Mathematics Education tends to contribute to the regeneration of an inequitable society through undemocratic and exclusive pedagogical practices, which portray mathematics and mathematics education as absolute, authoritarian disciplines.¹

So tell me – what’s the point of all this stuff you’re asking us? Why would anyone want to know what we think about learning maths?²

INTRODUCTION

Research in mathematics education is primarily conducted for the benefit of teachers and the children they work with. Yet so often the voices of these key beneficiaries are marginalised within research to play the roles of clipped commentators, allowed in only so long as they offer sound bites that sit neatly in the researcher’s preferred story. The two quotes which open the chapter offer a view of the gap between ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’ as perceived by some of the young people who are in the position of learning mathematics in school.

If we are to find ways of making research more democratic we need to find ways of stepping out of this mould. Framed as research is, in its own culture of regulative practices, the social specificity of research makes any claims it might proffer to a wider truth seem somewhat problematic. Indeed such claims to truth may in themselves become oppressive, leaving the researchers to sulk about their own complicity. The purpose of research might be viewed alternatively, however, as being about opening spaces that allow us all to think about how our worlds may be changed. This chapter will examine ways in which researchers can work with pupils and teachers to develop an authentic ‘voice’ that speaks to researchers, academics, administrators, and those who have responsibility in policy formation. By privileging experience over theory as a basis for understanding, space is made for marginalised or ‘silenced’ groups to be heard. Using texts from recent work with pupils who have become disaffected with mathematics, a methodology is explored which both reflects ‘what it is like’ in these schools from pupil and teachers’ perspectives and offers insights into broader educational issues. The question, which is explored later in this chapter, is ‘What is it like to be a learner of mathematics?’ This question is responded to by two groups of learners from the same school. The first group are 11 and 12 years old and just beginning their experience of learning mathematics in a secondary school in the Midlands of England. Some of this group see themselves as successful learners of mathematics and some see mathematics as an area in which they struggle to learn. The other group is made up of 15 and 16 year olds who have been placed in the lowest streams in the school. This means that they are not able to access qualifications that would open up job opportunities in the future. To a large extent they are ‘disaffected’ learners of mathematics.

The fact that this second group of learners have become placed in a position which closes down rather than opens up opportunities is a matter of social justice. This is the form of mathematics education referred

¹ This is taken from the aims of the group Mathematics Education and Society.
² This was a comment from one of the young people I worked with for the empirical work on which this chapter draws.
to in the opening quote. This is the way in which mathematics education contributes to the ‘regeneration of an inequitable society’. The chapter begins to explore ‘what it is like’ to be in this position.

ENTREZ MONSIEUR FOUCALULT

Increasing attention is being paid to ideas influenced by post-modern thinkers to develop ways of working for social justice through researching mathematics education. Recent papers have suggested that the most important thing we can do as researchers and teachers is to become aware of ‘what, what we do, does’ (Cotton & Hardy 2000, p. 277). Drawing attention to the panopticon may change the way we operate. There is an additional problem for the writer of research, the question here is ‘what can we say about what we do and what does what we say, do?’ The Foulcauldian notion of archaeology helps here. Foucault, describes ‘archaeology’ as

an attempt to describe discourses. Not books (in relation to their authors), not theories (with their structures and coherences), but those familiar yet enigmatic groups of statements that are known as medicine, political economy, and biology. I would like to show that these unities form a number of autonomous, but not independent, domains, governed by rules, but in perpetual transformation, anonymous and without a subject, but imbuing a great many individual works (Foucault 1972:)

He goes on to describe a notion of ‘things said’. This revisits immediately the question of ‘what can we say?’ Archaeology explores how ‘things said’ come into being, how they are interpreted, transformed and articulated. The aim of such an archaeology is to expose the ideology present within current practice and through this description offer a view of possible futures. Such an ‘archaeology’ demands work from ‘archaeologists’. The empirical work later in this chapter engages the young people in a personal archaeology.

So this chapter will describe a methodology that takes as its starting point the ‘voice’ of those engaged in the research. It suggests that the exploration of educational settings should be a collaborative activity engaging those who live and work in the settings as well as the researcher. This gives a deeper understanding of the current context within the setting and offers areas for intervention and action by all engaged in the research. It also aims to be a chapter that requires active collaboration by the young people I worked with. In particular, the chapter illustrates how such a methodology can be used to raise questions around the development of identity within the mathematics classroom and the possible tensions between perceptions of identity and effective learning and teaching. I will suggest that for some learners who become disaffected learners of mathematics their self perception is held in tension with their perception of the characteristics of an effective learner of mathematics. I will also argue that the process of exploring identity formation can be empowering to those involved.

VOICE, NARRATIVE AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

But what is justice? Justice is allowing people to live in the way for which they evolved. Human beings have an emotional and physical need to do so, it is their biological expectation. They can only live in this way, or all the time struggle consciously or unconsciously to do so… We can express this basic need in many ways: aesthetic, intellectual, the need to love, create, protect and enjoy. These are not the higher things that can be added when more basic needs are met. They are basic. They must be the way we express all our existence, and if they do not control our daily life then we cannot function as human beings at all. (Bond, 1983, p. LXIV)

Edward Bond’s view of Social Justice echoes a Rawlsian (Rawls, 1971) conception. A socially just society would be one in which we would be happy for our worst enemy to choose our place. Perhaps a more pertinent metaphor for mathematics education is the image that a socially just mathematics education system would be one in which we would be happy for our own children, or children that we hold dear, to replace any other child within that system. If there are any children in situations in which we would not willingly place our own, injustice exists.

We would probably not choose to place our own children in the lowest streams in secondary schools in the UK. Not because of any pathologisation of the young people taught in these streams, but simply because these young people have access to a smaller range of life choices than those placed in the top
streams. It is because of this that the chapter focuses on the voices of this particular group of young people.
Perhaps these voices will help us explore what we should change in order to create a ‘more just’ situation.

Elliot Eisner suggests that the question ‘what is it like to be here?’ (Eisner, 1991, p. 72) is nontrivial and that such a question can only be answered by researchers taking a careful and rigorous approach to qualitative research. Such an approach to qualitative studies takes the issue of ‘voice’ as primary. Schratz and Walker (Schratz & Walker 1995, p. 14) ask the question:

If we are to find ways to make research democratic then we have to find ways to break the mould that confines research to a highly selected group of specialists.

For Schratz and Walker the social specificity of research make any claims to truth problematic. Indeed such claims to truth may be oppressive in themselves and reflexivity may become the main focus of concern for the researcher engaged in democratic research. The purpose of such work is not to tell truths about the world but to open up spaces that allow us all to think about how our worlds may be changed. As Doris Lessing reminds us, truth is elusive.

How little I have managed to say of the truth, how little I have caught of all that complexity; how can this small neat thing be true when what I experienced was so rough and apparently formless and unshaped (Lessing 2002, p.13)

I take this passage to act as a warning rather than a roadblock. It reminds me that I should be aware of the dangers of presenting simplistic answers when attempting to (re)present the voices of the people with whom I carry out research. I should always remind myself of the ‘roughness’ and complexity of the research experience. I do not attempt to capture the complexity of the research process, rather I try to remain aware of the messiness as I write. I do not stop exploring the notion of what might be ‘true’ in the research as … the search for ‘truths’ supports us in finding arenas in which to work for social justice. As Doris Lessing suggests later in the same text

(If)

we don’t believe the things we put on our agendas will come true for us, then there is no hope for us. We’re going to be saved by what we seriously put on our agendas. We’ve got to believe in our blueprints. We’ve got to believe in our beautiful, impossible blueprints (ibid, p. 553).

Narrative empowers as we find that there is shared vision which can effect change within personal spheres of influence and which can contribute towards a more just society through education. Empowerment is a contested term. What I am suggesting here is that collaborative work to form narratives which attempt to describe day to day lived experience allows individuals to describe themselves within a complex set of relationships with other individuals within the same social context and within complex institutional relationships. Through this process individuals move towards making sense of their identity within this set of relationships, rather than seeing themselves as ‘helpless’ and out of control.

It offers the empowerment described by Rappaport as empowerment …

based on divergent reasoning that encourages diversity through the support of many different local groups rather than the large centralised social agencies and institutions which control resources, use convergent reasoning, and attempt to standardise the way people live their lives (Rappaport 1981, p. 19).

and empowerment that

provides niches for people that enhances their ability to control their lives and allows them both affirmation and the opportunity to learn and to experience growth and development. (ibid 1981, p. 19)

Some of the young people we hear from in this chapter do not feel in control of their own learning within the mathematics classroom and would certainly not see their experience as mathematics learners as an opportunity to experience growth. Those who feel excluded from mathematics learning see themselves as outside an exclusive club. Their constructions of self do not include the category ‘good at mathematics’. Margaret Walshaw and Tania Cabral explore this from a Lacanian perspective (Walshaw and Cabral 2005, p. 301). For Lacan, the construction of identity begins with a young child unaware of the social situation into which it has been born. He describes the unconscious process through which the developing child takes
on the language of its surroundings through recognizing there are others on which it depends, but who are outside its control. This ‘taking on’ of language is a means of expressing desire and meeting needs. Lacan describes the imaginary order of awareness which precedes language. During this stage the child begins the process of identity separation through investing significance in particular events/objects particularly linked to the mother. This stage is interrupted when the child makes an identification with its mirror image. Through the mirror stage the child comes to identify with an image outside itself, this image can be its own mirror image or the image of another. The apparent completeness of this image gives the child mastery over the body.

Walshaw and Cabral also suggest that by investigating the process of learners’ self-construction of identity in connection with others, processes of learning within the classroom can be exposed (ibid. 2005, p. 301). For them, the space to explore is the struggle for meaning between the teacher and the learner over what it means to be a learner – they suggest that when this gap is small the ‘classroom becomes a safe place in which to speak and act’ (ibid. p301). The learners we will hear from will have this as a tool to work with.

FINDING VOICE

My books are a series of introductions to matters and agendas unfinished. Like memory, it has gaps, amnesias, fragments of past, fractured present. To those who have not lived it, it might appear opaque; those of us living it will recognise the map (Jarman 1992, p. 5).

‘Voice’ has been defined as privileging experience over theory as a basis for understanding (Hadfield and Haw, 2000). The main concerns of those researching with ‘voice’ at the heart of their research being work with marginalised or ‘silenced’ groups; inclusive and democratic research; the challenge and critique of processes which silence; and participation and empowerment within and through the research process.

The use of ‘voice’ within research texts is not unproblematic. The development of powerful narratives takes work. The narrative above offers both a critical and a representative voice (Hadfield and Haw, 2000). A critical voice which seeks to challenge existing structures and assumptions about working practices. Authentication comes both from an awareness of the teller of the story as to the purpose of asserting her voice and the particularity of her experience. The theme of representation aims to raise arguments and issues that are often marginalised in policy making.

In tackling this difficulty I would like to draw on the idea of techne. From Aristotle, techne is usually translated as ‘art’ or ‘craft’ and seen in opposition to episteme or knowledge. This opposition sets up a false divide between the domains of theory and practice however, and it may be more useful to see techne as theory in practice. Maria Nussbaum (1986) suggests we should see techne in opposition to tuche or luck. So here techne allows us to apply our knowledge to our world giving us some form of control rather than simply succumbing to luck. Nussbaum describes techne as being ‘concerned with the management of need and with prediction and control concerning future contingencies’ (Nussbaum 1986, p. 85). If we live by techne we possess ‘some sort of systematic grasp’ that will allow us to enter a ‘new situation well prepared, removed from blind dependence on what happens.’ (ibid, p. 85) We may argue that such a person in possession of techne can be described as empowered. In the Lacanian sense the ‘learner personalizes rules of conduct in order to optimise existence in the classroom’ (Walshaw and Cabral 2005, p. 310).

Martha Nussbaum (1986) suggests that from Aristotle there are four sources of techne: universality, teachability, precision, concern with explanation (Nussbaum 1986).

Universality and explanation yield control over the future in virtue of their orderly grasp of the past; teaching enables past work to yield future progress; precision yields consistent accuracy, the minimisation of failure (Ibid, p. 97)
These sources of techne offer powerful tools with which to analyse the narratives we produce. I would also argue that the exploration of narrative using these tools is both pedagogical and a model of research as praxis. The questions we should ask of our data are: to what extent does the narrative describe a past event so that it is recognizable by those involved in the event and by an audience who have experiences of similar events; to what extent is the narrative pedagogical, does it enable work to take place which may create alternative futures? Aristotle’s view of precision would suggest that the validity of the method is in the narratives it produces.

The process I describe below worked with young people to develop a description of how learning ‘felt’ for them. I would argue that at the beginning of the process those learners who had become excluded from the process of learning felt out of control of the process of education. They were living by tuche, the knowledge of the work that they brought with them into the classroom did not offer them ‘prediction and control concerning future contingencies’. As learners come to a language of critique they can gain techne, through the narratives which detail what has happened to them in the past they can gain some control over their possible futures.

I would also argue that drawing on the idea of techne allows us to return to Bond’s and Rawls’ view of social justice. If we feel in control of our future, if we can understand how our previous work moves us forward and if we feel in as much control as we can expect of our future(s) we are moving towards social justice. Drawing on techne rather than episteme also means that truth claims take a different form. In this case the knowledge produced can be seen as a form of critical and emancipatory knowledge described by Morrow as

Our individual and collective consciousness of reality in order to maximise the human potential for freedom and equality (Morrow 1994, p. 146).

The following section of the chapter describes a process through which such knowledge may be unearthed.

**WHAT IS IT LIKE TO BE HERE?**

Yeah – we’d love to hear your story  
Just as long as it tells us where we are  
And that where we are is where we’re meant to be

Oh, come on, make it up yourself  
You don’t need anybody else  
And I promise I won’t sell these days to anyone else but you  
No one but you

*(Pulp – Glory Days)*

The research that follows was undertaken with two groups of students in a Midlands inner city school. It is seen as a school in ‘challenging’ circumstances within the city and takes many young people from disadvantaged parts of the city.

Much of the research I engage in uses schools that may be seen as difficult places in the education system. I like to work with groups who find it difficult to access education and in schools that may find it difficult to implement national education policy. Researching in these settings is problematic. The groups of students do not remain constant over a period of weeks, as attendance at school is erratic for these students. Some of these groups have become disengaged from schooling and are thus less likely to engage with the research process as the quote that opens this paper suggests. Similarly the teachers in these schools are working in very stressful situations and the likelihood that they take time off during the research period is high. Indeed, both of these things were the case in this piece of research. However, unless we engage with students and teachers in these settings the only voices we hear are in settled environments, meaning that we only hear half of the story.

I worked with a group of 12 Year 7 students, aged 11-12. These students were usually taught in a ‘pod’ which took a cross curricular approach to the curriculum. They had been selected by their teacher to provide a cross section of skills, abilities and attachments to learning mathematics. These students had had
little experience of learning mathematics in the secondary schools. Any mathematics that they had learnt had been to support learning in another curriculum area. In contrast I also worked with a group of 15 – 25 (depending on attendance on any particular day) of Year 11 students. These students were about to sit the national examinations at 16 and were placed in the lowest achieving groups of students. The school streamed students according to prior attainment, amalgamating the two lowest achieving groups with two teachers team teaching. The current teachers suggested this was an attempt to improve behaviour in mathematics lessons.

Whenever I work with groups of learners in school I try to ensure that the sessions are worthwhile learning experiences in themselves as well as worthwhile in terms of research outcomes for me. This, for me, is an issue of social justice. So each research visit to the school consisted of activities that allowed me to develop responses from the young people about what it was like for them to learn mathematics, alongside activities that I hoped also supported them in developing as mathematicians.

The beginning of the process is about exploring who we are. If we are to describe what is it like to be here, we need to articulate how we see ourselves early in the process. The technique I use to develop this articulation is often used as a drama warm up activity. I ask every member of the group I am working with to ask me the question, ‘Who are you?’ I have to answer each questioner with a different facet of who I am, teacher, parent, musician, frustrated football fan, and so on. This begins to model the complex natures of our identities – it also brings to the surface those facets of identity we bring to particular situations. You may like to try this:

Who are you?
Who are you?
Who are you?

I then asked the two groups of learners to create a web diagram answering the question ‘Who am I?’ with as many different views of themselves as they could think of. There were fascinating differences between the 11-year old and the 16-year old students. The year 7 immediately worked in small groups to talk about things about themselves that they saw as important. They drew on many categories. They described their families, the wide range of linguistic backgrounds they could draw on, their hobbies and interests. All their definitions of themselves were phrased as positive statements, including three of the group who described themselves as ‘someone who loves maths’, or ‘someone who is good at maths’. This group averaged 18 statements about themselves. The class teacher suggested that the ethos of year 7 encouraged celebration of linguistic diversity and an acceptance of all facets of identity – this certainly seemed to support the young people in being able to bring a positive view of themselves into school.

In contrast the group of 16 year olds who had been placed in low attaining groups found it very difficult to describe themselves at all. They needed constant support and encouragement to bring themselves into the classroom. The average number of responses from this group was 10. These described familial relationships and interests as with the younger group. None of the students described themselves in terms of their linguistic background although many were positive about their ethnic background. One student phrased this in a slightly more complex way saying, ‘People say I look like an Iraqi.’ In this group there were several negative comments – 3 young people said ‘I am someone who hates teachers.’ 4 students stated that they ‘hated school uniform’ and 4 other students said ‘I hate maths’. Unlike the younger group this group’s complex view of their identities often created a tension between their view of themselves and a view of self, which is compatible with seeing learning in school as a positive endeavour. Earlier in the chapter the struggle of negotiation between teacher and learner over what it is to learn was discussed. The young people in this study who had been placed in groups on which low expectations were placed described this tension, both during this activity and in the following session which explored what it was to be ‘good at maths’.

I asked the two groups to draw me a mind map which described, for them, what it was to be ‘good at maths’. Again most of the younger group treated this is as a collaborative activity, engaging in discussion before making their mind maps. One of the group asked me if she could work on her own. She argued convincingly that she worked better when she ‘could think things through for herself.’ This showed great confidence and an understanding of how she felt she best engaged with learning. The posters all used an imaginary figure or a figure from history to characterise someone who was successful in mathematics. The figures from history were scientists such as Thomas Edison, the ‘imaginary’ figures contained the
stereotypes which have appeared in previous studies of this type. Figures with glasses, having very bad hair
days! When the students described what skills these people had they listed: they do not need to use
calculators; they can answer questions very quickly; they can use all the mathematical operations well; they
use complex mathematical vocabulary and explain things well. This suggests that the group has a fairly
narrow view of the nature of mathematics that is limited to arithmetic. They also seem to see ‘being good at
mathematics’ as something out of the ‘norm’ – the ‘mad scientist’ or ‘geek’ stereotype persists. However
they could all describe peers who they saw as good mathematicians, and several pointed out individuals
within the group. One whispered to me that they knew one of their friends was good at maths because the
teacher always asked them the questions – this was seen as positive as she said, ‘It’s great, we always let
them answer the questions so we can get on quickly.’

In contrast the Year 11 students did not draw on any peers. All of the students used their current teacher
as a model for someone who is good at mathematics. They described success in mathematics as mastery
over content. A summary of their discussion could be that individuals who are ‘good’ at maths understand the
content – these individuals are also ‘boring’. This view of successful learners in maths completely cut
across their view of themselves as learners. In this way they cannot see any way that their identities as
individuals are compatible with an identity which would include being successful learners of mathematics.
More worryingly, this was beginning to emerge with the younger group of learners too.

To further explore the young people’s images of learning mathematics and their images of themselves
as learners of mathematics I asked them to draw me images of ‘what learning maths was like’. As in the
previous activities the younger students drew a wide ranges of images, and articulated clearly how these
images related to their prior experiences of learning mathematics – they could also describe their
relationship to the images. However the older students could not articulate what it was like for them to
learn mathematics, none of them could relate a time when they had felt successful in learning mathematics.
One student told me that the activities we had worked on together during my first visit allowed them access
to learning mathematics for the first time. In order to try to get the older students to engage with the
question ‘what is it like for you to learn maths?’ I used the images that the younger students had
drawn and asked them to sort them into two piles. Those that resonated with their own ideas of what it was to learn
mathematics and those that didn’t. This activity allowed them to begin to describe their feelings towards
learning mathematics.

I used a similar process with the younger group – they sorted the set of 24 images into two groups, and
then selected a key image from the group that they thought fitted their view of the process of learning
mathematics. They then explained in some detail why they had selected this image. For the 11-year old
pupils the key image was of a tape recorder sitting on a teacher’s desk. There is no sign of a teacher. Lines
emanating from the tape recorder make it clear that the tape recorder is controlling the lesson. There is also
a sheet of paper resting on another desk. This is a pupil’s answer sheet for a mental maths test. The pupil
has written next to the image ‘I like doing Mental Maths with the tape recorder in the Primary School’.
This image refers to the process, which is used by the national tests at age 11 in the UK. Pupils are asked to
respond to a series of questions using mental methods. The process is standardised nationally by using a
common set of questions delivered to schools on an audio-tape.

This image was selected by all the 11 year old students as being an image that they saw as
representative of ‘what it was like to learn maths’. When I asked them to talk more about this choice they
said:

It’s good because it says it clearly. The teachers take too long but the tape goes really quickly.
Sometimes the teachers repeat themselves and it takes ages

I like doing them booklets\(^3\). Yesterday I completed one and then nearly completed another one. I
completed everything

This suggests a view of learning mathematics as disembodied, literally in this case. The tape recorder was
not required to take account of individual needs – it did not bring emotion into the equation. This view

\(^3\) Many primary classrooms in the UK use individualised programmes which ask individual learners to
work through booklets of examples in a structured way. Once the learner completes a booklet successfully
they will move on to the next booklet in the sequence.
linked directly to the sense the young learners had that success in mathematics is measured through successful completion of tasks.

This was not a view of learning mathematics that was recognised at all by the older students. This group selected three cards; one showed a pupil sitting at a desk, almost swamped by a huge piece of paper saying ‘Oh no not maths again’; another image showed a face with swimming eyes with the statement ‘learning maths is sometimes confusing’; their final choice was a card showing a sleeping pupil sitting at a desk with a teacher. The teacher’s speech bubble contains ‘Blah, blah, blah, blah, …’. The student has written on the card ‘I don’t like it when teachers take FOREVER to explain something and Boring (sic) teachers shouldn’t teach maths’.

When we discussed these choices further the students told me that they felt teachers took too long to explain things – for these students the explanations were not supporting their learning – they said:

- It just makes me confused
- People get scared when they do their work because sometimes they can’t solve it
- When I’m doing my maths revision at home it makes me mad and it makes me confused

This suggested an image of learning mathematics as a process of confusion and frustration, which could not be alleviated by the teacher trying to explain concepts and ideas. In fact the lengthy explanations were perceived as increasing the frustration. Mathematics for these learners appeared to be confusing, frightening and enraging.

DEVELOPING A VOCABULARY OF CRITIQUE

The transition to verbalised self-observation denotes a beginning process of generalisation of inner forms of activity. The shift to a new type of inner perception means also a shift to a higher type of inner activity, since a new way of seeing things opens up new possibilities for handling them (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 170).

I have suggested above that the data shows a group of young people who, at age 11, are able to see ‘mathematics learner’ as a facet of their identity, although with this group there was an emerging sense of identifying success in mathematics as external to their self-image. The group of 16-year old students, identified as ‘disaffected’ by the school, made no connection at all between their images of themselves and images of successful learners of mathematics. This disconnection makes any form of teacher – student relationship in the mathematics classroom very difficult. There was also a marked difference between the ways that the younger students could articulate their images of themselves – particularly in relation to school, learning and mathematics learning, and the older students who could articulate self identity but often saw it in tension with what it is to be a learner of mathematics. These students found it very difficult to articulate their relationship to mathematics and mathematics learning – except as an opposition.

The process of research allowed the students who felt disconnected to the process of mathematics to begin to articulate this sense of disconnection. I suggested earlier in the chapter that developing a sense of ‘techne’ allowed individuals to take some control over their lives. It removes the sense of ‘blind dependence’ on the experiences that life throws at us. My hope would be that the process of research has begun the process of developing a vocabulary of critique for these young people. If we can describe what it is like for us to be in a particular situation, we can begin to think through the possibilities for change.

In the introduction to the book Tony Brown argued that a positivistically conceived world is Imaginary – in the Lacanian sense. The young people I worked with were coming to see the world through positivistic lenses. They could describe the characteristics of effective learners of mathematics – they seemed certain that people with these characteristics would succeed. Unfortunately they described themselves in opposition to these characteristics and their positivist view of identity meant that they became excluded from this world. Exploring identity with these young people offered them a glimpse of a more complex world in which identities slip and slide and are not fixed oppositions. This gives previously excluded learners room for manoeuvre, it opens up the possibility for them to find matches between facets of self-identity and their perceptions of what it is to be ‘good at maths’.
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