Remember. . .

Using the self-explanation strategy has been shown to substantially improve students' comprehension of mathematical proofs. Try to use it every time you read a proof in lectures, in your notes or in a book.

CONTACTS

Dr Lara Alcock
Dr Mark Hodds
Dr Matthew Inglis

Mathematics Education Centre
Loughborough University

Self-Explanation Training
for Mathematics Students

mec.lboro.ac.uk

Loughborough University
Mathematics Education Centre

How to Read Proofs:
The "Self-Explanation" Strategy

The "self-explanation" strategy has been found to enhance learners' problem solving and comprehension across a wide variety of subject domains. It can help you to better understand mathematical proofs: in one recent study students who had worked through these materials before reading a proof scored 30% higher than a control group on a subsequent proof comprehension test.

How to Self-Explain

To improve your understanding of a proof, there is a series of techniques you should apply.

After reading each line:

- Try to identify and elaborate the main ideas in the proof.

- Attempt to explain each line in terms of previous ideas. These may be ideas from the information in the proof, examples from previous theorems/proofs, or ideas from your own prior knowledge of the topic area.

- Consider any questions that arise if new information contradicts your current understanding.

Before proceeding to the next line of the proof you should ask yourself the following:

- Do I understand the ideas used in that line?

- Do I understand why those ideas have been used?

- How do those ideas link to other ideas in the proof, other theorems, or prior knowledge that I may have?

- Does the self-explanation I have generated help to answer the questions that I am asking?

On the next page you will find an example showing possible self-explanations generated by students when trying to understand a proof (the labels "(L1)" etc. indicate line numbers). Please read the example carefully in order to understand how to use this strategy in your own learning.

Theorem

No odd integer can be expressed as the sum of three even integers.

Proof

(L1) Assume, to the contrary, that there is an odd integer x, such that $x = a + b + c$, where a, b, and c are even integers.

(L2) Then $a = 2k$, $b = 2l$, and $c = 2p$, for some integers k, l, and p.

(L3) Thus $x = a + b + c = 2k + 2l + 2p = 2(k + l + p)$.

(L4) It follows that x is even; a contradiction.

(L5) Thus no odd integer can be expressed as the sums of three even integers.

After reading this proof, one reader made the following self-explanations:

- "This proof uses the technique of proof by contradiction."

- "Since a, b and c are even integers, we have to use the definition of an even integer, which is used in L2."

- "The proof then replaces a, b and c with their respective definitions in the formula for x."

- "The formula for x is then simplified and is shown to satisfy the definition of an even integer also; a contradiction."

- "Therefore, no odd integer can be expressed as the sum of three even integers."

You must be aware that the self-explanation strategy is not the same as *monitoring* or *paraphrasing*. These two methods will not help your learning to the same extent as self-explanation.

Paraphrasing

- "a, b and c have to be positive or negative, even whole numbers."

There is no self-explanation in this statement. No additional information is added or linked. The reader merely uses different words to describe what is already represented in the text by the words "even integers". You should avoid using such paraphrasing during your own proof comprehension. Paraphrasing will not help your understanding of the text as much as self-explanation.

Monitoring

- "OK, I understand that $2(k + l + p)$ is an even integer."

This statement simply shows the reader's thought process. It is not the same as self-explanation because the student does not relate the sentence to additional information in the text or to prior knowledge. Please concentrate on self-explanation rather than monitoring.

A possible self-explanation of the same sentence would be:

- "OK, $2(k + l + p)$ is an even integer because the sum of three integers is an integer and two times an integer is an even integer."

In this example the reader identifies and elaborates the main ideas in the text. They use information that has already been presented to understand the logic of the proof.

This is the approach you should take after reading every line of a proof in order to improve your understanding of the material.

Practice Proof 1

Please now read this short proof and self-explain each line, either in your head or by making notes on a piece of paper, using the advice from the preceding pages.

Theorem. There is no smallest positive real number.

Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that there exists a smallest positive real number.

Therefore, by assumption, there exists a real number r such that for every positive number s, $0 < r < s$.

Consider $m = \dfrac{r}{2}$.

Clearly, $0 < m < r$.

This is a contradiction since m is a positive real number that is smaller than r.

Thus there is no smallest positive real number.

Practice Proof 2

Here's another more complicated proof for practice. Remember: use the self-explanation training after every line you read, either in your head or by writing on paper.

Definition. An abundant number is a positive integer n whose divisors add up to more than $2n$. For example, 12 is abundant because $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 12 > 24$.

Theorem. The product of two distinct primes is not abundant.

Proof. Let $n = p_1 p_2$ where p_1 and p_2 are distinct primes.

Assume that $2 \le p_1$ and $3 \le p_2$.

The divisors of n are 1, p_1, p_2 and $p_1 p_2$.

Note that $\dfrac{p_1 + 1}{p_1 - 1}$ is a decreasing function of p_1.

So max $\left\{ \dfrac{p_1 + 1}{p_1 - 1} \right\} = \dfrac{2 + 1}{2 - 1} = 3$.

Hence $\dfrac{p_1 + 1}{p_1 - 1} \le p_2$.

So $p_1 + 1 \le p_1 p_2 - p_2$.

So $p_1 + 1 + p_2 \le p_1 p_2$.

So $1 + p_1 + p_2 + p_1 p_2 \le 2 p_1 p_2$.