International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 7 Issue 4, April 2018,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 6.765
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

# TITLE: A STUDY ON MODEL CATEGORIES AND FUNCTION CALCULUS

**PROF. JAY PRAKASH TIWARI**
Department of Mathematics,
Patel group of institutions,indore

***KEYWORDS:***
Algebra, Functions.

**ABSTRACT**

Many early college mathematics students have acquired abilities before developing a fundamental knowledge of the topic, which was identified as a source of worry. Despite the fact that the concept of function is heavily emphasized in intermediate mathematics, a trial study conducted at a prestigious Academic institution discovered that a significant percentage of students with excellent university entry scores have a poor knowledge of it. Despite the fact that most pupils were familiar with functional families, many have yet to provide a requires effective or decide whether a certain graph or rule reflected a function; and many were just unable to establish proper connections among function graphs and tables of values.



**1. INTRODUCTION** : This idea of a function having long been regarded as an integrating concept in mathematics, as well as in mathematics or the actual world. It is generally acknowledged that because a solid grasp of a idea of functional is critical for calculus students. Most of the work in secondary education is done in the latter years. This study of calculus is emphasized in the mathematics curriculum. The most important aspect is the function. In calculus, an objects is a function, not some other function, but a continuous function, so to truly comprehend . In order to succeed in calculus, learners must have a strong grasp of functions. According to research (see below), Knowledge of function takes time to develop, and so many people have done so in the past. Undergraduates exhibited a lack of functional understanding. Much of this research was done in the early 1990s; two decades have gone since then, but has anything changed. The research presented in this paper looks into current employees' conceptual understanding of their jobs a group of students from a prestigious Australian university. In just this section, we'll research the history of the term "function" as well as its current definition mathematics. The studies on students' misconceptions about functionalities would also be covered inside this study. With a number of instructional practices that include a focus on different presentations. Meaning and Background Within mathematics, this notion of functional always has at since the 17th century. Over all that period, a lot has changed. In regard to aspects, Leibniz coined the term 'function' in 1692. various curves, including a point's slope . Bernoulli coined the term "functions" to define an equation comprised of the a variables and also some variables in the early 1800s: "You defines now Component of the a variables a value built in just about any manner whatsoever of the this variables so of constant" (quoted in Kleiner, 1989, p. 284). According to Kleiner, Euler popularised the term by considering mathematics as just a theoretical model of functions. Euler's theory on functions had improved by 1748, when he wrote: When some variables are dependent upon it in such a way that when the former varies, the previous changes as well, the former values are referred to as function of latter quantities. This is really a broad concept that encompasses all the ways for which any statistic could be influenced from other quantities. If x is a variable item, so its factor relates to all the variables that reflect on it in some way or are determined by it (cited in Kleiner, 1989, p. 288). By the 19th century, new notions of 'function' had emerged, leading to Dirichlet's 1837 definition: y is a function of a variable x, defined on the interval a x b, if there is a definite value of the variable y for every value of the variable x in this interval. Furthermore, it makes no difference how this correspondence is established (cited in Kleiner, 1989, p. 291). Discussions concerning that literal definition between functionality or variables there in twentieth century led to Bourbaki's formal ordered pairings description of function in 1939: a relationship among tuple wherein every initial component has a distinct two elements. Suppose E and F represent different pairs that are either unique or otherwise. A function relationship with y is indeed a relationship between such a changeable item processing of E as well as a variables component y of F and that there appears a distinct yF in the specified reference to x for all x E. The action that correlates each component x E with component yF that is in the provided relation with x is called a function (quoted in Kleiner, 1989, p. 299). This Bourbaki concept, also known as that of the Stochastic description, is a popular choice. "You describe a functional as just a between any sets, termed the scope the ranges, such that each item inside the scope correlates to precisely single member inside the range," says a typical Australian college textbook description. However a variation of a Bourbaki definition available with various in books or courses, "the examples used it to demonstrate or engage also with idea were typically, often entirely, functions whose rule of correspond is specified by a formula," according to Vinner and Dreyfus (1989). As a result, students tend to give a Bourbaki-type description of function if questioned, yet actual performance on recognition or construct assignments may be founded on the formulaic notion. Despite the fact that syllabus records have included a description of the feature idea, Tall and Bakar (1991) assert that meaning "also isn't overwhelmed as well as demonstrates to just be inoperable, to pupil analysis of the purpose reliant on characteristics of acquainted technology demonstrator examples" (p. 212), resulting in many misunderstandings among classmates. Tall and Bakar, for example, found that 44 percent of 109 students commencing a college mathematics program thought a thus becomes was not a functional in at most one of its graphical or algebraic forms, owing to the fact that y is independent of the value of x. Furthermore, 62% of the students considered a circle to be a function. Despite the relevance of many representations in secondary school mathematics, according to Blume and Heckman (1997), many students do not understand the links between them. Carlson (1998) conducted research with high-achieving kids who had either. Several of the trainees, according to Carlson, did not comprehend functional writing or the roles of a variables in a particular problem. I couldn't describe just what meant to represent any number as a functional of another because I didn't understand what it intended to indicate any number as just a functional of another.They couldn't communicate with one another since they didn't understand the words of function. The students indicated that they had removed . In the lack of time for reflection and inquiry, comprehension is achieved by memorization. According to Oehrtman, Hansen, and Thomson (2008), citing to Carlson's 1998 study, just 7% of A-students in college algebra and 25% of A-students in undergraduate geometry could create a proper example. As an example, 2nd semester calculus yielded x = y." (p. 151). Since constant function (e.g., y 5) do not alter, pupils assumed they were not functional. "Only one function has all of its output identical to each other," he says when asked for examples. Most of these pupils, according to Oehrtman, Carlson, and Thomson, have been unable to compute f(x) a provided a functional f(x) , with 43% of collegiate algebra classmates trying to get f( x+a) by putting a to the conclusion of a equation for f(x) rather than inserting x a kind into the function. Students typically explained the responses in term of a remembered method instead of conceiving of x as an output to the functions when asked to explain their thoughts. Learners often memories without comprehending that the graphs of a function g provided by g( x)= f( x+a) is moved to the left of the slope of f "but expecting students to find or interpret that assertion as indicating 'the result of g at each and every x is the same'," according to Oehrtman, Carlson, and Thompson. Learners easily associated the visual qualities of a real-world event with similar qualities of a graph of a function that describes the circumstance, according to Oehrtman, Carlson, and Thompson (2008). Special properties of diagrams, such as pivotal moments, are often the subject of mathematics instruction. Important turning sites and slope True function models sometimes have similar features. A road heading up a steep hill, a bend in the highway, or a car slowing down are examples of characteristics. Oehrtman, The apparent closeness of the these aspects of charts and the real world is noted by Carlson and Thompson. Including for pupils who have a strong understanding of function, the setting can be confusing. Every graphs of a functional is viewed by learners as just a representation of a physical state instead of a mapping from such a set of inputs to a number of output values. Mastering function in these kind of real-world situations which reflect dramatic change is a crucial step toward advanced math accomplishment (p. 154). Teachers' mathematics or mathematics curriculum practices, as according Norman (1992), is critical to understanding both classroom instruction of the function notion. Norman states that teachers, including those who were "particularly mathematically educated," had gaps in their grasp of function in a research with ten teachers pursuing a master's degree in mathematics education. The majority of teachers could give an informal description of function that would be helpful in conveying the subject to someone who didn't understand it. The proper definition of function, on the other hand, generated much confusion, as illustrated by one teacher's response:

**METHOD:** Some results of a mathematics quiz (made reference to as 'quiz') utilised with a cohorts from first college mathematics students as part of a preliminary research study at an Academic institution are discussed in this work. As least one mathematical topic had been completed by all of the students, that included During their high school years, they will study mathematics. This quiz was provided via the internet and it was made accessible to anyone who wanted to take it. students as soon as possible following the commencement of their first semester, so that students' existing mathematical abilities can be assessed.The level of comprehension and expertise they had attained by the end of secondary school remained quite constant school. The great majority of the students polled were enrolled in degree programmers with entry levels. demonstrating that pupils in their final year of secondary school were in the top 8% of their cohort in terms of success .Despite the fact that no particular information about their math score was gathered. When the quiz was given, There were students enrolled. Those mathematical courses intended to increase the intake' mathematics understanding that needed students to grasp the notion underlying calculus functionality. Email as well as informal reminders from instructors drew participants' focus to the quiz. That university's Learning Management System has been used to take the test. Involvement of children in the research project seemed completely optional, and the quiz wasn't really related to any of subjects we were studying researching. The exam was timed (35 minutes) so pupils have only been allowed single attempt. Only 427 pupils out of around 2000 who had access to the quiz responded. Since all of the teachers took the quiz, not all of students completed all the questions. The answers of the 383 pupils that took part in the survey. The majority of the quizzes was completed and analyzed. The test consisted of 16 queries that were meant to elicit information. Students' grasp of pronumerals and functions (not reported in this article). After the first semester was completed, a sample of quiz responders who had misunderstood at least a handful of the sixteen test questions was chosen. Personal face-to-face interviews conducted with the student participants. Even during discussion, every participant were asked to clarify his reasoning in response to the questions that were comparable to the test questions that they had answered poorly. This quiz's topics 1 to 11 were all for the notion of function; the paper is about the participants' replies to such questions. The questions were created to test pupils' ability in the following areas:

• recognizing functions using rules or statements (question 2) or diagrams (question 11);

• recognizing different functions using graphing (questions 5, 6, 7) or tables (question 8, 9, 10);

• for just a function f, replacing numeric or mathematical values (question 3).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION : Question 1**

Question 1 is indeed a wide question which invites learners to describe functionality in their own words: "Express what such a functional is already in simple English." Question 1 was completed by about 95% of the 385 students. Only 214 of the 381 students (58.4%), or 61 percent of everyone who responded, was capable of giving any or more accurate function descriptions, while most explanations reflected improper notions, confirming Tall and Baker's findings (1991). Throughout Table 1, valid characteristics are listed as following: principle connecting variables; particular feature of predictor variables for every worth of independent variable; diagonal line test (a vertical line drawn everywhere on the chart of a feature crosses the chart only once); cartography among independent and dependent variable values; modeling including one or many-to-one communications; diagram of relationship between independent and dependent variables.

The following sentences demonstrate the vast range of answers from students:

• A functionality is indeed a regulation which connects equal values of one dependent variable towards the quantities of some other dependent variable in a way that now the independent variables quantity's price is primary data collection more specific by a first variable quantity's content.

• It's just a formula with one y value for each x value. When we draw lines through graph's plots, your arrow will go through once.

• A mappings through one set to another, typically in the shape of a rules, the with feature so each source does have a distinct output.

• A graph with a vertically line passing the graphical method f(x)

• It is indeed similar to a computer with outputs and inputs. As well as the result is linked to the source in some way.

• Every device which accepts a solitary input and returns an output level. Consider, for illustration, an orange juice.

• This is a technique which changes shifting integers that are entered to make them right various figures when they are output.

• Just one relationship is what a functional is.

· Some with the capacity to execute multiple tasks.

• Anything containing the letter x.

• In mathematical language, explain the reality.

Although some students truly had a strong grasp of a functional idea, everyone else had attempted to remember descriptions, frequently to no avail, as in the instance of "a functional is a one-to-many relationship." Some, inspired either by current count analogy, demonstrated naive mental grasp.

**Table 1 : Answers to Question 1 (by Category)**

| Students' responses contain concepts that are present in their responses. | This element was included by a certain percentage of all quiz takers. 385 people were involved. | This element was included by a certain percentage of Q1 respondents. 373 people were involved. |
|---|---|---|
| **Rule** | **54** | **58** |
| **Each x-value has a unique y-value.** | **20** | **22** |
| **Test with a vertical line** | **5** | **5** |
| Mapping | **5** | **5** |
| **Is it a one-to-one or a many-to-one relationship?** | **6** | **6** |
| Graph | **7** | **8** |
| **There must be at least one valid description.** | **61** | **65** |
| **Unanswered** | **7** | |

**Question 2:**

**Students were given six descriptors in Question 2 and asked to identify which ones defined functions (items 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3e):**

**3a. f (x) = x2 -2 where x ∈ ℝ**

**3b. f ( x)= ax + b where x, a, b, c ∈ ℝ**

$x2 \quad if \quad x \leq 0$

3c. $f(x) = \{2 \quad if \ 0 < x \leq 1 \quad for\ all\ x \in \mathbb{R}$

$2x \quad if\ x > 1$

$2x + 1 \quad if\ x < 2$

**3d.** $f(x) = \{$

$-5x + 3 \qquad if\ x > 1$

$for\ all\ x \in \mathbb{R}$

**3e. Let f be a function whose rule**

**3f. Let f be a function whose rule**

One goal of question 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3e was to see if learners could identify activity in a variety of textual or symbol forms, ranging from recognizable prototype of function (item 3a) to hybrids forms with more than one rules description (item 3c) or worded descriptions (item 3e). The latter style of presentation is rarely or seen studied on at the high school level, but it is regularly seen at the university level, so school students fail to recognize a functional when it is presented in a manner where no rule can be determined instantly.

Question 2 was finished by everyone 384 individuals, but still only 24 (7%) answered accurately to all six answers. The percentage of 384 students in choosing each of the regulations as determining functions are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Question 2: Percent of Students Choosing Each Descriptor**

| A statement or a rule | (n = 384) percent of pupils who marked as function | (n = 383) percent of correct responses |
|---|---|---|
| 3a* | 92 | 92 |
| 3b* | 91 | 91 |
| 3c* | 90 | 87 |
| 3d* | 87 | 86 |
| 3f* | 61 | 57 |

The unexpected population of schools (11 percent or 15%, respectively) who did not accept that the rules presented in items 3a and 3b formed function was possibly perplexed either by presence of a surd and surd variables that are pronumeral 73 students (19%) thought the hybrid rules in items 3c and 3d were correct. Although these kids did in fact understand function, however neither rule in item 3c nor even the rule in thing 3d did. Although they answered properly for question 3d, the explanation was most likely erroneous. Notwithstanding their previous experiences. This idea of a composite function appears to have run rampant in upper high mathematics. In contrast to their preconceived notion of a function as defined by a recognized rule, such as a A quadratic or polynomial rule can be used. Even though 289 educators (75 percent) correctly answered product 3c, just 96 of the these classmates accepted that rule 3d did not describe a purpose, with several educators missing the correlation between both the combination body of norms and the feature property which each valuation of the variable must correlate to a unique dependent variable. 177 students (46.2 percent) thought however neither assertion in question 3e nor the statement in 3f provided a relation for the verbal assertions in item 3e and 3f. For these kids, the concept of function was most often represented by an algebra rule or a diagram.

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**: Even though different universities possess distinct entry criteria and assume various levels of prior knowledge, people studying arithmetic as a standalone topic or even as portion of a scientific knowledge, business, or advanced degree must have a fundamental level of competency with fundamental skills such as linear algebra deception. Cognition is more difficult to enforce, but it may be inferred by looking at things pupils studied in secondary education. Thus, if mathematics or probabilities, for instance, were taught in college, it would be natural to suppose that the curriculum contained a thorough examination of equations, and also that features might be updated instead of built from scratch at the university level. All that follows is constructed on fragile grounds if students lose the basic knowledge required. You were addressing the notion of functionality with in framework of a realm and made the request which are the entire R or subsets of R at the end of secondary education. When kids arrive at the school,This concept of purpose is rapidly expanded in a variety of ways at college; for instance, we can consider Being function having realm C and get really R, Re(z) or Im(z) can be thought of as a bijection that maps C to R onto $R^n$, we look at functions from $R^n$ to R – multivariable functions; in algebra, we consider of .We look at inner factors mapping $R^n$ to R, and so on, for functions from $R^m$ to $R^n$. After that, we examine a a broader concept of function in which the domain and codomains are polynomial and matrix or events, and I'm still in my first year after university.

**REFERENCES**

[1]Blume, G. & Heckman, D. (1997). What do students know about algebra and functions? In P. Kenney
& E. Silver (Eds.), *Results from the Sixth Mathematics Assessment of the National Assessment of Educational Progress*, pp. 225–277. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of
Mathematics.

[2]Bridger, M. & Bridger, M. (2001). Mapping diagrams: another view of functions. In A. Cuoco & F. R.
Curcio (Eds.), *The roles of representation in school mathematics*, pp. 103–116. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

[3]Carlson, M. P. (1998). A cross-sectional investigation of the development of the function concept.
*Research in Collegiate Mathematics Education III, Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Issues in Mathematics Education, 7*(2), 114–162.

[4]Clement, L. (2001). What do students really know about functions? *Mathematics Teacher*, *94*(9), 745–
748.

[4]Cooney, T. J. & Wilson, M. J. (1993). Teachers thinking about functions: Historical and research
perspectives. In T. A. Romberg, E. Fennema & T. P. Carpenter. *Integrating research on the graphical representation of functions* (pp. 131–158). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[5]Eisenberg, T. (1992). On the development of a sense for functions. In E. Dubinsky & G. Harel (Eds.),
*The concept of function: Aspects of epistemology and pedagogy* (pp. 153–174).

[6]Kieran, C. (1993). Functions, graphing, and technology: Integrating research on learning and
instruction. In T. Carpenter, E. Fennema, & T. Romberg (Ed.), *Integrating research in the graphical representation of functions*, pp.189–237. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[7]Kieran, C. & Yerushalmy, M. (2004). Computer algebra systems and algebra: Curriculum, assessment,
teaching, and learning. In K. Stacey, H. Chick, & M. Kendal (Eds.), *The Future of the Teaching*

*and Learning of Algebra: The 12th ICMI study (pp. 99-154)*. Norwood, MA: Kluwer Academic
Publishers.

[8]Kleiner, I. (1989). Evolution of the function concept: a brief survey. *The College Mathematics*
*Journal*, *20*(4), 282–300.

[10]Knuth, E. (2000). Understanding connections between equations and graphs, *The Mathematics*
*Teacher*, *93*(1), January 2000, pp. 48–53.

[11]Norman, A. (1992). Teachers' mathematical knowledge of the concept of function. In E. Dubinsky &
G. Harel (Eds.), *The concept of function: Aspects of epistemology and pedagogy*, pp. 215–58.
Washington, DC: The Mathematical Association of America.

[12]Oehrtman, M. C., Carlson, M. P., & Thompson, P. W. (2008). Foundational reasoning abilities that
promote coherence in students' understandings of function. In M. P. Carlson & C. Rasmussen
(Eds.), *Making the connection: Research and practice in undergraduate mathematics*, pp. 150–
170). Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.

[12]Sierpinska, A. (1992). On understanding the notion of function. In E. Dubinsky & G. Harel (Eds.), *The*
*concept of function: Aspects of epistemology and pedagogy*, pp. 22–58. Washington, DC: The
Mathematical Association of America.

[13]Tall, D. & Bakar, N. (1991). Students' mental prototypes for functions and graphs. In P. Boero & F.
Furinghetti (Eds.), *Proceedings* of *PME 15*, Assisi, Vol. 1, pp. 104–111. Assisi: Program Committee of the 15th PME Conference.