



Developing Mathematical Thinking: Time Matters

DMTI INSIGHTS

BY

Jonathan Brendefur, PhD
and Associates

TIME MATTERS: HOW INSTRUCTIONAL MINUTES SHAPE MATHEMATICAL UNDERSTANDING

(DMT INSIGHTS)

Introduction: Time ≠ Quality

Across the nation, educators are working to improve mathematics achievement amid rising standards, limited instructional time, and increasing expectations for depth of understanding. One of the most powerful—but often overlooked—levers for improvement is **how instructional time is allocated and structured**. Minutes are not neutral; they determine whether teachers can engage students in **problem-solving, reasoning, and discourse**, or whether instruction is reduced to surface-level coverage. Research from **cognitive science, developmental psychology, and mathematics education** converges on a clear conclusion: students need **sufficient, consistent, and intentionally structured time** to develop durable mathematical understanding. Importantly, this research does **not** suggest that simply adding minutes automatically improves learning. Rather, it shows that **without sufficient time, high-leverage instructional practices cannot reliably occur at all**, regardless of curriculum quality or teacher effort (Hiebert & Grouws, 2007; National Research Council, 2001).

What Does the Developing Brain Require From Mathematics Instructional Time?

From a cognitive psychology perspective, mathematics instruction must align with the developing brain's realities. **Cognitive load theory** demonstrates that **working memory is highly limited**, particularly when students encounter new procedures, representations, or multi-step reasoning (Sweller, 1988). Long stretches of uninterrupted teacher talk overload this system, reducing comprehension and retention. Instead, effective mathematics instruction requires **purposeful segmentation**—brief instruction followed by exploration, discussion, and reflection. These instructional shifts are **cognitive necessities**, not pedagogical preferences, because they allow students to process, organize, and integrate new information into long-term memory (Sweller, 1988; Sweller, Ayres, & Kalyuga, 2011).

Equally important is the **spacing effect**, one of the most robust findings in learning science. Research shows that learning is stronger and more durable when practice is **distributed over time rather than massed** (Cepeda et al., 2006). Daily engagement with mathematics—through retrieval routines, cumulative review, and repeated encounters with core ideas—helps maintain and strengthen understanding. **Without consistent daily activation, both conceptual and procedural knowledge decay**, particularly for students who rely most on school-based learning opportunities. Automaticity, which frees working memory for higher-order reasoning, requires **repeated, distributed practice** rather than irregular exposure (Baroody, 2006). Thus, the central issue is not whether teachers value rich

instruction, but whether **there is sufficient instructional time for that instruction to function as intended.**

How Much Daily Mathematics Time Do Students Need?

Research integrating cognitive principles with mathematics education points to a clear developmental progression in daily Tier 1 instructional time. In **Grades K–2**, students are building foundational number concepts through experiences with quantity, comparison, and structure. These ideas require time for **manipulation, discussion, representation, and revisiting concepts**. Research supports **70–90 minutes daily** of core mathematics instruction, not to accelerate pacing, but to allow young learners to engage in developmentally appropriate cycles of exploration and sense-making. A workshop-style structure—brief instruction followed by extended small-group and hands-on learning—supports attention limits while promoting deep understanding.

In **Grades 3–5**, students transition to more abstract content, including multi-step operations, fractions, and early algebraic reasoning. These concepts demand opportunities for **rich problem solving, strategy comparison, and discourse**. A daily block of **60–75 minutes** allows teachers to include retrieval routines, conceptual investigation, guided practice, and consolidation. When time is compressed, teachers are often forced to choose between **depth and coverage**, even though research consistently shows that **depth supports long-term retention and transfer more effectively than rapid coverage** (Hiebert & Carpenter, 1992; Schmidt, Wang, & McKnight, 2005).

In **Grades 6–8**, departmentalized schedules typically provide **50–70 minutes** of mathematics instruction. Adolescents still benefit from lessons divided into phases to manage cognitive load as abstraction increases. Topics such as proportional reasoning, expressions, equations, geometry, and statistics require **sustained problem-solving paired with structured discussion and formalization**. Across all grade bands, research supports a **minimum of 60 minutes of Tier 1 mathematics daily**, not because more time guarantees learning, but because **less time reliably prevents high-leverage instructional practices from occurring** (Banilower et al., 2013; National Research Council, 2001).

What Happens Inside a 50–70 Minute Mathematics Block?

Research suggests that effective mathematics learning unfolds through a complete cognitive cycle that cannot be compressed into short periods. A sustained block allows students to **(a) activate prior knowledge, (b) engage in effortful problem solving, (c) discuss and refine strategies, and (d) consolidate learning into durable understanding**. While specific instructional approaches vary, studies consistently show that each phase requires time to emerge (Kapur, 2014; Hattie & Yates, 2014).

Typically, the block begins with a brief **activation of prior knowledge**, supporting retrieval and attentional readiness. This is followed by an extended period of **exploration and reasoning**, during which students grapple with mathematical ideas, test strategies, and make sense of representations. **Whole-group discussion and consolidation** then play a critical role in connecting ideas, addressing misconceptions, and formalizing understanding. Finally, **purposeful practice** or reflection helps stabilize learning and prepare students for future retrieval.

Shortened or fragmented instructional periods interrupt this sequence. When lessons end before discussion and consolidation, students may complete tasks without integrating their understanding. Research on cognitive load and productive struggle indicates that learning is strongest when students are given enough uninterrupted time to struggle, resolve, and reflect within a single session, rather than restarting the cognitive process multiple times across

the day.

How Should Intervention Time Be Added Without Weakening Core Instruction?

Within a **Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)**, one principle is non-negotiable: **intervention must supplement, not replace, Tier 1 instruction** (Fuchs et al., 2008; Gersten et al., 2009). Pulling students from core mathematics for intervention deprives them of exposure to new content and often creates the very gaps that intervention is intended to address. This concern becomes especially salient when schedules are compressed or instructional days are reduced.

Tier 2 intervention typically consists of **20–30 minutes, three to four days per week**, delivered in small groups. Effective Tier 2 instruction is **diagnostic and targeted**, focusing on prerequisite skills and misconceptions using varied representations and feedback. Tier 2 is **not a slower re-teaching of the core lesson**, but a strategic support designed to strengthen access to upcoming grade-level learning.

Tier 3 intervention requires **30–45 minutes of daily, highly individualized instruction**. Research consistently shows that interventions are most effective when Tier 1 instruction remains intact and when instructional priorities are clearly defined at the system level. Many schools address this need through a **school-wide intervention or enrichment block**, ensuring students receive support without sacrificing access to core mathematics.

How Do Weekly Schedules Influence Mathematics Learning?

Weekly scheduling decisions interact directly with cognitive principles. The **spacing effect** indicates that frequent, consistent engagement produces stronger retention than longer but less frequent sessions. A **five-day instructional week** naturally supports this pattern. In contrast, a **four-day week** introduces recurring three-day gaps that increase forgetting and require additional re-teaching. While longer instructional days may appear to compensate for reduced frequency, research has **not identified scheduling redesigns that fully offset the loss of distributed practice in mathematics** (Thompson, 2021; Fitzpatrick, Grissmer, & Hastedt, 2011).

Empirical studies show that mathematics achievement is more sensitive than reading to reduced instructional frequency, with **small but cumulative adverse effects** over time (Thompson, 2021). Teachers are right to ask whether certain students are affected more than others; evidence suggests that **students who are already behind or most dependent on school-based learning experience the greatest harm**. When four-day weeks are adopted, research points to the need for **deliberate mitigation strategies**, including structured review cycles, protected intervention time, and close monitoring of student learning outcomes.

What Is the Impact of Extended Breaks, Including Summer?

Just as spacing influences weekly learning, it also shapes yearly patterns. Lengthy interruptions—especially the **summer break**—lead to significant erosion in mathematical understanding. Research indicates that students lose an average of **1 to 3 months of mathematical proficiency over the summer**, with the largest losses occurring in the elementary grades (Cooper et al., 1996). Mathematics is particularly vulnerable because of its **cumulative structure and reliance on sustained practice**.

Importantly, summer learning loss is **not evenly distributed**. Longitudinal studies show that students from lower

socioeconomic backgrounds experience substantially greater summer declines than their peers, while more advantaged students often maintain or increase skills through enrichment (Alexander et al., 2007). Over time, these unequal seasonal patterns contribute significantly to **widening achievement gaps**, even when school-year instruction is strong. Research identifies effective responses, including **high-quality summer learning programs**, balanced calendars, and structured home-learning supports (Augustine et al., 2016). Addressing summer learning loss is therefore **both an academic and an equity imperative** (Alexander et al., 2007; Quinn & Polikoff, 2017).

Conclusion

Designing effective mathematics instruction requires more than selecting strong materials or improving individual teaching practices; it requires structuring **time** in ways that align with how students learn. Achievement strengthens when students receive **sufficient, consistent, and cognitively aligned instructional minutes** across the day, week, and year. Protecting daily mathematics blocks, structuring lessons to support reasoning and consolidation, adding targeted intervention without replacing core instruction, carefully evaluating shortened weeks, and mitigating long instructional gaps together form a coherent system that supports lasting understanding. The research does **not** argue for “more math at any cost,” but for **aligning instructional time with the realities of learning so that teachers’ efforts can have their intended impact**.

References

- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Olson, L. S. (2007). Lasting consequences of the summer learning gap. *American Sociological Review*, 72(2), 167–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240707200202>
- Augustine, C. H., McCombs, J. S., Pane, J. F., Schwartz, H. L., Schweig, J., McEachin, A., & Siler-Evans, K. (2016). Learning from summer: Effects of voluntary summer learning programs on low-income urban youth. RAND Corporation.
- Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campbell, K. M., & Weis, A. M. (2013). Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education. Horizon Research.
- Baroody, A. J. (2006). Why children have difficulties mastering the basic number combinations and how to help them. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 13(1), 22–31.
- Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 354–380. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.3.354>
- Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2009). Spacing effects in learning: A temporal ridgeline of optimal retention. *Psychological Science*, 20(9), 1095–1102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02418.x>
- Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., & Greathouse, S. (1996). The effects of summer vacation on achievement test scores: A narrative and meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 227–268. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543066003227>
- Fitzpatrick, M. D., Grissmer, D., & Hastedt, S. (2011). What a difference a day makes: Estimating daily learning gains

during kindergarten and first grade using a natural experiment. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(2), 269–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.08.004>

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Powell, S. R., Seethaler, P. M., Cirino, P. T., & Fletcher, J. M. (2008). Intensive intervention for students with mathematics disabilities: Seven principles of effective practice. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 31(2), 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25474677>

Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. R., & Witzel, B. (2009). Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools (NCEE 2009-4060). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

Hattie, J., & Yates, G. (2014). *Visible learning and the science of how we learn*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885025>

Hiebert, J., & Carpenter, T. P. (1992). Learning and teaching with understanding. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 65–97). Macmillan.

Hiebert, J., & Grouws, D. A. (2007). The effects of classroom mathematics teaching on students' learning. In F. K. Lester Jr. (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 371–404). Information Age.

Kapur, M. (2014). Productive failure in learning math. *Cognitive Science*, 38(5), 1008–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12107>

National Research Council. (2001). *Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics*. National Academy Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/9822>

Quinn, D. M., & Polikoff, M. S. (2017). *Summer learning loss: What is it, and what can we do about it?* Brookings Institution.

Rohrer, D., & Pashler, H. (2010). Recent research on human learning challenges conventional instructional strategies. *Educational Researcher*, 39(5), 406–412. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X10374770>

Schmidt, W. H., Wang, H. C., & McKnight, C. C. (2005). Curriculum coherence: An examination of US mathematics and science content standards from an international perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(5), 525–559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027042000294682>

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8126-4>

Thompson, P. N. (2021). Does a four-day school week improve student achievement? Evidence from Oregon and Colorado. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 43(2), 307–329. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720988479>

Social Media

How much math time do students really need?

Schools are asking important questions right now—about daily instructional minutes, four-day weeks, intervention time, and summer learning. These are not scheduling details. They are **learning design decisions**.

Decades of research from cognitive science and mathematics education converge on a clear message:

- **Mathematics requires sustained, daily instructional time**
- **Shortened or fragmented blocks undermine reasoning, discourse, and consolidation**
- **Four-day weeks disproportionately harm math learning**, especially for students who are already behind
- **Intervention must supplement—not replace—core instruction**
- **Extended breaks widen equity gaps unless intentionally addressed**

This isn't about "doing more math." It's about **aligning time with how students actually learn mathematics**.

When time is designed well, teachers can teach deeply, students can reason meaningfully, and learning becomes durable.

Time matters.



For more information, contact@dmtinstitute.com or follow us on social media:



facebook.com/dmtinstitute



instagram.com/dmtinstitute/



@DMTInstitute.bsky.social



mathsuccess.dmtinstitute.com



x.com/dmtinstitute



linkedin.com/company/dmt-institute



Tiktok.com/@math.success



youtube.com/@dmtinstitute

