Editorial

This issue contains three research articles and one call for papers. It also marks the beginning of a new editorial work order where accepted research papers are made available on the journal web-page as soon as they are accepted for publication. We at NOMAD strive to keep being an excellent alternative for publishing mathematics education research from the nordic region. We hope this development is to our readers' and authors' liking. More news yet to come. On to presenting this issue's three articles:

In the issue's first article, by Kullberg and Nord, the authors investigate first-grade students' learning of part-whole relations of numbers through a partitioning task using finger patterns. The study is situated in the context of concerns that young learners often rely on counting strategies rather than adopting more advanced approaches such as using part-whole relations. Drawing on variation theory, the authors analyse video-recorded lessons from an intervention in four Swedish classes, identifying critical aspects that students need to discern to flexibly partition numbers up to 10. These aspects include differentiating between finger pattern and finger number, differentiating between parts and fingers, creating parts larger than one, experiencing commutativity, and recognising zero as a part. The results show that while some students could readily generate multiple partitions, others relied heavily on fixed finger numbers or imitated peers, indicating challenges in varying representations. Kullberg and Nord argue that explicit attention to these critical aspects in teaching can support students in developing more efficient addition and subtraction strategies from the outset, with implications for early mathematics instruction and teacher awareness of variation in students' representations.

In the article of Vee and Meaney, the authors analyse kindergarten preservice teachers' descriptions of using mathematical digital apps with children. The authors argue that even though children's use of digital tools is mandated as a requirement in Norwegian kindergartens, this issue is still a source of public debate. Thus, it is relevant to study how kindergarten preservice teachers make sense of what could be conflicting influences of their work involving digital tools in kindergarten. The issue

of using digital tools with children in kindergarten is analysed through a socio-political lens, as the results are discussed with respect to potential socio-political influences on the kindergarten preservice teachers' views upon the use of digital tools in kindergarten. Vee and Meaney find that the studied preservice teachers situate apps as providing the mathematical content to children. However, their role is to make the apps understandable to the children. Vee and Meaney argue that this view seems to be affected by the curriculum and the public debate about using digital technology with young children. This result has implications for kindergarten teacher education, as the teacher educators need to have explicit discussions about the impact of socio-political influences of digital technology with their kindergarten preservice teachers.

Finally, in the article of Briseid, Forssell and Smestad, the authors critically examine Norwegian preservice teacher education textbooks' treatment of diagrammatic proofs for the area formulas of triangles and parallelograms. Focusing on the concept of generality in proofs, they analyse 14 textbooks to determine whether the presented arguments are valid for all cases and whether attention to generality is made explicit. The findings reveal that most textbooks present non-general arguments, particularly the widely used "Standard Argument" for parallelograms, that only apply when certain conditions are met. Moreover, explicit prompts or reasoning to help readers consider the general case are largely absent, leaving it to the teacher to identify and address these limitations. The authors argue that this lack of attention to generality risks preservice teachers accepting incomplete arguments as valid proofs, especially for statements they already believe to be true. They conclude that teacher education should more explicitly address issues of generality in diagrammatic proofs, equipping future teachers with the skills to critically assess and adapt mathematical arguments.

The editors