder groups.....	47
3.1.2. Rationale in using a mixed methods design.....	48
3.1.3. Privileging mathematics teachers' voices.....	50
3.1.4. The lens of policy and change.....	51
3.2. Procedure.....	53

3.2.1.	Approvals and consents	53
3.2.2.	Web survey of secondary school mathematics teachers in NSW	53
3.2.2.1.	<i>The web survey questionnaire</i>	54
3.2.2.2.	<i>Target population and sample size</i>	57
3.2.2.3.	<i>The web survey process</i>	59
3.2.2.4.	<i>Survey participation</i>	60
3.2.2.5.	<i>The approach to data analysis</i>	60
3.2.3.	Document analysis	63
3.2.3.1.	<i>Document selection</i>	63
3.2.3.2.	<i>The approach to data analysis</i>	65
A.	NSW DoE STEM Project programs.....	65
B.	NESA Stage 4 STEM Units.....	68
C.	NESA STEM Pathway and STEM Advanced Pathway.....	68
D.	NESA Mathematics syllabus and Science syllabus.....	68
E.	External STEM provider information appearing on the STARportal.....	68
3.2.4.	Semi-Structured interviews.....	70
3.2.4.1.	<i>Interview questions</i>	70
3.2.4.2.	<i>Target population and sample size</i>	71
3.2.4.3.	<i>The interview process</i>	72
3.2.4.4.	<i>The approach to data analysis</i>	72
3.3.	Concluding remarks	73
Chapter 4.	Mathematics in the age of STEM: findings from the data.	74
4.1.	What is STEM education for mathematics?	76
4.1.1.	STEM is an interdisciplinary or integrated approach across Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics	77
4.1.2.	Mathematics teachers see STEM education as situated within mathematics.....	80
4.2.	What does STEM education for mathematics look like in the classroom?	85
4.2.1.	Technology as the curriculum host for STEM programs in NSW schools.....	86
4.2.2.	Mathematics in learning in STEM programs privileges process-driven outcomes.....	91
4.3.	The affordances and challenges of STEM education for mathematics	96
4.3.1.	Students enjoy learning in a STEM environment but nevertheless struggle with applying their mathematics learning	97
4.3.2.	Teaching mathematics in a STEM environment is professionally satisfying	99
4.3.3.	Including meaningful mathematics content in STEM programs is difficult.....	100
4.3.4.	External providers of STEM programs do not focus on mathematics.....	105
4.3.5.	Finding common content between the mathematics and science curriculums presents challenges.....	106
4.3.6.	The nature of mathematics knowledge and learning is itself an obstacle to inclusion in integrated STEM programs	114

4.4.	Indicators of change: sustainability of STEM education for mathematics.....	115
4.5.	Concluding remarks	118
Chapter 5.	Discussion of findings.....	121
5.1.	Key findings	122
5.2.	What is understood as STEM education?.....	123
5.2.1.	Regulatory vision of STEM.....	123
5.2.2.	Confusion, complexity and capacity: divergent visions of STEM in schools.....	125
5.2.3.	Envisaging the possible: STEM in the mathematics classroom	130
5.3.	Mathematics in the STEM classroom.....	131
5.3.1.	The role of mathematics: value in the integrated STEM transaction.....	132
5.3.2.	The role of mathematics: the epistemology of integrated STEM	135
5.3.3.	Curriculum challenges	138
5.4.	Sustaining STEM for mathematics	141
5.4.1.	The NSW STEM strategy and change for mathematics.....	142
5.4.2.	Individual teacher change	143
5.5.	Concluding remarks	145
Chapter 6.	Conclusion	148
6.1.	Contribution of this research.....	149
6.2.	Future directions in practice, policy and research.....	154
6.2.1.	Access to quality STEM education resources for mathematics.....	155
6.2.2.	A connected-curriculum experience for teachers and students	155
6.2.3.	Realigning the STEM education conversation through research	156
6.3.	Limitations of current study	158
6.4.	Concluding remarks	160
References	162

Index of Tables

Table 1. Research Questions: themes guiding dimensions of enquiry.....	44
Table 2. Overview of Data Sources and Data Collection Methods	49
Table 3. Common interview questions and web survey questions mapped to themes	50
Table 4. “Levels of Use and behavioural indicators for that level” (Bennett & Anderson, 2018, p. 626) ..	52
Table 5. Thematic design of web survey questionnaire.....	55
Table 6. Survey participation by school location, school sector and years of experience teaching mathematics.....	60
Table 7. Web survey response rate of individual questions.....	62
Table 8. Search filters used for STARportal searches July 2019.....	69
Table 9. What the NSW Department of Education and the NSW Education Standards Authority said about STEM Education 2017 to 2021	78
Table 10. STEM Showcase Project programs involving Technology, Mathematics and Science programs involvement by subject area.....	88

Index of Figures

Figure 1. Secondary school teachers accredited with the NSW Education Standards Authority (NESA) as of 2017 by Key Learning Area specialisation. Sourced from CESE (2020, p. 52).	57
Figure 2. Nature of Student Participation in STEM programs in your School. (n = 35).....	81
Figure 3. What does STEM education look like to Secondary Mathematics Teachers? (n = 61)	83
Figure 4. Mathematics Content in STEM programs by Curriculum Strand from Web Survey (n = 14)	92
Figure 5. Mathematics Content in DoE STEM Project Programs by Curriculum Strand.	92
Figure 6. Mathematics Content in NESA STEM units by Curriculum Strand.	93
Figure 7. The Challenges for Students from Teaching Mathematics in a STEM environment (n = 48).....	98
Figure 8. The Benefits for Teachers from Teaching Mathematics in a STEM environment (n = 48).....	100
Figure 9. Challenges in the Whole-School Environment in Implementing STEM. (n = 48).....	101
Figure 10. Challenges in Teaching Mathematics in a STEM Environment (n = 48).....	102
Figure 11. Demand for Professional Development for STEM (n = 47).	104
Figure 12. STARportal mathematics STEM activities showing actual focus area (n = 73).....	106
Figure 13. Comparing Line Graphs in Science and Mathematics	109
Figure 14. Comparing lines of best fit in science and mathematics	111
Figure 15. Rearranging the speed/velocity formula in science and mathematics.....	113

Appendices

<i>Appendix A</i>	<i>Common Interview Questions</i>
<i>Appendix B</i>	<i>Web Survey Questions</i>
<i>Appendix C</i>	<i>Ethics approvals</i>
<i>Appendix D</i>	<i>MANSW approval</i>
<i>Appendix E</i>	<i>Web Survey link button</i>
<i>Appendix F</i>	<i>STEM Showcase Project duration and student participation</i>
<i>Appendix G</i>	<i>STEM Showcase Project subject area involvement.</i>
<i>Appendix H</i>	<i>STEM Showcase Project description and assessment</i>
<i>Appendix I</i>	<i>NESA STEM units description and assessment of mathematics syllabus outcomes</i>
<i>Appendix J</i>	<i>Mathematics outcomes recorded in the 27 DoE STEM Showcase Project programs excluding Working Mathematically (WM)</i>
<i>Appendix K</i>	<i>Mathematics outcomes recorded in the three stage 4 NESA STEM units programs excluding Working Mathematically (WM)</i>
<i>Appendix L</i>	<i>STEM Showcase Program activities attributed to mathematics syllabus outcomes for stage 4</i>
<i>Appendix M</i>	<i>Stage 4 outcomes from the NSW Syllabus for the Australian Curriculum Mathematics K-10</i>