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Some research suggests that teachers’ beliefs and thoughts about the nature of mathematical knowledge and knowing (broadly termed epistemic dispositions) comprise an important factor that influences their practice. However, to date, there is no systematic review of the empirical literature on mathematics teachers’ epistemic dispositions. The purpose of this systematic research synthesis was to assess the existing empirical literature in order to (a) describe mathematics teachers’ epistemic dispositions, (b) to identify whether such dispositions correlate with teacher’s use of constructivist teaching practices, and (c) correlate with student learning outcomes. A systematic assessment of 30 relevant studies suggest that teachers, on average, hold constructivist epistemic dispositions regarding mathematics. Few studies reported correlations between epistemic cognition indices and teacher practice or student outcomes.
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Cognitive processes involved in constructing and evaluating arguments—called epistemic cognition—has been well studied in the educational psychology literature. Epistemic cognition concerns itself with the thinking that people do about what they know and how they know it (Chinn, Rinehart, & Buckland, 2014; Sandoval, Greene, Bråten, 2016). For example, a learner engages in epistemic cognition when they explain “how they know” that a mathematical assertion is true or justified. A common object of investigation in epistemic cognition research is people’s beliefs about the nature of mathematics, mathematical knowledge, and processes of knowing—sometimes termed epistemic beliefs (e.g., Cooney, 1985; Ernest, 1989; Muis, 2004; Thompson, 1984). Existing research syntheses suggest that students’ epistemic beliefs support their motivation, selection of productive problem-solving strategies, and achievement outcomes in mathematics (e.g., Muis, 2004) and are involved in teachers’ lesson planning, evaluation of student work, and instructional techniques (e.g., Maggioni & Parkinson, 2008). Yet, despite several decades of research consistently confirming that epistemic cognition plays a crucial role in facilitating teaching and learning in many disciplines, little to no research focuses on synthesizing findings regarding teachers’ epistemic cognition in the domain of mathematics.

The purpose of this systematic review was therefore to synthesize the existing work on epistemic cognition in mathematics teaching in order to specify teachers’ epistemic dispositions and identify whether epistemic dispositions are associated with instructional practice and student achievement. Specifically, we sought to answer three central questions: (a) What are teachers’ epistemic dispositions towards mathematics? (b) To what extent are epistemic dispositions associated with teacher instruction? (c) To what extent are epistemic dispositions associated with student learning?

Theoretical Framework

Epistemic cognition can be defined as the thinking that people do about knowledge and knowing (Greene et al., 2016). A common focus in epistemic cognition research is on the beliefs that people hold about knowledge and knowing—or epistemic beliefs—which are studied both as both a domain-general and domain-specific construct. Three decades of research from various
disciplines have yielded multiple domain-general models of epistemic cognition that broadly fall into three categories: developmental, multidimensional, and philosophically informed models (e.g., Sandoval et al., 2016). Developmental models of epistemic cognition investigate how people’s views of knowledge progress through a series of levels over time (e.g., Kuhn, 1991; Moschman, 2015; Perry, 1970). Multidimensional models explore epistemic cognition as a set of multiple, relatively independent dimensions of beliefs (e.g., Hofer & Pintrich, 1997; Schommer, 1990). Philosophically informed models more broadly conceive of epistemic cognition as encompassing not only beliefs, but cognitive processes that take into account motivation, emotion, and practices that dynamically interact with beliefs in context (e.g., Chinn et al., 2014).

**Theoretical Models of Epistemic Cognition Specific to Mathematics**

Much of the literature on mathematical epistemic cognition focuses on individuals’ beliefs about mathematics and the nature and acquisition of mathematical knowledge (e.g., epistemic beliefs; Ernest, 1989; Thompson, 1984). The most commonly cited model of teachers’ beliefs about mathematics is that of Ernest (1989). Ernest’s model posits that teachers’ beliefs about what mathematics is impacts their beliefs about how students learn, how teachers should teach, and subsequently impact their enacted model of how students learn (e.g., their teaching practices and how they utilize classroom resources like textbooks). Ernest proposes three categories of epistemological beliefs that increase in their level of sophistication: instrumentalist, Platonist, and problem-solving. Individuals that hold an instrumentalist perspective believe that mathematics is a set of unrelated rules and facts. Instrumentalists view mathematical statements as mere consequences of a set of arbitrary mathematical rules. Math teachers that adopt an instrumentalist perspective might view math statements as “just a collection of disconnected formulas” to be memorized and reproduced that are ultimately disconnected from our experience in the world. Platonists hold the view that mathematics is a unified body of objective mathematical knowledge and that mathematics is discovered. This can be illustrated by the teacher who believes that that mathematical knowledge is highly interconnected, builds upon itself, and exists in an unchanging almost transcendent world of objective mathematical knowledge. A Platonist teacher might believe that the best way to communicate mathematical knowledge to their students is to expose students to math knowledge in a logically consistent way. The problem-solving perspective holds that mathematics is dynamic, expanding, and is a human invention. This perspective stems from the view that mathematics is essentially a human invention constructed from subjective experience in the world. Teachers that hold a problem-solving perspective might believe that mathematical knowledge is a construction used to describe individual experience of the world, that math is a language to describe the world around us, and that the best way for students to learn mathematics is to co-construct knowledge through discussion and interaction in the classroom.

Additional mathematics-specific theoretical models of epistemic cognition are similar to Ernest’s (see Table 1). Felbrich and colleagues (2012) and Daepepe and colleagues (2016) also posit categorizations of teachers’ epistemic dispositions that lie on a continuum of less to more constructivist (scheme-related, formalism, and process-related). Two of Blömeke’s three categories are similar, with the third category, the application perspective, being somewhat unique in that it represents a teacher with the perspective that math is a tool that can be applied to accomplish various tasks.

Teachers’ mathematical beliefs are also predicted to shape their perceived role in the classroom, intended outcomes, and enacted instructional practices. For example, Ernest’s (1989) model predicts that teachers’ epistemic beliefs inform their espoused and enacted models of
teaching and learning mathematics as well as their use of classroom materials. Briefly, this model posits that teachers’ constructivist epistemic beliefs are expected to correspond with teaching practices that subsequently support student learning.

**Table 1: Four Developmental Models of Teachers’ Beliefs about Mathematics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Instrumentalist</th>
<th>Platonist</th>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ernest (1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felbrich (2012)</td>
<td>Math is Static Science</td>
<td>Math is a Dynamic Process</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blömeke (2008)</td>
<td>Scheme-Related</td>
<td>Formalist</td>
<td>Process-Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daeppe (2016)</td>
<td>Absolutist</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fallibilist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it stands, the epistemic cognition frameworks reviewed here posit that teachers generally progress from less to more constructivist mathematical beliefs and that these views on the nature of mathematics shape teachers’ espoused models for teaching and learning and their enacted practices. However, it should be noted that such developmental models of epistemic cognition concentrate on epistemic beliefs and are limited in that they do not consider the multidimensionality or context-sensitivity of epistemic cognition as proposed in the educational psychology literature (e.g., Hofer & Pintrich, 1997; Chinn et al., 2014). As such, we operationalized epistemic cognition to include multidimensional and philosophically informed models and cast a wide net for retrieving relevant information about the topic, despite there being no math-specific theoretical models that are widely used that take these perspectives.

**Method**

**Inclusion criteria.** This review investigates empirical research on epistemic cognition of instructors within the domains of educational psychology and mathematics education. Studies were selected if they examined teachers’ thinking about mathematical knowledge and knowing that could be identified as satisfying one or more of the components of the operational definition outlined above. These components included beliefs about the nature of knowledge in mathematics, justifications of knowledge in mathematics, sources of knowledge in mathematics including teachers’ perspectives on the acquisition of mathematical certainties (i.e., proof). We included articles, dissertations, reports, and book chapters published in English.

**Search procedures.** Relevant empirical literature was identified by searching online databases, PsychINFO and ERIC, with the following search command: “(teach* OR instruct* OR profess* OR faculty) AND (epistem* OR proof* OR prove OR proving OR (math* NEAR/6 belief*)) AND (math*),” no additional restrictions were placed on the search. This search resulted in a total of 810 items, of which a total of 30 texts met the inclusion criteria and were selected for this review after multiple rounds of screening (screening procedures available upon request).

The 30 papers were then coded to capture characteristics of the theoretical framing, study setting, participants, internal validity, and external validity (Cooper, 2016; codebooks available upon request). Papers were broadly categorized by whether they addressed one or more of the three main research objectives to (a) describe teachers’ epistemic cognition about mathematics, (b) identify whether there is a relationship between epistemic cognition and teaching practices, and/or (c) identify whether there is a relationship between epistemic cognition and student learning outcomes. Some texts were applicable to more than one category.

**Preliminary analysis.** For this preliminary analysis, we recorded the direction of effects—we noted whether each study found that teachers held constructivist dispositions or not, and
whether these dispositions were positively or negatively correlated with reform-based instructional practices or with student learning. We then tallied the direction of effects across these studies. The secondary reference section presents a list of the articles cited in the review.

Preliminary Results

The empirical literature identified in this synthesis tended to centralize epistemic beliefs as the object of investigation. Of the 30 items reviewed, all 35 of them appeared to be explicitly focused on assessing static epistemic beliefs using developmental or multidimensional conceptions of epistemic cognition (rather than philosophically informed models that consider the context-sensitive nature of epistemic cognition). Study samples ranged from pre-service K-12 teachers, and in-service teachers of preschool up through undergraduate and graduate instructors. Of 30 texts, 12 were qualitative, 16 were quantitative, and 2 were mixed methods.

RQ1: What are teachers’ epistemic dispositions towards mathematics?

We assessed sample means of teachers’ beliefs about mathematics from quantitative studies to judge whether their epistemic dispositions towards mathematics were constructivist or not. Of the 17 studies presenting relevant means, 13 of them (76%) revealed that teachers on average held constructivist beliefs about mathematics knowledge and knowing. Qualitative findings were consistent, but suggest that these dispositions were context dependent.

RQ 2: To what extent are epistemic dispositions are associated with teacher instruction?

To answer the second research question, we tallied the direction of effects of correlations between constructivist epistemic dispositions and teachers’ reform-based teaching practices. Of the thirty papers, only four of them reported such correlations, all of which (100%) were positive and significant.

RQ3: To what extent are epistemic dispositions associated with student learning?

To answer the third research question, we tallied the direction of effects of correlations between constructivist epistemic dispositions and student learning outcomes. Of the thirty papers, only two studies presented correlations between epistemic dispositions and student learning. Both correlations were positive, but only one was significant.

Significance

We sought to assess the empirical literature on mathematics teachers’ epistemic cognition to describe their epistemic dispositions and identify potential relationships with their practice and student learning outcomes. A systematic review of 30 journal articles, book chapters, reports, and dissertations begin to suggest that teachers lean towards constructivist perspectives regarding mathematical knowledge and knowing. A few studies show that these constructivist dispositions are correlated with reform-based teaching practices. However, due to the very small number of studies linking such beliefs with specific teaching or student learning outcomes, we recommend that more research is needed to establish such links.

We also found that all of the literature identified in this search conceived of and measured epistemic cognition as a unidimensional, static construct. Future work should also build from epistemic cognition models that centralize the role of context and frame epistemic cognition as a situated process rather than capturing only static beliefs.

We also note that issues of race, gender, and class were all but absent from this body of literature. Existing research suggests that teachers’ seemingly innocuous beliefs about the nature of mathematical ability are not gender-neutral (Copur-Gencturk, Thacker, & Quinn, 2019). Such evidence suggests that implicit racial and gender biases may belie the seemingly harmless beliefs about the nature of mathematics and mathematical knowing. Future research should explore potential relationships.
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