Investigating Computer Designs for Grounded and Embodied Mathematical Learning

Mitchell NATHAN[a*], Candace WALKINGTON[b] & Michael SWART[a]
[a]*School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA*
[b]*Simmons School of Education & Human Development, Southern Methodist University, USA*
*MNathan@wisc.edu

Abstract: Findings synthesized across five empirical laboratory- and classroom-based studies of high school and college students engaged in geometric reasoning and proof production during single- and multi-session investigations (346 participants overall) are presented. The findings converge on several design principles for computer technologies to support embodied mathematical thinking and learning: (a) the importance of integrating linguistic and body-based processes, especially via *dynamic gestures*, which enable simulated action of mathematical transformations for hypothesizing, testing, and generalizing universal truths about space and shape; (b) the *cognitive relevance* of directed actions to the concepts under consideration so that action-cognition transduction elicits the bodily interactions needed to influence mathematical reasoning in the intended manner; (c) *collaborative contexts* that foster common ground and shared meaning construction, production of socially mediated gestures, and the emergence of extended and distributed knowledge and representations; (d) conditions that encourage *transfer* of sensorimotor experiences across contexts in order to predict and make sense of the world; and (e) the need to assess learners' knowledge and learning that is expressed nonverbally.

The Hidden Village is presented as an instance of an embodied learning environment that uses the narrative context of a visual novel to instantiate these design principles and investigate their influences on mathematical thinking and learning. These design principles are placed in terms of larger efforts to articulate a broader theoretical framework of grounded and embodied learning. Together, the interplay of theoretical, empirical and design considerations of grounded and embodied learning reframes learning, transfer, and assessment, offering promising new pathways for an emerging class of learning environments that may propel educational practice and learning theory.

Keywords: Action-cognition transduction, classroom learning, collaboration, design principles, gesture as simulated action, learning theory, mathematical cognition.

1. Introduction

Grounded and embodied learning (GEL) offers a framework for understanding and designing for meaning making based on body-based processes. These GEL processes include actions, gestures, collaborative movements, and operative speech, as well as processes for eliciting simulated action, such as spatial metaphor, prediction, and imagination. Evidence is mounting that GEL is also activated when learners engage in the directed actions of well-designed educational interventions. This paper summarizes a set of interwoven empirical, theoretical, and design advancements for mathematical reasoning and its broader implications for teaching, learning, educational technology, and assessment.

The **theoretical contributions** offer hypothesis-driven inquiry into the nature of learning and meaning making through body-based experiences, and principled guidance for the design of learning technology and educational experiences. **Empirical** contributions span several laboratory- and classroom-based studies of high school and college students and K-12 teachers; in all, some 346 participants who engaged in 5 single and multi-session investigations. These investigations provide evidence of the role of embodied processes for meaning making in support of mathematical reasoning and theoretically guided design principles to promote learning.

Design advancements to technologies for embodied thinking and learning instantiate theoretically derived hypotheses by creating contexts in which embodied behaviors are elicited and documented. Empirical findings and theory derived from these observations, in turn, inform redesigns

that make further theoretical and empirical advancements possible. The interplay of evidence, design, and GEL theory development offer pathways for progress on complex issues in education, such as generalizing from research, and guiding evidence-based instruction and assessment practices.

2. Theory: Grounded and Embodied Mathematical Cognition

2.1 Assumptions About Cognition

This work builds upon assumptions about cognition. The first is that memories, experiences, and meaning are constructed through the continuous *interactions* among environmental, social, cognitive, motoric, and perceptual processes of a highly dynamic, self-regulating organism, via a *perception-action loop* (Neisser, 1976; Varela et al., 1991). Second, the organism employs a *predictive architecture*, continually anticipating responses to sensorial input from the environment and from within (Clark, 2013; Glenberg, 1997). Third, people engage in cognitive processes that *extend* beyond the individual actor's cranium. Task-relevant knowledge is *embedded* in the situations in which activity unfolds and is *distributed* across actors, objects, and space (Clark & Chalmers, 1998). People can regulate distributed resources through acts such as cognitive *offloading* (Hutchins, 1995; Wilson, 2002). Finally, for learning to be meaningful, new ideas, abstractions, and symbolic representations must be *grounded* in one's lived, sensorimotor experiences (Harnad, 1990; Glenberg et al., 2004), which may include simulations and emergent processes such as those of dynamic systems (Thelen, 1995).

Several scholars have synthesized evidence-based design principles for fostering embodied learning (e.g., Abrahamson et al., 2020; Lindgren & Johnson-Glenberg, 2013; Johnson-Glenberg et al., 2014; Skulmowski & Rey, 2018)), with considerable overlap on these considerations: Motoric engagement; cognitive relevance of actions (aka "action-concept congruency"); and presence, including virtual, sensorial, and social immersion.

2.2 Integrating Linguistic and Body-Based Processes

In addition to assumptions about cognition broadly, mathematical cognition emerges from the interplay of symbolic, verbal, and sensorimotor knowledge and processes. Symbol systems are important disciplinary representations that codify formal knowledge, yet their arbitrary, abstract, and amodal (i.e., ungrounded) nature pose challenges for learners (Nathan, 2012). Oral language, a biologically primary ability, naturally serves as a source for consciously grounding symbol systems, expressing meaning, and representing abstract relations (Koedinger, Alibali & Nathan, 2008). Sensorimotor processes offer a natural complement, through nonverbal and nonsymbolic forms of knowing based on feeling and one's lived experiences. Through the cognitive mechanism of conceptual metaphor, these bodily processes can be the basis for grounding foundational mathematical concepts, such as number, as well as the means to *link* grounded concepts to more abstract topics (Lakoff & Núñez, 2000).

Gestures are a special type of behavior that seem to elegantly bridge oral language, symbols, and sensorimotor processes. *Gestures* are spontaneous acts of the body—most typically the hands and arms—that integrate naturally with public speech (social communication) and inner speech (verbalizable thinking) to make direct indexical reference to the world (deixis), depict worldly objects (iconics) and represent abstract relations (metaphorics) (Alibali & Nathan, 2012). Gesture has three special qualities relevant for embodied mathematical cognition. First, it can manifest simulated actions (Hostetter & Alibali, 2008). As an example, one does not merely imagine *100* as a symbol, but as a location along a mental number line, with a corresponding gesture that may sweep to the right of the body's central axis. Second, gestures can add abstract as well as sensorimotor information from actions into the cognitive encoding of a task. In effect, gestures help to *schematize* the most important qualities of task-relevant actions—physical and simulated actions—facilitating the formation and generalization of task-relevant cognitive processes for future use (Kita et al., 2017). As such, gestures "provide a bridge between concrete actions and more abstract representation" (Goldin-Meadow & Beilock, 2010, p. 672). Third, gestures can express multimodal knowledge that cannot be verbalized, and which may be unconscious or as yet unformed.

2.3 Action-Cognition Transduction: How Actions Produce Ideas

Cognitive processes have historically been framed using computer-based metaphors. A "central processing unit" (CPU) governs the behaviors of "peripherals," which are reduced to input organs in the form of perceptual systems, and output devices in the form of actuators such as our hands, that act upon the world (Eisenberg, 2002). We readily accept that our thoughts can (often) control our actions. *Action–cognition transduction* (ACT) explains how, in reciprocal fashion, body movement can induce mental states and actions (Nathan, 2017). ACT recognizes that the complex coupling that enables cognition to drive actions also runs "in reverse." This alternative cognitive architecture places the functioning of peripherals as also central to cognition, through means such as gestures, eye gaze patterns, epistemic actions, and cognitive offloading (Kirsch & Maglio, 1994; Wilson, 2002). In this way, ACT decentralizes cognition and distributes it among the many sensory and motor processes that all contribute to intellectual behavior. Actions, in this view, literally change our minds. Thus, ACT offers promising avenues for designing learning interventions through bodily engagement.

2.4 Geometric Reasoning and Mathematical Proof Production

Embodied approaches to thinking and learning confront some unique challenges regarding mathematical proof. Proof is a central disciplinary practice among mathematicians, serving as the primary method for testing claims, constructing knowledge, and disseminating research (Lakatos, 2015). For K-12 students, geometry goes beyond thinking about space to forming generalized, logical, and defensible universal claims about imagined entities that extend to all areas of math. By high school, geometry is the primary scholastic content area to learn about proof and exploring universal properties of space and shape (Lehrer & Chazan, 2012). Consequently, geometric proof is a major curriculum standard in mathematics education (NCTM, 2000; Stylianides, 2007).

As a topic of advanced mathematics, proof is steeped in abstractions and formalizations intended to make universal claims about shape and space that go well beyond any one person's range of personal experiences. Furthermore, developing proof performance does not rest on learning of well-rehearsed procedures or algorithms; rather, it requires the development of one's mathematical intuition along with logical, generalizable, and goal-directed, operational thought (Harel & Sowder, 2005).

Despite its importance, educational systems struggle to cultivate valid proof practices (Dreyfus, 1999). As examples, students rely on tautological claims without cultivating true insights about the phenomena of interest and tend to overgeneralize claims derived from specific examples (e.g., Healy & Hoyles, 2000). This prompted our inquiry about ways to promote GEL of proof practices.

2.5 Theoretically Guided Research Questions

We report on the findings from several empirical studies designed to explore the following questions:
(1) What are the emerging cognitive principles for GEL of geometry proof?
(2) How can these principles inform the design of computer-based embodied learning experiences?

3. Empirical Support for GEL of Mathematical Reasoning

3.1 Dynamic Gestures Enact Simulated Actions to Facilitate Geometric Reasoning

This first study (Nathan et al., 2020) asked, *Is geometric reasoning associated with participants' gesture production?* Secondarily, we wanted to know: *Does the strength of the relationship between geometric reasoning and gesture production depend on participants' mathematical expertise?* We analyzed video recordings of 46 mathematics experts and 44 non-experts recruited from a large midwestern university who evaluated the truth of conjectures about geometric properties (Table 1). We used logistic regression for binary outcomes (0/1) to model accuracy of intuition (snap judgments), insight (gist), and proof. To be valid, a proof had to show reasoning that is logical, goal-directed, and operative, and generalizable across the class of mathematical objects under consideration.

Analyses provide empirical support for claims that geometry proof production is an embodied activity, even when controlling for math expertise, language use, and spatial ability. We coded for *dynamic depictive gestures* that portray generalizable properties of shape and space through enactment of transformational operations (e.g., dilation, skewing; Garcia & Infante, 2012; Nathan & Walkington, 2017). *Dynamic depictive gestures* (Figure 1) are contrasted with non-dynamic depictive gestures that may trace or merely refer to mathematical objects and their transformations. Learners who make non-dynamic depictive gestures are more likely to generate correct mathematical intuitions ($p = .004$). Learners who made dynamic depictive gestures are more likely to generate correct insights ($p = 0.04$) and mathematically valid proofs ($p < .0001$) than when no such gestures were made. Furthermore, experts significantly out-performed non-experts and were more likely than non-experts (79% v. 52%) to produce dynamic gestures.

Table 1. *Truth Value, Insights, and Proof for Example Math Conjectures in* The Hidden Village

| Conjecture Text	Truth	Insight	Proof	Cognitively Relevant Directed Actions
The area of a parallelogram is the same as the area of a rectangle with the same length and height	True	(1) Parallelogram is a rectangle tilted or pushed over. (2) States area of a parallelogram and a rectangle have the same formula.	(1) Shows rearranging the area makes them congruent. (2) State all rectangles are parallelograms and therefore the formula for area is the same.	
Given that you know the measure of all 3 angles of a triangle, there is only one unique triangle that can be formed with these 3 angle measurements	False	Similar triangles or infinite/many triangles	(1) Gives specific counterexample (2) Shows scaling or discusses scaling and similar triangles	

Figure 1. Participants reasoning about a conjecture. (a) *Left panel.* A dynamic depictive gesture simulates transformations to reveal generalizable properties. (b) *Right panel.* Non-dynamic gesture of a static property joining two sides meeting at a vertex of a simulated triangle with no transformation.

The benefits of spontaneously produced dynamic gestures were replicated among undergraduates from a large, southwestern university (N = 108). Production of dynamic gestures was associated with mathematical insights ($d = 0.45$, $p < .05$) and mathematically valid proof ($d = 0.74$, $p < 0.001$), whereas production of *any* gesture was not (Walkington, Woods et al., 2019). Dynamic gestures may allow participants to explore generalized properties of shapes and space, thus supporting their geometric reasoning. This suggests that gestures, as simulated actions, provide an alternative account of mathematical reasoning than that of symbolic cognition. This raises the question of whether and how to design learning experiences that elicit gestures in service of mathematics education.

3.2 Directed Actions Through Video Game Play: The Importance of Cognitive Relevance

To explore how eliciting gestures impacts mathematical reasoning, we developed *The Hidden Village* (THV), an embodied video game that uses the *visual novel* genre. We explored *Can we use directed actions to elicit dynamic gestures that will enhance geometry proof performance?* And *Does the cognitive relevance of the directed actions used in the game matter?*

     A player mimics movements of in-game "villagers" doing ordinary activities such as dance and play (Figure 2). THV uses 3D infrared motion-capture technology via the Kinect™ sensor array to track player motion in real time to determine if the player has performed the intended directed action. *Directed actions* are carefully chosen movements curated from prior sessions of successful mathematical reasoning. Once the directed actions are repeatedly matched (e.g., 5 times), the player reads a geometry conjecture (Table 1), decides if it always true or ever false, provides an explanation in speech and gesture (which is video recorded), and then chooses the best multiple-choice response. Completing each conjecture cycle earns a knowledge token and reveals a bit more of the map of THV that reveals the way home.

Figure 2. Flow of *The Hidden Village. Bottom row from left*: (a) Meet a Villager, (b) mimic directed actions of in-game avatar, (c) generate free-responses in speech and gesture for a given mathematical conjecture, (d) select a multiple-choice response, and finally (e) receive a token of knowledge and expose the Village map to find the way home. *Top row:* Game play in a high school classroom.

     In this experiment (Walkington et al., 2021), 85 high school students (65 female) in a program for first-generation college students were recruited. Forty-eight identified as Hispanic, 26 as African American, 5 as Asian, 3 as Caucasian, 2 as other race/ethnicity, and 1 had race/ethnicity data missing. Each student played eight conjectures. Cognitive relevance of the directed actions to each conjecture was manipulated within-subjects (4 relevant, 4 irrelevant). For example, a conjecture was "The area of a parallelogram is the same as the area of a rectangle with the same length and height." The cognitively relevant directed actions in Table 1 schematize the relations that can help foster intuition, insight, and general proof (Nathan & Walkington, 2017). The *irrelevant* directed actions are recycled actions from other conjectures to vary relevance while controlling for physical complexity. Order effects of conjectures were counterbalanced using an 8-item Latin Square factorial design. Participants were not informed that the directed actions were relevant to the conjectures they were asked to prove.

     Inter-rater reliability for gesture coding was established using Cohen's kappa at 0.87 for any gesture, 0.74 for dynamic gestures, and 0.73 for depictive gestures. Data were analyzed using mixed

effects logistic regression models with repeated observations of students solving conjectures nested within student. Participant ID was made a random effect with an additional random effect for conjecture.

In the empirical findings, condition (relevant v. irrelevant) was not a reliable predictor of gesture usage on its own. Still, when participants were cued with relevant actions, they showed superior proof performance compared to times when cued to make irrelevant actions, *provided* they made any gestures ($d = 1.13$, $p < 0.01$), or, more strongly, when they made dynamic depictive gestures ($d = 1.56$, $p < 0.01$). Similar advantages for cognitive relevance were observed for performance on mathematical insight ($d = 1.02$, $p < .01$) and intuition ($d = 1.00$, $p < .01$), *so long as* students produced dynamic gestures during their explanations.

The results suggest that cognitively relevant directed actions contribute to superior mathematical reasoning. This beneficial influence is not direct, however, but appears to be *moderated* by the role of dynamic gestures during students' multimodal explanations. This may be because explanatory gestures help to schematize relevant mathematical information from learners' actions (Kita et al., 2017), thus enabling students to make better use of the conceptual information they obtain via action-cognition transduction when they perform directed actions that are cognitively relevant. Comparable actions that are not cognitively relevant offer fewer benefits to mathematical reasoning.

3.3 Collaborative Gestures Also Enhance Geometric Reasoning: Extended Cognition

Collaboration offers another potential way to increase students' production of dynamic gestures during mathematical reasoning, thus supporting enhanced performance. When high school students (N = 51) from an urban school district in the Southwestern US were observed playing *The Hidden Village* in groups, they operated as a form of distributed system, with mathematical thinking extended across multiple members of the group in speech as well as gestures. Walkington and colleagues (2019, 2021) observed several types of *collaborative gestures,* defined as "gestures that are physically and gesturally taken up by multiple learners, holding a meaning that is explicitly dependent upon the gestures of interactional partners." Forms of collaborative gesture that students exhibited (see Figure 3) included: echoing, as when a gesture was repeated; mirroring, as when an observer matches the speaker's gestures at the same time; alternating, as when an observer proposes an alternate gesture to advance the group's mathematical line of thinking without copying (as in echoing); and joint gestures, as when multiple learners use their hands conjointly to form a single mathematical object or idea.

Figure 3. Example collaborative gestures (1) echoing, (2) mirroring, (3) joint.

They found that gestures--especially collaborative gesture production--contributed significantly to student performance. When group members did not gesture, students generated the correct insight 12% of the time. In comparison, the correct insight was produced more often with non-collaborative gestures (39%) and far more often with collaborative gestures (72%). Extending body-based resources across multiple participants, as well as other resources, reveals additional ways embodiment facilitates cognition.

3.4 Embodied Transfer and the Travel of Ideas

One of the hallmarks of education is to foster transfer, the conditions in which prior experiences facilitate learning and extend its reach to novel areas of performance. Goldstone, Landy, and Son (2008) demonstrate how perceptual learning transfers "not through acquiring and applying symbolic formalisms but rather through modifying automatically perceived similarities between scenarios by

training one's perceptual interpretations" (p. 329). Nathan and Alibali (2021) expand this to include movement as well as perception, reinforcing the recognition that these operate within a highly integrative perception-action loop. They describe how a self-regulatory, predictive architecture that employs transduction processes between action and cognition can bring about transfer through embodied interactions. Two claims are central to this proposal. One is the recognition that learners are not isolated. Rather, transfer of learning is naturally embedded in rich socially mediated environments in which teachers and more knowledgeable peers are a fundamental part of the transfer process. Second, is that transfer is the norm, rather than the exception. Learners are continually adjusting to predict rather than react to the world around them and strive to establish a sense of cohesion across learning settings.

In this small-scale, qualitative, classroom-based study (Kirankumar et al., 2021), 12 students in a high school played THV in small groups during Day 1. On Day 2 they used the THV-Conjecture Editor (Figure 4) to collaboratively co-create new game content for their classmates. In so doing, they had to create cognitively relevant directed actions that would foster mathematical learning among their peers for Day 3, but without telling them—only through embodied game play.


Figure 4. Left. THV Conjecture Editor to create new conjecture for future game play. *Middle.* THV Pose Editor to create directed actions. *Far right.* A new directed action sequence.

Group A chose to create the *ABC Reflection* conjecture (which is false)*: Given three points A, B, and C, and their reflected images about a line, A', B', and C', then ∠ ABC and ∠ A'B'C' are not equal.* Within-group analyses of their collaborative co-design process (Day 2) showed that students regularly produced dynamic depictive gestures while investigating which directed actions would assist new players in forming the proper geometric relations relevant to proving their conjecture. Between-group analyses (Day 2) showed that students in Groups B and D learned some of the key insights and proof elements by enacting the directed actions for the *ABC Reflection* conjecture created by Group A.

The spontaneous gesture produced by students in Group D following Group A's directed actions demonstrated that game play provided an embodied conceptualization of how ∠ ABC changes during reflection over a vertical axis. The gesture made by a student in Group B reveals an understanding of reflection based on the directed actions performed by their teammates. This is demonstrated by a hand flip rather than whole arm/torso flip, showing how the student tracked the key invariant relation (angular measure), mapping that relation across contexts and bodies through the student's own body movement. The action (hand flip) performed in the new context can activate common cognitive states through transduction, which highlights the invariant relation in its new setting. This highlight helps establish the mapping by preserving what must remain invariant as it "travels" across contexts and physical settings.

Although limited in scope, these two cases provide early insights into how ideas can transfer via embodied engagement through game content creation and game play. It illustrates how "transfer is an embedded process, situated in a particular physical and sociocultural learning context" (Nathan & Alibali, 2021, p. 52). It demonstrates ways learners readily map their sensorimotor experiences across contexts to predict and make sense of the world, thus exhibiting the embodied nature of transfer.

4. Discussion

With these empirical findings in mind, we revisit the research questions. For the first question, we highlight four emerging design principles for GEL of geometry proof. One principle is the cognitive benefits of *integrating linguistic and body-based processes.* Gestures are multimodal linguistic forms that both express and influence students' nonverbal (intuition) and verbal (insight and proofs) reasoning, even controlling for spatial ability and prior math education. Dynamic gestures in particular support the simulated actions (Hostetter & Alibali, 2008) used for hypothesizing and generalizing universal truths about space and shape, which is central to geometry proof practices. This principle applies to other topics, such as algebra (Alibali & Nathan, 2012) and engineering (Nathan & Alibali, 2021).

A second principle is that the *cognitive relevance of directed actions* is critical for designing effective interventions to enhance the quality of students' reasoning. This builds in part on the notion that decentralizes thinking by recognizing that cognition and goal-directed actions mutually and reciprocally influence one another through transduction (Nathan, 2017). The mapping of concepts to relevant actions is, however, not a one-to-one relationship, which illustrates its complexity while inviting tremendous variety for the designer. This design constraint appears to rest on the degree to which learners use explanatory gesture (again, integrating linguistic and bodily processes) to schematize key mathematical relationships through movement (Walkington et al., 2021). This principle applies to science topics such as learning about planetary motion (Lindgren & Johnson-Glenberg, 2013).

Creating collaborative contexts is a third principle shown to foster the kinds of gestures that are beneficial to mathematical reasoning and argumentation (Walkington, Chelule et al., 2019). In addition, the collaborative interactions that arise in these contexts support the formation of distributed knowledge and representations exhibited by students' jointly co-constructed collaborative gestures, and the tightly coupled interactions that foster shared meaning, as seen in children's learning about complex systems (Danish et al., 2020).

The final principle is *designing for embodied transfer by supporting production of prior actions*. Transfer emerges from the embodied nature of learning and the natural tendency of learners to predict the world and build cohesion across learning experiences (Nathan & Alibali, 2021). In this sense, transfer is the default mode for engaged learners. Transfer is inherently embedded in socially mediated interactions among learners with teachers, peers, and technologies, allowing ideas to "travel" among groups and across contexts. Recurrent action sequences can bridge the travel of ideas across contexts. Example educational environments designed with this in mind foster enhanced learning in algebra (Ottmar & Landy, 2017) and systems thinking (Goldstone et al., 2008), as well as geometry.

The second research question asks how these principles inform the design of computer-based embodied learning experiences. We explored these design principles in the context of *The Hidden Village* (THV), a visual novel used to engage players in embodied mathematical reasoning. THV is designed to integrate linguistic- and body-based processes during learning and performance assessment. It prompts players to perform cognitively relevant movements curated from prior sessions of successful mathematical reasoning. Following this, THV collects data on players' nonverbal intuitions (i.e., snap judgments) about the truth of the mathematical conjectures of interest. It then elicits these movements during players' multimodal explanations and justifications. THV strives to bridge between exemplar-based concrete thinking and the abstract thinking that is central to generalized, logical proof production.

THV draws on the power of collaboration to engage players in the formation of distributed knowledge. Collaborators are shown to do far more than share knowledge verbally and symbolically. In addition, people come to recognize the representational power and expressiveness of both their own bodies and that of their collaborators. These interactions require establishing a shared understanding as well as offering ways to extend their own embodied thoughts onto the malleable world around them.

THV also explores the power of collaborative co-creation of new mathematical content to share with others. Student-creators come to recognize some of the ways their novel mathematical ideas become grounded in movement. They can then use movement as a means for transferring generalizable math concepts to others, who, in turn, demonstrate these concepts through their own individual and collaborative movements. By recognizing transfer as an inherently embodied process, THV proposes alternative ways to build shared knowledge. This last point raises considerations about the role of the body in assessment, as learners may exhibit their emerging understanding through movements before they are explicitly aware of new emergent meanings or before they can verbalize new ways of thinking (Church & Goldin-Meadow, 1986; Goldin-Meadow, Alibali, & Church, 1993).

Here, we have looked at the close relationship among empirical evidence, theory building, and design to investigate pathways for progress on complex issues facing GEL. We believe this work starts

to establish an empirical basis for theorizing how linguistic and bodily knowledge among individuals and groups serves advanced mathematical reasoning, and the technological designs to support these types of social and embodied interactions. Still, this work has several limitations. One is the provisional nature of many of these empirical findings, which must face replication using larger and more varied samples, conducted with less direct input from the original research team. Another is that the principles themselves need to be tested with other digital platforms and using a broad array of tasks and student outcome measures before they can be truly regarded as well established and generalizable. Our interest is to foster this additional research and the scrutiny it offers for theory and design. We take these initial steps as promising forays into a new class of technologies for grounded and embodied learning.

Acknowledgements

References

Abrahamson, D., Nathan, M. J., Williams-Pierce, C., Walkington, C., Ottmar, E. R., Soto, H., & Alibali, M. W. (2020, August). The future of embodied design for mathematics teaching and learning. *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 5, p. 147). Frontiers.

Alibali, M. W., & Nathan, M. J. (2012). Embodiment in mathematics teaching and learning: Evidence from learners' and teachers' gestures. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *21*(2), 247-286.

Church, R. B., & Goldin–Meadow, S. (1986). The mismatch between gesture and speech as an index of transitional knowledge. *Cognition*, *23*, 43–71.

Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *36*(3), 181-204.

Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis*, *58*(1), 7−19.

Danish, J. A., Enyedy, N., Saleh, A., & Humburg, M. (2020). Learning in embodied activity framework: A sociocultural framework for embodied cognition. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, *15*(1), 49-87.

Dreyfus, T. (1999). Why Johnny can't prove. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 38*(1–3), 85–109.

Eisenberg, M. (2002). Output devices, computation, and the future of mathematical crafts. *International Journal of Computers for Mathematical Learning*, *7*, 1-44.

Garcia, N., & Infante, N. E. (2012). Gestures as facilitators to proficient mental modelers. In L. R. Van Zoest, J.-J. Lo, & J. L. Kratky (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (pp. 289–295). Kalamazoo: WMU.

Glenberg, A. M. (1997). What memory is for. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *20*(1), 1−19.

Glenberg, A. M., Gutierrez, T., Levin, J. R., Japuntich, S., & Kaschak, M. P. (2004). Activity and imagined activity can enhance young children's reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *96*(3), 424-436.

Goldin-Meadow, S., Alibali, M. W., & Church, R. B. (1993). Transitions in concept acquisition: Using the hand to read the mind. *Psychological Review, 100*(2), 279–297.

Goldstone, R. L., Landy, D., & Son, J. Y. (2008). A well-grounded education: The role of perception in science and mathematics. In M. de Vega, A. Glenberg, & A. Graesser (Eds.)., *Symbols, embodiment and meaning* (pp. 327-355). Oxford.

Harel, G., & Sowder, L. (1998). Students' proof schemes: Results from exploratory studies. *Research in Collegiate Mathematics Education III*, 234-283.

Harel, G., & Sowder, L. (2005). Toward comprehensive perspectives on the learning and teaching of proof. In F. Lester (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 805-842). NCTM.

Harnad, S. (1990). The symbol grounding problem. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, *42*(1-3), 335-346.

Healy, L., & Hoyles, C. (2000). A study of proof conceptions in algebra. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 31*(4), 396–428.

Hostetter, A. B., & Alibali, M. W. (2008). Visible embodiment: Gestures as simulated action. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *15*(3), 495-514.

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the Wild*. MIT Press.

Johnson-Glenberg, M. C., Koziupa, T., Birchfield, D., & Li, K. (2011, June). Games for learning in embodied mixed-reality environments: Principles and results. In *Proceedings of the 7th GLS Conference* (pp. 129-137).

Kirankumar, V., Sung, H., Swart, M., Kim, D., Xia, F., Kwon, O. H., Nathan, M. J., & Walkington, C. (2021). Embodied transmission of ideas: Collaborative construction of geometry content and mathematical thinking. *Proceedings of the 2021 Annual Meeting of the ISLS.* Bochum, Germany (virtual). ISLS.org.

Kirsh, D., & Maglio, P. (1994). On distinguishing epistemic from pragmatic action. *Cognitive Science*, *18*(4), 513-549.

Kita, S., Alibali, M. W., & Chu, M. (2017). How do gestures influence thinking and speaking? The gesture-for-conceptualization hypothesis. *Psychological Review*, *124*(3), 245.

Knuth, E. J. (2002). Secondary school mathematics teachers' conceptions of proof. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *33*(5), 379-405.

Koedinger, K. R., Alibali, M. W., & Nathan, M. J. (2008). Trade-offs between grounded and abstract representations: Evidence from algebra problem solving. *Cognitive Science*, *32*(2), 366-397.

Lakatos, I. (2015). *Proofs and refutations: The logic of mathematical discovery*. Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Núñez, R. (2000). *Where mathematics comes from.* Basic books.

Ottmar, E., & Landy, D. (2017). Concreteness fading of algebraic instruction: Effects on learning. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *26*(1), 51-78.

Lehrer, R., & Chazan, D. (Eds.). (2012). *Designing learning environments for developing understanding of geometry and space*. Routledge.

Lindgren, R., & Johnson-Glenberg, M. (2013). Emboldened by embodiment: Six precepts for research on embodied learning and mixed reality. *Educational researcher*, *42*(8), 445-452.

Nathan, M. J. (2012). Rethinking formalisms in formal education. *Educational Psychologist*, *47*(2), 125–148.

Nathan, M. J. (2021). *Foundations of embodied learning: A paradigm for education*. Routledge.

Nathan, M. J. & Alibali, M. W. (2021). An embodied theory of transfer of mathematical learning. In Charles Hohensee and Joanne Lobato (Eds.) *Transfer of learning: Progressive perspectives for mathematics education and related fields* (pp. 27-58). Springer.

Nathan, M. J., & Walkington, C. (2017). Grounded and embodied mathematical cognition: Promoting mathematical insight and proof using action and language. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, *2*(1), 1-20.

Nathan, M. J., Schenck, K. E., Vinsonhaler, R., Michaelis, J. E., Swart, M. I., & Walkington, C. (2020). Embodied geometric reasoning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*.

Nathan, M. J., Walkington, C., Boncoddo, R., Pier, E., Williams, C. C., & Alibali, M. W. (2014). Actions speak louder with words: The roles of action and pedagogical language for grounding mathematical proof. *Learning and Instruction*, *33*, 182-193.

NCTM [National Council of Teachers of Mathematics]. (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Neisser, U. (1976). *Cognition and reality: Principles and implications of cognitive psychology*. San Francisco, CA: WH Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.

Skulmowski, A., & Rey, G. D. (2018). Embodied learning: introducing a taxonomy based on bodily engagement and task integration. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, *3*(1), 1-10.

Stylianides, A. J. (2007). Proof and proving in school mathematics. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 38*(3), 289–321.

Thelen, E. (1995). Time-scale dynamics and the development of an embodied cognition. In T. van Gelder & R. Port (Eds.) *Mind as motion: Explorations in the dynamics of cognition* (pp. 69-100). MIT Press.

Varela, F., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Walkington, C., Chelule, G., Woods, D., & Nathan, M. J. (2019). Collaborative gesture as a case of extended mathematical cognition. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, *55*, 100683.

Walkington, C., Nathan, M. J., Wang, M. & Schenck, K. (2021). *The effect of cognitive relevance of directed actions on mathematical reasoning*. Manuscript currently under review.

Walkington, C., Wang, M. & Nathan, M. J. (2021). Collaborative gestures among high school students conjointly proving geometric conjectures. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Congress on Mathematics Education (ICME-14), Shanghai, China*.

Walkington, C., Woods, D., Nathan, M. J., Chelule, G., & Wang, M. (2019). Does restricting hand gestures impair mathematical reasoning? *Learning and Instruction*, *64*, 101225.

Williams-Pierce, C. C., Pier, E. L., Walkington, C., Boncoddo, R., Clinton, V., Alibali, M. W., & Nathan, M. J. (2017). What we say and how we do: Action, gesture, and language in proving. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *48*(3), 248-260.

Wilson, M. (2002). Six views of embodied cognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 9*(4), 625-636.