The Role of Digital Technology in Mathematics Education: Considerations, Benefits, and Pedagogical Implications

Abstract

The integration of digital technology into mathematics education has become one of the most actively debated topics in contemporary educational research. This paper examines the role of digital tools in the teaching and learning of mathematics, drawing principally on the theoretical framework proposed by Hoyles (2018), which categorises the contributions of technology into six domains. Three interrelated themes are explored. First, the paper analyses key considerations that must inform the deployment of digital tools, arguing that technology should augment mathematical thinking rather than supplant it. Second, it evaluates the benefits that digital environments confer, including the creation of constructionist learning spaces (Papert, 1991), the offloading of procedural computation through Computer Algebra Systems (Heid, 2005), and the facilitation of semiotic mediation through dynamic visual representations (Bartolini Bussi & Mariotti, 2008). Third, the paper investigates the pedagogical changes necessitated by technology adoption, with particular attention to the concept of instrumental orchestration (Drijvers et al., 2010). By synthesising empirical evidence and theoretical perspectives from instrumentation theory (Rabardel, 1995; Artigue, 2002), Vygotskian semiotics (Vygotsky, 1978), and the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006), the paper argues that the effective integration of digital technology requires a fundamental reconceptualisation of both curricular content and classroom pedagogy. Implications for teacher education and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: digital technology, mathematics education, instrumental orchestration, constructionism, semiotic mediation, TPACK

1 Introduction

The proliferation of digital technology in the twenty-first century has transformed virtually every domain of human activity, and education is no exception. Within mathematics education in particular, the availability of graphical calculators, dynamic geometry environments, Computer Algebra Systems (CAS), and bespoke educational software has generated sustained scholarly interest in how these tools affect teaching and learning (Kaput, 1992; Zbiek et al., 2007). Yet the mere presence of technology in classrooms does not guarantee improved learning outcomes; indeed, Cuban (2001) has argued that digital tools in schools have frequently been "oversold and underused," achieving far less than their advocates promised. This tension between technological potential and pedagogical reality forms the central concern of the present paper.

Pea (1985) drew an influential distinction between technologies that *amplify* existing cognitive processes and those that *reorganise* them. In the context of mathematics, this distinction is critical: a graphical calculator that merely produces a graph on demand amplifies the student's computational capacity, whereas a dynamic geometry environment that allows the student to manipulate geometric objects and observe invariant properties may fundamentally reorganise the student's conceptual understanding of proof and conjecture. Building on this line of reasoning, Hoyles (2018) proposed a comprehensive theoretical framework that categorises the roles of digital technology in mathematics education into six groups. Her framework provides a structured lens through which the multifaceted contributions of technology can be analysed systematically.

This paper takes Hoyles's framework as its principal theoretical anchor and pursues three interrelated aims. First, it examines the key considerations that must guide the integration of digital tools into mathematics classrooms, with particular emphasis on the imperative that technology should aid, rather than replace, mathematical thinking. Second, it evaluates the documented benefits of technology use, including the creation of constructionist learning environments (Papert, 1991), the reduction of procedural burden through CAS (Heid, 2005), and the facilitation of conceptual understanding through semiotic mediation (Bartolini Bussi & Mariotti, 2008; Mariotti, 2009). Third, it investigates the pedagogical transformations that effective technology integration demands, focusing on the concept of instrumental orchestration as elaborated by Drijvers et al. (2010).

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature, establishing the theoretical foundations that underpin the subsequent analysis. Section 3 discusses the key considerations for technology integration. Section 4 evaluates the benefits of digital technology in mathematics education. Section 5 examines the pedagogical changes that technology necessitates. Section 6 synthesises the foregoing analyses and discusses their implications for practice and policy. Section 7 offers concluding remarks and identifies directions for future research.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Digital Technology in Mathematics Education: An Overview

Research on the use of digital technology in mathematics education has expanded considerably since Kaput (1992) published his seminal overview in the first *Handbook of Research on Mathematics Teaching and Learning*. Kaput argued that technology could serve as a new medium for mathematical expression, enabling representational forms that were previously inaccessible. Subsequent reviews have broadly confirmed this view while identifying significant mediating factors. Zbiek et al. (2007), in the *Second Handbook*, synthesised two decades of research and concluded that the effects of technology on mathematical learning depend critically on the nature of the mathematical tasks, the design of the technological tools, and the pedagogical context in which they are deployed. Clark-Wilson et al. (2014) extended this analysis by focusing specifically on the role of the teacher, arguing that the teacher's capacity to orchestrate technology-mediated learning is the single most important determinant of successful integration. Ruthven (2009) proposed a naturalistic framework for conceptualising technology integration, identifying five structuring features—working environment, resource system, activity structure, curriculum script, and time economy—that shape how teachers incorporate digital tools into their practice.

Despite the depth of this research base, Cuban (2001) cautioned that the history of educational technology is littered with unfulfilled promises. From film projectors to personal computers, each new technology has been heralded as a revolution in learning, only to be absorbed into existing pedagogical practices with minimal transformative effect. This sceptical perspective serves as an important counterweight to more optimistic accounts and underscores the need for rigorous, evidence-based analysis of when and how technology genuinely enhances mathematical learning.

2.2 Constructionism and Mathematics Learning

The theoretical foundations for understanding technology-mediated learning in mathematics owe much to the work of Seymour Papert. Papert (1991) articulated the theory of *constructionism*, which extends Piaget's constructivism by emphasising the role of external artefacts in the construction of knowledge. In a constructionist framework, learning is most effective when students are actively engaged in building public, shareable artefacts—a computer program, a geometric construction, a mathematical model—rather than passively receiving instruction. The Logo programming language, which Papert developed, was designed to instantiate this principle: by programming a "turtle" to draw geometric shapes, students could explore mathematical concepts through direct, embodied interaction (Papert, 1991).

Constructionism is itself rooted in the broader Vygotskian tradition, which emphasises the role of tools and signs in mediating cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1978). For Vygotsky, higher mental functions are not simply "in the head" but are distributed across individuals, cultural artefacts, and social practices. Digital tools, from this perspective, are not merely aids to cognition but constitutive elements of the cognitive process itself. Borba & Villarreal (2005) have formalised this insight through their concept of *humans-with-media*, arguing that mathematical thinking is always shaped by the representational media through which it is expressed, whether pencil-and-paper, graphical calculators, or CAS.

2.3 Computer Algebra Systems and Representational Tools

Computer Algebra Systems (CAS) represent one of the most powerful categories of digital tools available to mathematics learners. By automating symbolic manipulation—differentiation, integration, equation solving, simplification—CAS can relieve students of procedural burdens and allow them to focus on conceptual understanding (Heid, 2005). However, the integration of CAS into mathematics curricula has been contentious. Critics have argued that fluency in symbolic manipulation is itself a form of mathematical understanding and that outsourcing it to a machine may impoverish the student's cognitive development (Zbiek et al., 2007).

Artigue (2002) addressed this tension through the lens of *instrumentation theory*, a framework originally developed by Rabardel (1995) in cognitive ergonomics. Rabardel distinguished between an *artefact* (the material or symbolic object) and an *instrument* (the artefact together with the schemes of use that the individual has developed for it). The process by which an artefact becomes an instrument—termed *instrumental genesis*—involves both *instrumentalisation* (the user's adaptation of the artefact) and *instrumentation* (the artefact's shaping of the user's cognitive schemes). Artigue applied this framework to the use of CAS in mathematics classrooms and demonstrated that instrumental genesis is a complex, time-consuming process that teachers must actively support.

Guin & Trouche (1999) provided further empirical evidence for this complexity, documenting the difficulties that students encounter when attempting to reconcile the outputs of CAS with their existing mathematical knowledge. Their findings underscored that the introduction of CAS does not simply "free" students from computation; rather, it introduces new cognitive demands related to interpreting machine output, understanding the limitations of algorithmic procedures, and coordinating multiple representations.

2.4 Semiotic Mediation

The concept of semiotic mediation, rooted in the work of Vygotsky (1978), has been extensively developed within mathematics education by Bartolini Bussi & Mariotti (2008) and Mariotti (2009). In this framework, mathematical tools—whether physical (rulers, compasses) or digital (dynamic geometry software, graphing applications)—function as *signs* that mediate between the student's personal, situated experience and the formal, decontextualised knowledge of mathematics. The teacher plays a pivotal role in this process, guiding students to interpret the feedback provided by digital tools in terms of mathematical concepts and relationships.

Hoyles (2018) identified semiotic mediation as one of the key mechanisms through which digital technology enhances mathematical learning. When students interact with a dynamic graphing environment, for example, they can observe in real time how changes to a function's parameters affect its graphical representation. This interactive, visual feedback provides a *concrete* instantiation of otherwise *abstract* mathematical relationships, facilitating the transition from empirical observation to theoretical understanding. Hegedus & Moreno-Armella (2009) extended this analysis by investigating how networked technologies—such as shared interactive whiteboards—can create collective semiotic experiences, enabling entire classes to engage simultaneously with mathematical representations.

2.5 Instrumental Orchestration

The concept of *instrumental orchestration* was introduced by Trouche (2004) and subsequently elaborated by Drijvers et al. (2010) to describe the intentional, systematic organisation of digital tools within the classroom by the teacher. Drawing on Rabardel (1995)'s instrumentation theory, Trouche argued that teachers must actively manage the process of instrumental genesis, ensuring that students develop productive schemes of use for the available tools. This management involves decisions about which tools to use, when to use them, how to configure them, and how to integrate tool-mediated activities with broader pedagogical goals.

Drijvers et al. (2010) identified six types of instrumental orchestration: (1) *technical demonstration*, in which the teacher demonstrates tool use to the class; (2) *explain-the-screen*, in which the teacher explains the mathematical significance of what appears on the screen; (3) *link-screen-board*, in which the teacher connects the digital representation to conventional blackboard notation; (4) *discuss-the-screen*, in which students collectively discuss the tool's output; (5) *spot-and-show*, in which the teacher selects a student's work for class-wide discussion; and (6) *Sherpa-at-work*, in which a student operates the tool under the teacher's direction. These orchestration types provide a practical vocabulary for describing and analysing teachers' technology-mediated pedagogical practices.

3 Key Considerations for Technology Integration

3.1 Technology as an Aid to Thinking, Not a Substitute

Perhaps the most fundamental consideration in integrating digital technology into mathematics education is the distinction between technology that *supports* mathematical thinking and technology that *replaces* it. Hoyles (2018) argued that digital tools can offer "new representational infrastructures" that enhance students' understanding of mathematical concepts by making abstract structures visible and manipulable. However, this potential is realised only when the tools are deployed in ways that require students to engage actively with mathematical ideas. If technology is used merely to produce answers—to graph a function, to solve an equation, to compute a derivative—without any accompanying cognitive engagement, then the tool has replaced thinking rather than supported it (Pea, 1985).

This concern is not merely theoretical. Evidence from the Longitudinal Proof Project (Noss & Hoyles, 2006) demonstrated that traditional methods of teaching geometry—relying exclusively on static diagrams and verbal definitions—produced limited improvements in students' understanding of the properties of circles and quadrilaterals. Hoyles (2018) proposed a thought experiment: had students developed a dynamic understanding of geometric structures through interactive graphical tools, they might have achieved substantially better results. Yet the same graphical tools that can illuminate geometric reasoning can also be misused. Laborde (2001) showed that the design of tasks within dynamic geometry environments is crucial; poorly designed tasks can lead students to focus on superficial, perceptual features rather than underlying mathematical properties, while well-designed tasks can provoke genuine mathematical reasoning. Laborde et al. (2006) reinforced this point, demonstrating that the pedagogical value of dynamic geometry software depends critically on the nature of the tasks and the teacher's guidance.

3.2 The Risk of Over-Reliance: Graph Sketching as a Case Study

The risk of over-reliance on technology is vividly illustrated by the case of graph sketching in secondary mathematics. An important component of the GCSE Mathematics syllabus concerns functions and their graphical representations. With the aid of graphical calculators or software, students can produce the graph of any given function instantaneously, without engaging in the cognitive processes that manual graph sketching demands (Zheng, 1998). These cognitive processes—identifying intercepts, analysing asymptotic behaviour, determining the effects of transformations—are precisely the processes through which students develop conceptual understanding of functions.

Ainsworth (1999) argued that the value of multiple representations in learning depends on the learner's ability to translate between them. If students use graphical technology merely to produce a visual output without connecting it to the algebraic representation, then the potential of multiple representations is squandered. The concern is particularly acute at higher levels of mathematics. In the A Level Further Mathematics syllabus, for instance, students encounter rational functions with complex asymptotic structures. A deep understanding of these functions requires the ability to sketch graphs from first principles—an ability that atrophies if students habitually delegate graph production to machines.

3.3 Assessment and the Promotion of Mathematical Thinking

The integration of digital technology also has significant implications for assessment. Traditional assessment methods, which prioritise correct answers and procedural fluency, may not capture the higher-order thinking that technology-mediated learning is designed to promote. If students are permitted to use CAS during examinations, for example, then assessment tasks must be redesigned to evaluate conceptual understanding, reasoning, and problem-solving rather than routine computation (Zbiek et al., 2007). Ruthven (2009) noted that the alignment between technology-mediated pedagogy and assessment practice is a persistent challenge, as institutional assessment structures often lag behind pedagogical innovation.

4 Benefits of Digital Technology in Mathematics Education

4.1 Constructionist Learning Environments

One of the most significant benefits of digital technology is its capacity to create *constructionist* learning environments in the sense articulated by Papert (1991). In such environments, students take the initiative in their learning, constructing their own knowledge through active engagement with computational tools. Hoyles (2018) argued that digital tools with "outsourced processing power" can maximise students' potential in constructionist settings by freeing them from the procedural demands that often dominate mathematics classrooms.

The use of CAS exemplifies this dynamic. By automating tedious calculations that contribute little to conceptual understanding, CAS enables students to focus on interpretation, conjecture, and proof (Heid, 2005; Artigue, 2002). Borba & Villarreal (2005) framed this shift in terms of the *humans-with-media* construct: when students work with CAS, they form a cognitive unit with the technology, redistributing the labour of mathematical thinking in ways that can be highly productive—provided that the redistribution is carefully managed by the teacher.

4.2 Enhanced Engagement and Motivation

A related benefit concerns student engagement and motivation. When the procedural burden of mathematics is reduced, students have more time and cognitive resources to devote to exploratory, open-ended tasks that align with their interests (Hoyles, 2018). The interactive nature of many digital tools—the immediate feedback, the visual richness, the capacity for experimentation—can make mathematical exploration intrinsically rewarding. Hegedus & Moreno-Armella (2009) found that networked technologies, which allow students to share and compare their mathematical constructions in real time, can further enhance engagement by introducing a social, collaborative dimension to mathematical activity.

4.3 Semiotic Mediation and Visualisation

One of the most widely cited barriers to mathematics learning is the subject's perceived abstractness. Digital tools that offer real-time interactive visualisations can mitigate this barrier by providing concrete, visible instantiations of abstract concepts (Hoyles, 2018; Ainsworth, 1999). When students manipulate a parameter in a function and observe the resulting change in its graphical representation, they experience what Bartolini Bussi & Mariotti (2008) termed *semiotic mediation*: the tool mediates between the student's personal experience and the formal mathematical concept, facilitating the construction of meaning.

A compelling illustration of this process is provided by the case study reported by Confrey & Maloney (2007), in which Graphs 'N Glyphs—a computer animation software for graphing—was introduced to students studying the functions of mechanical motion. Students reported that the interactive visualisations enabled them to "feel" the effect of changing variables, suggesting that the technology had succeeded in grounding abstract mathematical relationships in perceptual experience. Mariotti (2009) theorised this process in Vygotskian terms: the digital tool functions as a *pivot* between the empirical and the theoretical, enabling the student to move from direct sensory experience to abstract mathematical reasoning.

4.4 Implications for Classroom Management

The benefits of digital technology extend beyond individual cognition to the organisation of the classroom as a learning environment. When students are actively engaged in constructionist activities, they tend to be more motivated, more attentive, and more self-directed (Papert, 1991; Hoyles, 2018). This shift in student behaviour has significant implications for classroom management: a class of actively exploring students requires a different form of management from a class of passive recipients of instruction. The teacher's role shifts from that of *transmitter* to that of *facilitator*, a transition that, while demanding, can result in a more efficient and productive learning environment (Clark-Wilson et al., 2014).

5 Pedagogical Changes and Instrumental Orchestration

5.1 Rethinking Mathematical Content: Papert's Ten Percent

The integration of digital technology into mathematics education is not merely a matter of adding new tools to existing practices; it requires a fundamental rethinking of what is taught and how it is taught. A vivid articulation of this principle is “Papert’s ten percent,” an initiative advocating that educators rethink at least ten percent of mathematical knowledge whenever new technology is introduced (Hoyles & Lagrange, 2010). The rationale is that technology does not simply make existing mathematics easier to learn; it changes the relative importance of different mathematical topics and skills. When CAS can perform symbolic integration instantaneously, for example, the pedagogical justification for spending weeks on integration techniques must be reconsidered—not necessarily abandoned, but reconsidered in the light of what the technology makes possible.

This perspective is consistent with Pea (1985)’s distinction between amplification and reorganisation. If technology merely amplifies existing practices, its transformative potential is unrealised. Genuine reorganisation requires changes not only in pedagogy but also in curriculum content—changes that many educational institutions have been slow to make (Cuban, 2001).

5.2 The TPACK Framework

The pedagogical demands of technology integration have been conceptualised by Mishra & Koehler (2006) through the *Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge* (TPACK) framework. TPACK identifies three fundamental domains of teacher knowledge—content knowledge (CK), pedagogical knowledge (PK), and technological knowledge (TK)—and argues that effective technology-mediated teaching requires an integration of all three. A teacher who understands mathematics deeply (CK) and knows how to teach it effectively (PK) will nevertheless struggle to integrate technology if she lacks understanding of the tools themselves (TK). Conversely, a teacher who is technologically proficient but lacks deep content or pedagogical knowledge will be unable to design tasks that exploit the mathematical potential of digital tools.

The TPACK framework thus highlights the complexity of the knowledge base that teachers require in the digital era. Clark-Wilson et al. (2014) argued that teacher education programmes must be redesigned to develop this integrated knowledge, moving beyond the compartmentalised treatment of content, pedagogy, and technology that characterises many existing programmes.

5.3 Instrumental Orchestration in Practice

The concept of instrumental orchestration, as elaborated by Drijvers et al. (2010), provides a detailed vocabulary for describing the teacher's role in technology-rich classrooms. Drawing on the instrumentation theory of Rabardel (1995) and the earlier work of Trouche (2004), Drijvers identified six types of orchestration that teachers employ when managing digital tools in the classroom.

In practice, the orchestration process unfolds in a structured sequence. The teacher typically begins with a *technical demonstration*, modelling the use of the digital tool for the entire class. This is followed by an *explain-the-screen* phase, in which the teacher provides detailed explanations of the visual output displayed by the tool and articulates the connections between these visuals and the underlying abstract mathematical concepts. The teacher then assumes the role of facilitator, initiating a *discuss-the-screen* activity in which the entire class discusses the mathematical significance of what they have observed. Through a *spot-and-show* strategy, the teacher selects the most insightful or provocative student interpretation and presents it to the class for collective examination. Finally, the teacher transitions to a *Sherpa-at-work* or guided individual practice phase, providing step-by-step instructions as students work on their own digital tools (Drijvers et al., 2010).

This orchestration sequence represents a significant departure from the traditional model of teacher-led lectures. Rather than delivering content in a linear, expository manner, the teacher must continually adapt to the outputs generated by students' interactions with digital tools, selecting, sequencing, and connecting these outputs in real time (Ruthven, 2009). Guin & Trouche (1999) emphasised that this adaptive, responsive mode of teaching is considerably more demanding than traditional instruction and requires sustained professional development.

5.4 From Transmission to Facilitation

The shift from transmission-based to facilitation-based pedagogy has implications that extend beyond the individual lesson. At the curricular level, it requires a reconsideration of the balance between procedural fluency and conceptual understanding. At the institutional level, it demands investment in professional development, technical infrastructure, and assessment redesign (Ruthven, 2009; Clark-Wilson et al., 2014). Laborde (2001) demonstrated that even experienced teachers require significant time and support to develop effective technology-mediated pedagogical practices, suggesting that the transition from transmission to facilitation is not merely a matter of adopting new techniques but of developing a fundamentally different professional identity.

6 Discussion

The foregoing analysis reveals a complex, multifaceted picture of the role of digital technology in mathematics education. On the one hand, there is substantial theoretical and empirical evidence that digital tools can enhance mathematical learning by creating constructionist environments (Papert, 1991), reducing procedural burden (Heid, 2005; Artigue, 2002), facilitating semiotic mediation (Bartolini Bussi & Mariotti, 2008; Mariotti, 2009), and promoting engagement (Hegedus & Moreno-Armella, 2009). On the other hand, these benefits are realised only under specific conditions: the tools must be well-designed, the tasks must be carefully constructed, and the teacher must possess the integrated knowledge and pedagogical skill to orchestrate technology-mediated learning effectively (Drijvers et al., 2010; Mishra & Koehler, 2006).

A central tension that emerges from this analysis is the dual potential of technology to both *support* and *undermine* mathematical thinking. The same graphical calculator that can illuminate the behaviour of a function can also enable a student to produce a graph without any understanding of the underlying mathematics (Zheng, 1998). The same CAS that can free a student from tedious computation can also deprive that student of the procedural experience that contributes to conceptual understanding (Guin & Trouche, 1999). Resolving this tension requires not a blanket endorsement or rejection of technology but a nuanced, context-sensitive approach that attends to the specific mathematical content, the specific tool, and the specific pedagogical context (Zbiek et al., 2007).

The implications for teacher education are significant. The TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) makes clear that effective technology integration requires a form of professional knowledge that many existing teacher education programmes do not adequately develop.

Clark-Wilson et al. (2014) called for a fundamental reconceptualisation of teacher education in the digital era, one that integrates technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge from the outset rather than treating them as separate domains. The concept of instrumental orchestration (Drijvers et al., 2010; Trouche, 2004) provides a practical framework for this integration, offering teachers a structured vocabulary for planning, executing, and reflecting on technology-mediated instruction.

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of the evidence base. Much of the research reviewed in this paper is qualitative or small-scale, making it difficult to draw generalisable conclusions about the effects of technology on mathematical learning at the population level. Cuban (2001) rightly cautioned against the tendency to extrapolate from small, enthusiast-driven studies to the broader educational system. Future research should prioritise large-scale, longitudinal studies that investigate the long-term effects of sustained technology integration on mathematical achievement, conceptual understanding, and mathematical identity.

7 Conclusion

This paper has examined the role of digital technology in mathematics education through the lens of Hoyles's (2018) theoretical framework, focusing on key considerations, benefits, and pedagogical implications. Three principal conclusions emerge.

First, the integration of digital technology into mathematics classrooms must be guided by the principle that technology should *augment* mathematical thinking, not replace it. The risks of over-reliance on graphical tools and CAS are real and well-documented (Zheng, 1998; Guin & Trouche, 1999), and teachers must exercise careful judgment in determining when and how digital tools should be deployed.

Second, digital technology offers significant benefits for mathematics learning, including the creation of constructionist environments that promote active knowledge construction (Papert, 1991), the facilitation of semiotic mediation through dynamic visualisations (Bartolini Bussi & Mariotti, 2008; Confrey & Maloney, 2007), and the enhancement of student engagement and motivation (Hegedus & Moreno-Armella, 2009). These benefits, however, are contingent on the quality of task design, tool design, and pedagogical practice.

Third, the effective integration of digital technology requires fundamental changes in pedagogy. The concept of instrumental orchestration (Drijvers et al., 2010) provides a valuable framework for understanding and enacting these changes, while the TPACK model (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) highlights the integrated knowledge base that teachers must develop. Implementing these changes at scale will require sustained investment in teacher professional development, curriculum redesign, and assessment reform (Clark-Wilson et al., 2014; Ruthven, 2009).

In an era of rapid technological change, the challenge for mathematics education is not whether to integrate digital tools but how to do so in ways that genuinely enhance mathematical thinking and learning. Meeting this challenge will require continued collaboration among researchers, teachers, curriculum designers, and policymakers, guided by rigorous evidence and informed by the rich theoretical traditions—constructionism, Vygotskian semiotics, instrumentation theory—that this paper has sought to bring into dialogue.

References

Ainsworth, S. (1999). The functions of multiple representations. *Computers & Education*, *33*(2–3), 131–152.

Artigue, M. (2002). Learning mathematics in a CAS environment: The genesis of a reflection about instrumentation and the dialectics between technical and conceptual work. *International Journal of Computers for Mathematical Learning*, *7*(3), 245–274.

Bartolini Bussi, M. G., & Mariotti, M. A. (2008). Semiotic mediation in the mathematics classroom: Artifacts and signs after a Vygotskian perspective. In L. English (Ed.), *Handbook of international research in mathematics education* (2nd ed., pp. 746–783). Routledge.

Borba, M. C., & Villarreal, M. E. (2005). *Humans-with-media and the reorganization of mathematical thinking: Information and communication technologies, modeling, visualization and experimentation*. Springer.

Clark-Wilson, A., Robutti, O., & Sinclair, N. (2014). *The mathematics teacher in the digital era: An international perspective on technology focused professional development*. Springer.

Confrey, J., & Maloney, A. (2007). A theory of mathematical modelling in technological settings. In W. Blum, P. L. Galbraith, H.-W. Henn, & M. Niss (Eds.), *Modelling and applications in mathematics education* (pp. 57–68). Springer.

Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.

Drijvers, P., Doorman, M., Boon, P., Reed, H., & Gravemeijer, K. (2010). The teacher and the tool: Instrumental orchestrations in the technology-rich mathematics classroom. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *75*(2), 213–234.

Guin, D., & Trouche, L. (1999). The complex process of converting tools into mathematical instruments: The case of calculators. *International Journal of Computers for Mathematical Learning*, *3*(3), 195–227.

Hegedus, S. J., & Moreno-Armella, L. (2009). Intersecting representation and communication infrastructures. *ZDM—Mathematics Education*, *41*(4), 399–412.

Heid, M. K. (2005). Technology in mathematics education: Tapping into visions of the future. In W. J. Masalski & P. C. Elliott (Eds.), *Technology-supported mathematics learning environments* (pp. 345–366). National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Hoyles, C. (2018). Transforming the mathematical practices of learners and teachers through digital technology. *Research in Mathematics Education*, *20*(3), 209–228.

Hoyles, C., & Lagrange, J.-B. (Eds.). (2010). *Mathematics education and technology—Rethinking the terrain: The 17th ICMI Study*. Springer.

Kaput, J. J. (1992). Technology and mathematics education. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 515–556). Macmillan.

Laborde, C. (2001). Integration of technology in the design of geometry tasks with Cabri-Geometry. *International Journal of Computers for Mathematical Learning*, *6*(3), 283–317.

Laborde, C., Kynigos, C., Hollebrands, K., & Strasser, R. (2006). Teaching and learning geometry with technology. In A. Gutiérrez & P. Boero (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the psychology of mathematics education: Past, present and future* (pp. 275–304). Sense Publishers.

Mariotti, M. A. (2009). Artifacts and signs after a Vygotskian perspective: The role of the teacher. *ZDM—Mathematics Education*, *41*(4), 427–440.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(6), 1017–1054.

Noss, R., & Hoyles, C. (2006). Exploring mathematics through construction and collaboration. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 389–405). Cambridge University Press.

Papert, S. (1991). Situating constructionism. In I. Harel & S. Papert (Eds.), *Constructionism* (pp. 1–11). Ablex.

Pea, R. D. (1985). Beyond amplification: Using the computer to reorganize mental functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *20*(4), 167–182.

Rabardel, P. (1995). *Les hommes et les technologies: Approche cognitive des instruments contemporains*. Armand Colin.

Ruthven, K. (2009). Towards a naturalistic conceptualisation of technology integration in classroom practice: The example of school mathematics. *Éducation & Didactique*, *3*(1), 131–159.

Trouche, L. (2004). Managing the complexity of human/machine interactions in computerized learning environments: Guiding students' command process through instrumental orchestrations. *International Journal of Computers for Mathematical Learning*, *9*(3), 281–307.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Zbiek, R. M., Heid, M. K., Blume, G. W., & Dick, T. P. (2007). Research on technology in mathematics education: A perspective of constructs. In F. K. Lester Jr. (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 1169–1207). Information Age.

Zheng, T. (1998). Impacts of using calculators in learning mathematics. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Conference on Technology in Collegiate Mathematics*. Addison-Wesley.