

## Engineering students' generating counterexamples of calculus concepts

**Chih-Hsien Huang**

Ming Chi University of Technology  
New Taipei City, Taiwan

**ABSTRACT:** This article explores how 112 first-year engineering students generated examples of statements believed to be true and counterexamples for statements believed to be false. This study was based on the perspective that *examples are a research tool that provides a window into a learner's mind*. The primary data sources were interviews and written responses to a questionnaire. The findings indicated that few students could generate counterexamples, that most of the engineering students often failed to check that the conditions had been satisfied, and were not fluent in using appropriate terms, notations, properties or did not recognise the role of such conditions.

**Keywords:** Calculus, examples, counterexamples, engineering students

### INTRODUCTION

Conventional calculus education has emphasised *good* functions and examples. Students, therefore, are accustomed to using familiar skills and manipulating signs rather than focusing on reasoning and verifying mathematical concepts, definitions, and theorem conditions. This type of teaching and learning orientation generates misconceptions among students and may be explained by the generic extension principle. According to Skemp, a concept, for its formation, requires a number of experiences - or examples - that have something in common [1].

Generating examples of mathematical objects may be a complicated task for both students and teachers [2], but such tasks yield substantial educational potential. In mathematics education, requesting that students generate examples is a particularly valuable tool [3].

Lakatos argued that the more students practice in creating their own counterexamples, the more likely they are to see them as infinite classes of examples rather than as isolated and irrelevant pathological cases [4]. Furthermore, in advanced mathematical thinking, the role of counterexamples can be an integral part of problem-solving strategies and as a way of mathematical thinking.

There are at least two important roles that examples play in mathematics education. One is of interest to teachers and designers of instructional materials, while the other is of interest to researchers [5]. Peled and Zaslavsky classified counterexamples into *specific*, *semi-general* and *general* depending on the extent to which expert mathematicians provide an insight on how to construct similar counterexamples or generate an entire counterexample space [6].

Zaslavsky and Ron indicated that students' understanding of the role of counterexamples is influenced by their overall experiences with examples [7]. Zazkis and Chernoff also suggested that the convincing power of counterexamples depends on the extent to which they are in accord with individuals' example spaces [8].

This study is based on the perspective that *examples as a research tool that provides a window into a learner's mind* [9], and expands the research of Peled and Zaslavsky, and Zaslavsky and Ron [6][7]. Data were collected from engineering students to explicate these studies and discuss variations within the classifications.

## METHODOLOGY

The participants comprised 112 first-year engineering students at a university of technology in Taiwan who had previously completed courses of derivative and definite integrals. The questionnaire contained three false mathematical statements, and was designed to assess student ability to generate counterexamples regarding differentiation and integration. These mathematical statements required an understanding of, and the ability to, generate basic differentiation and integration counterexamples. These statements enabled the students' performance regarding the example generation to be analysed:

Statement 1: If  $\int_a^b f(x)dx \geq \int_a^b g(x)dx$ , then,  $f(x) \geq g(x), \forall x \in [a, b]$ .

Statement 2: If  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  are all differentiable and  $f(x) > g(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ , then,  $f'(x) > g'(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ .

Statement 3: If  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  are all differentiable and  $f'(x) > g'(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ , then,  $f(x) > g(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ .

The primary data sources were the written responses to the questionnaire and interviews, which were administered to the students in their calculus classes after they had completed the course of differentiation and integration. The students were asked to determine the validity of the mathematical statements and justify their answers. The results of the questionnaire necessitated further investigation into students' example generation. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 15 engineering students. The interviews were video- and audio-taped and time was allotted for each task so that interviewees had enough time to answer all the questions. Students were asked to think aloud, while they were solving the tasks so that their responses and strategies could be described, as well as to draw inferences about their examples and counterexamples. The examples and counterexamples that the participants generated were gathered as data. To facilitate characterising student performance and assessing how the participants responded to the false statements, the categories and those listed in Table 1 were extended. The analysis focused on identifying examples and counterexamples used by the students to create meanings for the problems and the justifications provided.

Table 1: Types of responses to the three false mathematical statements.

The statement	P1	P2	P3
Types of responses (N=112)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Asserting that the statement is correct	73 (65.2%)	49 (43.7%)	46 (41.1%)
Left blank, no relevant knowledge	10 (8.9%)	12 (10.7%)	17 (15.2%)
Used positive examples as demonstrations	2 (1.8%)	10 (8.9%)	5 (4.4%)
Used examples as demonstrations but did not support it or make logical errors	61 (54.5%)	27 (24.1%)	24 (21.5%)
Asserting that the statement is incorrect	39 (34.8%)	63 (56.3%)	66 (58.9%)
Left blank, no relevant knowledge	8 (7.1%)	2 (1.8%)	11 (9.8%)
Narrated a statement that was false instead of providing a counterexample to refute it	7 (6.3%)	6 (5.4%)	10 (8.9%)
Provided a counterexample that failed to refute a false statement	16 (14.3%)	18 (16.1%)	26 (23.2%)
Correct use of counterexample	8 (7.1%)	37 (33%)	19 (17%)

## RESULTS

Table 1 shows the distribution of the response types of engineering students, and the results show that the response types are related to mathematical statements. For example, most students asserted that Statement 1 was correct and few students generated correct counterexamples.

A substantial number of students generated counterexamples for the differentiation statements, and more students generated counterexamples for Statement 2 compared with those for Statement 3. This finding indicated that at least 41% of students failed to identify that the three mathematical statements were false. This may be because students lack conceptual understanding and rely on their intuition, resulting in overgeneralisation.

Statement 1: If  $\int_a^b f(x)dx \geq \int_a^b g(x)dx$ , then  $f(x) \geq g(x), \forall x \in [a, b]$ .

Overall, 65% of the participants asserted that Statement 1 was correct and generated examples for verification; however, most students generated converse statement examples (e.g. Selina):

Selina: Greater integrals yield greater function. Thus, this statement is correct. For example,  $f(x) = x^2+1$  and  $g(x) = x^2$ ,  $f(x)$  is larger than  $g(x)$ , with an integral from 0 to 1. The integral of  $f(x)$  is  $4/3$  is also greater than the integral of  $g(x)$  is  $1/3$ .

Approximately 21% of students used graphical representations to generate examples or counterexamples, including Kevin and John. Although they connected integrals and areas, they either misjudged or did not understand the true

relationship between integrals and areas. For instance, John believed that the integral was not related to the area above or below x-axis.

Kevin: This statement is correct. The integral represents the area. With a greater integral, the area is greater (Figure 1a) and this is correct. Here, a greater integral represents that the graph is located higher and, thus, the function is greater.

John: I think the statement is false. Greater integral does not imply greater function. Integral is the area. Thus, a greater integral means a greater area. Take a look of what I have drawn (Figure 1b), the area surrounded by  $f(x)$ ,  $x = a$ ,  $x = b$  and x-axis is larger than that of  $g(x)$ . However,  $f(x)$  is smaller than  $g(x)$ .

George was one of the few students who successfully generated counterexamples, intuitively judging the statement as false; however, he could not determine a counterexample until he noticed  $\forall x \in (a,b)$ .

George: The key point is that for all  $x$  in the interval  $[a, b]$ . In this graph (Figure 1c) I drew, the area surrounded by  $f(x)$ ,  $x = a$ ,  $x = b$  and x-axis is larger than that of  $g(x)$ ; therefore, the integral of  $f$  in  $[a,b]$  is greater than the integral of  $g$  in  $[a, b]$ . But, the function value of  $f$  in the interval  $[a, c]$  is smaller than the function value of  $g$  in the interval  $[a, c]$ . Therefore, the statement is incorrect.




Figure 1: Example and counterexamples of Statement 1.

Statement 2: If  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  are all differentiable and  $f(x) > g(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ , then,  $f'(x) > g'(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ .

For this statement, 40.2% of the students generated examples or counterexamples for verifying or refuting the statement. Most students (e.g. Tanya and Dan) failed to notice the interval and thus failed to generate correct examples or counterexamples.

Tanya: This should be correct. Given  $f(x) = 3x^2 + 5x + 2$  and  $g(x) = x^2 + 6x + 1, f'(x) = 6x + 5, g'(x) = 2x + 6$ . When  $x = 1, f(1)$  is 10, and  $g(1)$  is 8, and  $f'(1)$  is 11, and  $g'(1)$  is 8. Thus, this statement is correct.

Dan: If  $f(x) = x^2 + 1$  and  $g(x) = x, f(x)$  is greater than  $g(x)$ , and  $f'(x) = 2x, g'(x) = 1$ , and  $f'(x)$  is greater than  $g'(x)$ . Thus, this statement is correct.

Cindy noticed the effects of constants in the differentiation process.

Cindy: This statement is false, because constant terms become 0 after differentiation and constant terms influence the size of the function. For instance,  $f(x) = 3x + 1, g(x) = 3x - 5, f(x)$  is greater than  $g(x)$ , but  $f'(x)$  equal to  $g'(x)$ .

Few students (e.g. Tom and Lisa) used graphical representation or the slope of tangent to argue that the mathematical statement was false (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Lisa's and Tom's counter-examples of Statement 2.

Tom: I think a greater function does not imply a greater derivative. This statement is false. Thus, I would like to find an example to prove that larger functions imply higher graphs. The graph of  $f(x)$  is above that of  $g(x)$ . The  $g(x)$  graph is a straight line with a constant slope. However, the slope of  $f(x)$  in the interval of  $(a,b)$  is not always greater than that of  $g(x)$ . Therefore, I proved that this statement is false.

Statement 3: If  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  are all differentiable and  $f'(x) > g'(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ , then  $f(x) > g(x), \forall x \in (a,b)$ .

Statement 3 is a converse statement of Statement 2; nevertheless, the students demonstrated an individual performance in response to these statements. Only 17% of students successfully generated counterexamples for Statements 2 and 3. By contrast, 38.3% of students failed to generate examples or counterexamples, indicating that Statement 3 was more challenging compared with Statement 2.

However, 44.7% of the students neither noticed the interval nor generated correct examples or counterexamples when verifying or refuting the statement. For instance, Johnson assumed that  $f'(x) = 4x, g'(x) = 2x, f'(x)$  is greater than  $g'(x)$ , and  $f(x) = x^2$ , and  $f(x)$  is greater than  $g(x)$ . He did not realise that this example did not satisfy the condition of the statement and ignored the range of  $x$ . In contrast to Johnson, Abbie also said that the statement was true, indicating that  $x$  was positive (Figure 3a) and used algebraic representation to generate an example. But she neglected the meaning of the arbitrary constant  $c$ . She assumed that  $f'(x) = 2x + 1, g'(x) = 1, f'(x)$  is greater than  $g'(x)$ , for all  $x > 0$ , and  $f(x)$  is  $x^2 + x + c, g(x)$  is  $x + c, f(x)$  is greater than  $g(x)$ , for all  $x > 0$ . The 19 students who successfully generated counterexamples all noticed the effect of  $\forall x \in (a,b)$  in the mathematical statement. For instance, Anna connected derivatives and the slope of the tangent, using graphical representation to generate counterexample (Figure 3b); she also indicated that  $f(x)$  is not greater than  $g(x)$ , for all  $x$  in the interval  $(a,b)$ .




Figure 3: Counterexamples of Statement 3.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study explored how first-year engineering students performed when drawing inferences about false mathematical statements. The results showed that compared with integral concepts, the students were more likely to generate counterexamples for derivatives. This finding supports the argument of Perkins and Salomon that students' ability to generate counterexamples is highly related to the context [10]. The graphical representations connected with integrals and derivatives are the area and the slope of the tangent, respectively. However, the area representation is more complex compared with the slope of tangent. This likely explains why few students generated counterexamples in response to Statement 1.

Regarding Statement 1, although using graphical representation is a simple method of generating counterexamples, the students preferred using algebraic representation. Thus, visual-image knowledge and simple drawing skills related to functions are crucial for students to generate appropriate counterexamples. Finally, the differences in the performance of students when processing the three statements showed that the demonstration of flexibility and reversibility of thinking is crucial to completely understanding differentiation and integration in calculus [11].

To decide whether a mathematical statement is correct or incorrect, students must have a thorough understanding of the concept and logical reasoning. In this study, the engineering students demonstrated insufficient understanding of differentiation and integral concepts; therefore, they could not generate proper counterexamples to refute the false mathematical statements. They failed to check that the conditions were satisfied. This is because they are not fluent in using appropriate terms, notations, properties or do not recognise the role of such conditions. To improve the understanding of engineering students regarding calculus concepts, teachers must understand students' misconceptions [12] and spend additional time interpreting relevant concepts. Counterexamples can be used for assessment of learners'

understanding in a broad sense. Furthermore, when using counterexamples for teaching and selecting instructional examples, it is important to take into account learners' preconceptions and misconceptions. The counterexamples generated by participants (e.g. George, Tom, Anna) could serve as pivotal or bridging examples [8]. The power of these examples is also testified by the fact that they tend to be impressed in the memory of students, because of their peculiar features, thus, further helping their learning process.

Because numerous students could not distinguish between examples, which satisfied or did not satisfy the counterexample conditions, they failed to generate accurate counterexamples. For instance, the students could not comprehend the sufficient and necessary conditions in logical statements, particularly, the *if-then* statements used in calculus concepts. Certain students used the counterexamples for converse statements as the counterexample to refute statements, whereas others used examples that satisfied the statements as counterexamples.

These findings are similar to those of Zaslavsky and Peled, who indicated that student-teachers and mathematics teachers used incorrect counterexamples for given statements [2]. In addition, most students neglected the sufficient condition  $\forall x \in (a,b)$ , which was the key to successfully generating counterexamples or examples. Therefore, mathematics education must enable students to understand the sufficient and necessary conditions in logical statements and familiarise them with using logical language, particularly the *if-then* statement in calculus. Teaching strategies that require generating counterexamples may provide a viable teaching orientation.

## REFERENCES

1. Skemp, R., *The Psychology of Learning Mathematics*. London, UK: Penguin Books (1987).
2. Zaslavsky, O. and Peled, I., Inhibiting factors in generating examples by mathematics teachers and student-teachers: the case of binary operation. *J. for Research in Mathematics Educ.*, 27, 1, 67-78 (1996).
3. Watson, A. and Mason, J., *Mathematics as a Constructive Activity: the Role of Learner Generated Examples*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum (2005).
4. Lakatos, I., *Proofs and Refutations: the Logic of Mathematical Discovery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1976).
5. Bills, L., Dreyfus, T., Mason, J., Tsamir, P., Watson, A. and Zaslavsky, O., *Exemplification in Mathematics Education*. In: Novotná, J., Moraová, H., Krátká, M. and Stehlíková, N. (Eds), *Proc. 30th Inter. Conf. on the Psychology of Mathematics Educ.*, Prague: IGPME, 1, 126-154 (2006).
6. Peled, I. and Zaslavsky, O., Counter-examples that (only) prove and counter-examples that (also) explain. *Focus on Learning Problems in Mathematics*, 19, 3, 49-61 (1997).
7. Zaslavsky, O. and Ron, G., *Students' Understanding of the Role of Counter-Examples*. In: Olivier A. and Newstead, K. (Eds), *Proc. Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the Inter. Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Educ.*, Stellenbosch, South Africa: IGPME, 4, 225-232 (1998).
8. Zazkis, R. and Chernoff, E.J., What makes a counterexample exemplary? *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 68, 195-208 (2008).
9. Zazkis, R. and Leikin, R., Generating examples: from pedagogical tool to a research tool. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 27, 15-21 (2007).
10. Perkins, D.N. and Salomon, G., Are cognitive skills content bound? *Educational Researcher*, 18, 1, 16-25 (1989).
11. Haciomeroglu, E.S., Aspinwall, L. and Presmeg, N., *The Role of Reversibility in the Learning of the Calculus Derivative and Antiderivative Graphs*. In: Swars, S.L., Stinson, D.W. and Lemons-Smith, S. (Eds), *Proc. 31th Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Inter. Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Educ.*, Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University: IGPME, 5, 81-88 (2009).
12. Bezuidenhout, J., Limits and continuity: some conceptions of first-year students. *Inter. J. of Mathematical Educ. in Science and Technol.*, 32, 4, 487-500 (2001).

## BIOGRAPHY



Chih-Hsien Huang is an Associate Professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering and the Dean of Student Affairs at Ming Chi University of Technology, Taiwan. He earned his BSc in mathematics from the National Tsing Hua University, and his PhD degree in mathematics from the National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan. His research focuses on mathematics learning for engineering students, as well as mathematical modelling in engineering education and mathematics education. His publications include over 25 papers in international journals and conferences. He is a member of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education.