
Math Success with DMTI

WHY COMMON SHAPE MATERIALS CREATE PREDICTABLE MISCONCEPTIONS: AND WHAT TO DO INSTEAD

In today's edition, we explore:

- **The Classroom Reality:** Why students insist a rotated square is a “diamond”
- **The Cognitive Why:** How posters and worksheets quietly train picture-based thinking
- **The Instructional Shift:** How teaching shapes as intersecting lines builds durable understanding
- **The Materials Question:** What to audit, remove, and replace in K–8 geometry resources

Educators

A student looks at a square drawn on a corner and says, *“That’s a diamond.”* Another insists, *“Squares aren’t rectangles—rectangles are the long ones.”*

These are not careless mistakes. They are **logical conclusions drawn from the materials students see every day.**

Posters, worksheets, anchor charts, and online resources often teach shapes as **pictures to recognize** rather than **structures defined by properties**. Over time, students learn a “folk geometry” where orientation, symmetry, and cultural labels matter more than straight sides, closure, and invariant relationships.

Our latest **DMT Insight—*The Diamond Problem: How Everyday Language Undermines Geometric Thinking*** explains why these misunderstandings are so persistent and how a small but powerful instructional shift can prevent them.

The Classroom Reality: Where the “Diamond” Comes From

Many classrooms display shape charts that list:

Circle, Square, Rectangle, Triangle, Oval, **Diamond**

The message is subtle but powerful: **a diamond is a basic shape category.**

Students quickly infer the rule:

- Square on a side = square
- Square on a vertex = diamond

From the student’s perspective, this makes perfect sense. The materials are consistent—even when the mathematics is not.

Research in mathematics education and cognitive psychology shows that **students build shape categories from**

repeated examples rather than from formal definitions alone. When those examples emphasize appearance and orientation, misconceptions become stable and resistant to correction.

The Cognitive Why: Pictures Before Properties

Children naturally organize geometric ideas around **prototypes**—upright triangles, long rectangles, and symmetric shapes. These visual shortcuts are efficient, but they narrow what “counts” as a shape.

Without deliberate variation and precise language, students form internal rules like:

- “Triangles must point up.”
- “Rectangles must be long.”
- “Rotation changes the shape.”

This is not a lack of effort or intelligence. It is a predictable outcome of **prototype-heavy instruction**.

The Instructional Shift: Shapes as Intersecting Lines

Our research overview proposes a simple reframe: **Teach shapes as systems of intersecting straight lines—not pictures to name.**

From this perspective:

- **Vertices** are points where lines intersect
- **Sides** are straight segments between intersections
- **A polygon exists only when those segments are closed**

Only after straightness, closure, and the number of vertices are established do **properties** (right angles, equal sides, parallelism) determine *which* polygon it is.

This shift:

- Makes orientation irrelevant
- Clarifies why squares are rectangles
- Eliminates “diamond” as a mathematical category
- Connects early geometry to later work in area, similarity, and proof

The Materials Question: What to Remove, Replace, and Redesign

If students are consistently confused, the issue may not be instruction—it may be the **training set**.

High-impact moves include:

- Removing posters that list “diamond” as a basic shape
- Replacing definitions like “rectangles are long” with property-based language
- Auditing example spaces for overuse of upright, regular, and symmetric figures

- Intentionally including rotated, irregular, and non-prototypical examples

Small changes in materials can produce **large changes in student reasoning**.

A Question Worth Asking

If students learned geometry **only** from your posters, worksheets, and examples:

- **What theory of “what makes a shape a shape” would they construct?**
- That theory is being built every day—whether intentionally or not.

Your Turn to Share

We would love to hear from you. **What is one form of support that would genuinely help you teach math more effectively?** More time to collaborate? More demonstrations? Deeper content learning? Better coaching?

Share your thoughts at contact@dmtinstitute.com. We will compile and elevate your collective insights (anonymously) to help advocate for better teacher support across districts.

Keep inspiring mathematical minds!

MORE INFORMATION

This newsletter is just a preview—there is more to explore! For the complete research overview and additional videos, visit the “DMT Insights” page at dmtinstitute.com/research. You will find deeper insights, classroom strategies, downloadable resources, and more ways to expand your math teaching.

Have a classroom story, tip, or question to share? We love featuring educator voices and ideas. Email us at mathsuccess@dmtinstitute.com to contribute a teaching tip or share your experience—your story could be in our next newsletter!

For ongoing support, expert advice, and practical updates, join our DMTI community on social media or visit our website anytime: contact@dmtinstitute.com



facebook.com/dmtinstitute



instagram.com/dmtinstitute/



[@DMTInstitute.bsky.social](https://DMTInstitute.bsky.social)



mathsuccess.dmtinstitute.com



x.com/dmtinstitute



linkedin.com/company/dmt-institute



Tiktok.com/@math.success



youtube.com/@dmtinstitute

