JOL Established by INASP in 2007. Managed by Tribhuvan University Central Library.

Ganeshman Darpan

A Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Journal

Analyzing Role of Abstract Thinking: Teaching Solvable and Nilpotent Groups in Algebra

Yagya Prasad Gnawali [a,*], Umesh Acharya [b]

[a, b] Faculty of Education, Tribhuvan University, Mahendra Ratna Campus

Article Info **Abstract**

Received: October 07, 2024
Accepted: December 23, 2024
Published: May 22, 2025
Available online: May 29, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/gd.v10i1.80603

Keywords: *Solvable group, ninpotent group, abstract thinking, algebric structure*

This study explored the role of abstract thinking in teaching solvable and nilpotent groups in abstract algebra. We used an ethnographic approach, preparing a set of questionnaires and working with three university-level abstract algebra teachers to gather detailed insights. The main research objective was to explore the role of abstract thinking in understanding and teaching the concepts of solvable and nilpotent groups in algebra, and research question was how abstract reasoning influences students' conceptual clarity, problem-solving ability, and mathematical maturity in group theory. We used open-ended questionnaires to facilitate in-depth discussions about their pedagogical approaches and we observed the classroom teaching of abstract algebra for finding, challenges, and successes in conveying concepts in solvable and Nilpotent group. The study maintained rigorous ethical considerations throughout data collection and analysis, ensuring participant confidentiality and informed consent. Findings highlighted the critical role of abstract thinking in enhancing comprehension and promoting a supportive learning environment, ultimately empowering students to navigate advanced algebraic structures confidently and creatively.

Introduction

The concept of a subnormal series is fundamental in group theory as it provides a structured way to break down a group into simpler components (Bhattacharya et al.,2007). It helps in analyzing the hierarchical structure of groups and understanding their normal subgroups. By refining a subnormal series, we can arrive at a composition series, where each factor is simple, leading to the classification of groups through their composition factors (Bhattrai, 2011; Faizah et al., 2020; Hausberger, 2020). The group S_3 (the symmetric group on 3 elements) is not a subnormal series itself, but we can construct subnormal series for S_3(Gallian, 2013). Therefore, $S_3 > A_3 > 1$. In this context a subnormal series of a group G is a chain of a subgroup $\{e\} = G_n \, \Delta \, G_{n-1} \, \Delta \, G_{n-1} \ldots\ldots \, \Delta \, G_1 \, \Delta \, G_o = G$. For the infinite cyclic group Z under addition, every subgroup is normal because the group is abelian (Gallian, 2013).

A common subnormal series for Z is given $Z \supseteq 2Z \supseteq 4Z \supseteq 8Z \supseteq \cdots$ In this series, each subgroup $2^n Z$ is normal in Z (and in any intermediate subgroup) since all subgroups in an abelian group are normal (Goyal et al., 2015). The factor groups $Z/2Z$, $2Z/4Z$, etc., are each isomorphic to the cyclic group of order 2 (Herstein, 2006). This descending chain is an example of a subnormal series for Z that illustrates the nested structure of its subgroups. This idea is crucial in results like Schreier's Refinement Theorem and the Jordan-Hölder Theorem, which establish the uniqueness of composition factors in different subnormal series of a group (Hungerford, 1974).

We study normal series in abstract algebra because it provides a structured way to explore the hierarchy and internal organization of groups. A normal series breaks down a group into successive normal subgroups, where each subgroup is normal in the preceding one (Hazzan, 1999). This allows us to investigate how the group is built from smaller subgroups, and it plays a key role in understanding the group's structure (Gaonkar, 2017). The quotients of successive normal subgroups, called factor groups, reveal important information about the group's composition (Hungerford, 1974). By

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: gnawali.yagya@gmail.com

analyzing these factors, we can gain insights into the properties and behavior of the entire group, especially in the context of solvability and simplicity.

Moreover, normal series are crucial in the classification and study of groups. It is used to construct composition series, where all factor groups are simple, leading to a classification of groups based on their simple components. This idea is foundational in the Jordan-Hölder Theorem, which ensures that different normal series of a group yield the same structure factors, providing a unique structure for the group (Dummit & Foote, 2008). Studying normal series helps in understanding how groups decompose and how different types of groups, such as solvable or simple groups, fit into the broader algebraic landscape, with applications ranging from group theory to Galois theory and representation theory (Fraleigh, 1984). In this context, S_3 permutation group is the normal series such as $\{e\}\Delta A_3 \Delta S_3$, where {e} is a trivial subgroup, A_3 = {e, (123), (132)} is an alternating group which is normal in S_3 (Bhattrai, 2011). So S_3 has a normal series (Hungerford, 1974).

The cyclic group Z_5 is a cyclic group of order 5, Since 5 is prime, Z_5 is a simple group, meaning it has no nontrivial normal subgroups. Z_6 = {0,1,2,3,4,5} under addition modulo 6. It is a cyclic group generated by 1, $Z_6=\langle 1\rangle$, the subgroups of Z_6 correspond to the divisors of 6, {0} (trivial subgroup), $\langle 3\rangle$= {0,3} (order 2), $\langle 2\rangle$= {0,2,4} (order 3), Z_6 itself. G= {1, -1, i, -i} is a cyclic group which is abelian and it is a normal subgroup such as {1} Δ {1, -1} Δ G (Hungerford, 1974). Here, {1, -1} is a normal subgroup of G because it is the unique subgroup of order 2, and every subgroup of an abelian group is normal. This sequence forms a normal series as each subgroup is normal in the entire group (Bhattrai, 2011; Maharjan, 2007). The length of a subnormal series is the number of proper containment steps in the series, which is equal to k. For example, in the cyclic group Z_6 = {0,1,2,3,4,5}, one possible subnormal series is $Z_6 \Delta\langle 3\rangle \Delta \{0\}$. Since, this series has two strict containment steps, its length is 2 (Dummit & Foote, 2008). Again, for the dihedral group, let n>2 and S be the set of all vertices of regular n-gon is called the dihedral group of degree n denoted by D_n and written by $|D_n| = 2n$, D_4= {(1), (1234), (13) (24), (1432), (24), (13), (12) (34), (14) (23)}. Here, D_4 admits a normal series, meaning it can be decomposed into a chain of normal subgroups (Maharjan, 2007).

Nilpotent Groups Generalize Structural Simplicity and Applications in Group Theory

Nilpotent groups generalize abelian groups and have a well-structured lower central series, making them easier to study (Howe, 2022). It plays a crucial role in the classification of finite groups and p-groups, which are fundamental in algebra and number theory (Burton,2010; Howe, 2022). Nilpotent groups correspond to nilpotent falsehood algebras, which are essential in solving differential equations, understanding geometry, and modeling physical systems in quantum mechanics and relativity. Every nilpotent group is solvable, but not every solvable group is nilpotent (Dummit & Foote, 2008).

Nilpotent groups have a faster approach to reaching the trivial group through the lower central series, while solvable groups use the derived series. For example, the group (a group of upper triangular matrices with 1s on the diagonal) is nilpotent, and since all nilpotent groups are solvable, it is also solvable (Vasishtha & Vasishtha, 2000).

The symmetric group S_4 is solvable, but not nilpotent. However, a p-group (for prime p) is always nilpotent, and hence solvable. Nilpotency measures how close a group is to being abelian, with strict constraints on its commutator structure. Solvability measures whether a group can be broken down into abelian quotients using the derived series (Dummit & Foote, 2008).

The commutator subgroup acts as the first step in the process of measuring nilpotency, making it the "basis" for understanding nilpotent groups (Israel, 2007). If the commutator subgroup is small or gets absorbed quickly in the lower central series, then the group is highly nilpotent. S_3 is solvable group and S_5 is not solvable (Dummit & Foote, 2008).

Methods

This study employed a qualitative ethnographic research design to explore the role of abstract thinking in teaching solvable and nilpotent groups in algebra (Creswell, 2009). Conducted in higher education settings, the research focused on three experienced university-level abstract algebra instructors. Data collection methods included unstructured questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and classroom observations (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The unstructured questionnaires and interviews captured teachers' perspectives on fostering abstract thinking and the challenges students face in grasping complex group theory concepts. Classroom observations provided real-time insights into teaching strategies, student engagement, and approaches to addressing conceptual difficulties.

The study was grounded in a qualitative paradigm, embracing an ontological belief in multiple realities and a subjective epistemology where knowledge is co-constructed between researcher and participants (Creswell, 2012). An interpretivist methodology guided the inquiry, aiming to understand the lived experiences and instructional intentions of the teachers. A value-laden axiological stance acknowledged the researcher's positionality in the knowledge construction process. Through interviews and observations, the study explored how abstract thinking supports students' conceptual clarity, problem-solving skills, and mathematical maturity when learning solvable and nilpotent groups in group theory. We applied the insights and experiences shared by teacher A, B, and C with full respect for their confidence, confidentiality, and privacy

For data analysis, we used a thematic analysis approach, categorizing findings into basic themes, which captured specific challenges and strategies; organizing themes, which grouped related ideas such as instructional techniques and engagement methods; and global themes, which provided a broader understanding of the overall impact of abstract thinking in algebra instruction (Creswell, 2007). This triangulated approach combining questionnaires, in-depth-interviews, and observations ensured a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the teaching practices and challenges related to abstract thinking in algebra for the nilpotent and solvable groups (Creswell, 2012).

Results and Discussion

The findings of the study have highlighted key themes related to the role of abstract thinking in teaching solvable and nilpotent groups in algebra. Through unstructured survey responses and interviews with three experienced higher education teachers, we identified several basic themes, such as difficulties in understanding group structures, the necessity of step-by-step explanations, and the use of real-world analogies. These basic themes were grouped into organizing themes, including effective teaching strategies, student engagement challenges, and conceptual barriers in abstract algebra. We concluded global themes such as understanding definition and concepts, visualizing and working with group series, recognizing Nilpotency and the role of the center, and distinguishing between solvable and Nilpotent groups. We gave the three code of the mathematics teachers such as A, B, and C.

We analyzed several global themes that emerged from our study, which helped to organize our analysis of the role of abstract thinking in teaching solvable and nilpotent groups. We have observed the classroom teaching of the abstract algebra course conducted by Teachers A, B, and C. During each session, we used an observation checklist consisting of 15 criteria related to abstract algebra instruction. We filled in the checklist by marking either "Yes" or "No" based on what we observed in the classroom.

Understanding Definitions and Concepts

When we visited Teacher A, we explained the research objective and conducted an in-depth interview focused on abstract algebra, particularly on the topics of Nilpotency and Solvable Groups. Our questions were related how does abstract thinking influence students' understanding of solvable groups in abstract algebra. He responded that abstract thinking plays a crucial role in helping students understand solvable groups, as it allows them to move beyond surface-level definitions and engage with the underlying structure of the group.

We also visited Teacher B and shared the research objective with him before asking about his views on Nilpotent and Solvable Groups. He enthusiastically shared his perspective, discussing the progression from basic concepts to theorems. He recalled the difficulties students face in understanding and memorizing the definitions and concepts related to nilpotent groups. Regarding his own understanding of abstract algebra, he said, "I am still teaching based on what I studied at the Master's level." He further emphasized the importance of practice over rote memorization, noting that it is more meaningful for students to understand that a group is solvable if its derived series terminates in the trivial subgroup. In this context, he added, students with strong abstract thinking skills are better able to visualize how successive commutator subgroups simplify the structure of a group. Ultimately, this form of reasoning helps students connect the concepts of nilpotency and solvability with broader ideas such as group decomposition, normal subgroups, and abelian properties, thereby deepening their conceptual understanding (McGinn et al., 2015).

Teacher C added that students often find nilpotent groups challenging due to their abstract and structural complexity, especially the lower central series and recursive definitions. He also confused that the n^{th} term of Nilpotent group such as an example $G = \{1, -1, i, -i\}$ be a group. The center of the group is $Z(G) = \{1, -1\}$. It is abelian group series so $\{e\}=Z_0(G) \leq Z_1(G) =G$

$(1) = \{e\}=Z_0(G) < Z_1(G) = \{1, -1\} = G$ which is the Nilpotency of one. The group $G = \{1, -1, i, -i\}$, which consists of the fourth roots of unity under multiplication, is an abelian group. In any abelian group, every element commutes with every other element.

This means that the center of the group, denoted by Z(G), which consists of all elements that commute with every element in the group, is the group itself. The concept of nilpotency is studied through the upper central series, which begins with the trivial subgroup $Z_0 (G) = \{1\}$ and continues with $Z_1(G) = Z(G)$, and so on. Since G is abelian, the center Z(G) equals G, so the series terminates at the first step with Z1 (G) = G. When the upper central series reaches the whole group at the first step beyond the trivial subgroup, the group is said to be nilpotent of class one.

Therefore, G is nilpotent of class one because it is abelian, and its center already contains all its elements abstract reasoning helps students navigate these difficulties by enabling them to generalize and understand hierarchical group behavior (Wasserman, 2017). Conceptual visualization through tools like subgroup matrixes and commutator trees enhances comprehension by making abstract ideas more intuitive (Veith et al., 2022). A solid foundation in basic group theory concepts (e.g., normal subgroups, homomorphisms) supports deeper understanding of solvable and nilpotent groups (Ayres & Jaisingh, 2004; Johnson et al., 2015; Ying &Osman, 2020).

Furthermore, teacher A also added that the activities such as proof construction, counterexample exploration, and group classification foster abstract thinking and deepen reasoning (Ticknor, 2012). However, without concrete examples, students may resort to memorization, i.e. examples like upper-triangular matrices or the Nilpotent group help ground these abstract ideas. Techniques like symbolic manipulation and recursive thinking enhance understanding of commutators and derived series (Shikalepo, 2020). While high abstraction can discourage some students, it can also inspire those drawn to logical challenges. To maintain engagement, teaching should balance abstraction with examples, using progressive abstraction and visual aids (Khanna & Bhambri, 2013). Finally, developing students' metacognitive skills through reflection, self-explanation, and strategic thinking strengthens their ability to understand and navigate complex algebraic structures.

Visualizing and Working with Group Normal Series and Subnormal Series

For the visualizing of the Normal series and Subnormal series such as teacher A viewed when we met Teacher A, he expressed concern about the difficulty in visualizing and teaching abstract algebraic concepts such as solvable groups, nilpotent groups, and especially the ideas of normal series and subnormal series. Moreover, S_3 permutation group is the normal series such as $\{e\} \Delta A_3 \Delta S_3$, where $\{e\}$ is a trivial subgroup, $A_3 = \{e, (123), (132)\}$ is an alternating group which is normal in S_3. According to him, these topics are particularly challenging to explain because students often begin studying group theory without a strong foundational background. The concepts are highly theoretical and tend to lack intuitive appeal unless it is supported by concrete examples, visual representations, or real-world analogies (Agustyaningrun et al., 2021).

Teacher A further noted that the prevailing pass-only education system encourages students to focus solely on passing exams rather than truly understanding the subject matter. As a result, many students struggle with abstract algebra, lacking the logical progression and conceptual grounding needed to grasp these advanced topics. Teacher A emphasized the need for interactive teaching methods, conceptual clarity, and the use of simple, illustrative examples to make these abstract ideas more accessible and meaningful to learners.

The ability to visualize group structures and work through series like the derived series and central series was highlighted as crucial for students to grasp the concepts of solvability and nilpotency (Dummit & Foote, 2008). Abstract thinking plays a crucial role in helping students visualize and work with group series such as those found in solvable and nilpotent groups. When students develop the ability to think abstractly, they can better understand the recursive and hierarchical nature of group series like the derived series and the lower central series (Agustyaningrun et al., 2018; Khanna & Bhambri, 2013). These concepts are essential to defining solvable and nilpotent groups, yet it is highly abstract and difficult to grasp without a strong foundation in logical reasoning (Ticknor, 2012). Teacher B concluded that abstract thinking enables learners to move beyond surface-level memorization and begin to see how each step in a group series builds upon the last (Israel, 2007). Prior exposure to fundamental group theory concepts such as normal subgroups, quotient groups, and homomorphisms further strengthens their ability to connect abstract definitions to the larger algebraic structures (Booth et al., 2013). Tasks like constructing proofs, analyzing subgroup relationships, or exploring derived series using algebraic structure allow students to reason through group hierarchies and enhance their conceptual grasp (Lang, 1994).

When we discussed with Teacher C, he shared his concern about the difficulty in visualizing and teaching abstract algebraic concepts such as solvable groups, nilpotent groups, normal series, and subnormal series. These topics are often hard for students to grasp due to their abstract nature and the lack of a strong foundational background. I could relate to Teacher C's experience, as I also faced challenges in teaching these concepts with examples. However, as I continued teaching and engaging more deeply with the material, I gradually began to understand the examples myself. This experience helped me realize that the teaching process itself can enhance a teacher's understanding, and that learning by teaching is a powerful approach—not just for students, but for teachers as well.

Teachers C also said that conceptual visualization, such as using subgroup lattices, group trees, or diagrams, permutation groups that illustrate the progression toward the identity element, can significantly improve students' understanding of these abstract ideas. These visual tools bridge the gap between symbolic operations and conceptual meaning, especially for students who struggle to interpret the definitions of solvable and nilpotent groups without concrete examples. Activities that encourage reflective problem-solving, collaborative exploration, and explaining reasoning out loud help promote metacognitive skills, enabling students to monitor and adjust their learning strategies (Barz et al., 2024; Howe, 2022). Additionally, gradually increasing abstraction from specific group examples to general properties helps maintain motivation and engagement (Cetin & Dekici, 2021). Students are more likely to stay invested when they can visualize progress and connect theory to meaningful structures (Herstein, 2006; Sleeman, 1986). Teachers can support this by integrating progressive abstraction, visual aids, analogies, and opportunities for students to construct their own group series or explore the implications of group commutators and derived subgroups using logical reasoning (Wasserman, 2017).

Recognizing Nilpotency and the Role of the Center

For the concept of the recognizing Nilpotency and the role of the center. Teacher A adds abstract thinking is essential in recognizing nilpotency and understanding the role of the center in group theory. Teacher A mentioned that finding the center of a given group is very important. He provided the example ax=xa for all $x \in Z$, demonstrating how the center works in a commutative group. Additionally, Teacher A pointed out that elements in the center of a group commute with all other elements in the group, including those in the centralizer. This relationship highlights the role of the center in a group and how it interacts with other important subsets like the centralizer and the center itself.

The center of a group is key to understanding nilpotent groups, as it forms the basis of the upper central series a sequence of subgroups that builds from the center and eventually covers the entire group. If this process finishes in finitely many steps, the group is nilpotent. Such groups have a non-trivial, often large center, reflecting a high level of commutativity. All abelian groups, where the center is the whole group, are nilpotent of class one. Thus, the center is crucial for analyzing the group's structure and degree of commutativity.

Students who develop strong abstract reasoning skills can better grasp how nilpotent groups are defined through the lower central series and how this series terminates in the identity subgroup. These students are also more likely to appreciate the importance of the center of a group since nilpotent groups often have large centers that influence the structure of the group itself. Abstract thinking helps students visualize how successive commutators move "deeper" into the group's structure and how the behavior of central elements governs the simplification of the group through recursive steps (Leron & Dubinsky, 1995). Without this level of abstraction, students may struggle with the recursive nature of definitions or fail to recognize the hierarchical relationships among subgroups (Lanski, 2010). Prior exposure to key concepts like normality, commutators, and centralizers equips learners with a stronger foundation for interpreting nilpotency and solvability, making advanced topics more accessible (Lanski, 2010).

Teacher B emphasized that the center of a group is very important for recognizing whether a group is nilpotent. According to Teacher B, the center helps reveal the internal structure and level of commutativity within a group. In particular, he pointed out that the construction of the upper central series, which is used to define nilpotency, begins with the center. If this series eventually reaches the whole group in a finite number of steps, the group is considered nilpotent. Thus, the presence of a non-trivial and progressively growing center is a strong indicator of nilpotency in a group (Johnson et al., 2015). These tools allow students to "see" how the center plays a pivotal role in breaking down the group and leading to nilpotency. Activities such as constructing lower central series, identifying centers, and proving group properties through induction promote abstract thinking and deeper engagement (Maharjan, 2007). Teacher C viewed that to bridge the gap from concrete to abstract, teaching should begin with familiar group examples (like upper-triangular matrix groups or permutation groups, cyclic group, Dihedral group, Alternating group) and guide students through the abstraction process (Goyal et al., 2015). As students learn to monitor their thought processes and adapt their problem-solving strategies, he become more adept at navigating the complexities of solvable and nilpotent groups, leading to greater confidence and competence in abstract algebra (Sleeman, 1986).

Distinguishing Between Solvable and Nilpotent Groups

Teacher A claimed that distinguishing between solvable and nilpotent groups in abstract algebra requires a deep level of abstract thinking, as these group properties rely on understanding series of subgroups and their behavior under group operations. Abstract thinking allows students to comprehend the difference between the derived series (used for solvable groups) and the lower central series (used for nilpotent groups). Solvable groups are characterized by a series of subgroups where each quotient is abelian, while nilpotent groups require that the lower central series terminates at the identity subgroup. Students who can engage in symbolic manipulation and logical deduction are better able to trace these series and interpret what it means for a group to become progressively simpler in structure (Saracino, 2017). Teacher B viewed that however, many students struggle with nilpotent groups because their structural behavior is less intuitive and more reliant on recursive definitions involving the center of the group. Abstract reasoning helps students move beyond rote memorization, allowing them to understand how each level in a group series contributes to the overarching group property (Manandhar & Sharma, 2021).

Teacher C said that to improve teaching and understanding, conceptual visualization plays a key role. Diagrams such as subgroup lattices, central and derived series trees, and visual analogies of "descending" to identity help make abstract definitions more tangible. Prior knowledge of normal subgroups, abelian groups, and homomorphisms is crucial it acts as a scaffold for grasping more complex structures (Fraleigh, 1984). Activities that foster abstract thinking include proof-based tasks, constructing examples and counterexamples, analyzing series, and discussing why certain groups fit or do not fit the solvable/nilpotent criteria. Without concrete examples, students often misinterpret or fail to internalize abstract group properties. Examples like the symmetric group S_3 or upper-triangular matrices with 1s on the diagonal provide necessary anchoring (Ticknor, 2012). Teaching strategies should gradually transition from familiar groups to abstract structures, using tools such as conceptual mapping, guided discovery, and dynamic algebra software (Setianingrum et al., 2020). Developing students' metacognitive skills encouraging them to reflect on how they reason, where they struggle, and how they approach abstract relationships them navigate the complexities of higher algebra with greater confidence and insight (Xue, 2022).

Classroom Observation

Teacher A delivered a highly effective and conceptually rich lesson on solvable and nilpotent groups. The teacher began by clearly defining both concepts, establishing strong connections between foundational group theory and abstract algebraic definitions. Throughout the session, illustrative examples were provided to help students transition from concrete understanding to abstract reasoning. The lesson included exploration of commutator subgroups and the lower central series, encouraging students to think beyond memorization. Teacher A promoted generalization from specific group examples and used diagrams, algebraic structures, and metaphors such as "layers" to make abstract ideas more tangible. Students were prompted to reflect on the meanings and implications of definitions, worked through derivations collaboratively, and posed thoughtful questions. Group discussions and peer explanations further reinforced conceptual clarity. Tasks involving derived and lower central series challenged students and allowed them to apply theoretical knowledge. Misconceptions were addressed through abstract reasoning, and students demonstrated confidence in using abstract terminology and logic throughout the lesson. Overall, Teacher A fostered a deep and meaningful learning experience grounded in active student participation and abstract understanding.

Teacher B conducted a more traditional, lecture-style session with a focus on procedural clarity rather than conceptual exploration. While the teacher provided definitions of solvable and nilpotent groups, these were presented briefly and with limited emphasis on underlying ideas. Some attempts were made to link group theory basics to abstract definitions, and basic examples were given, though their connection to abstract thinking was minimal. The teacher made a brief mention of commutator subgroups but did not delve into their significance. Students were mostly passive, with few opportunities for generalization, discussion, or reflection. Abstract representations were used symbolically but not visually or metaphorically. Although the teacher guided the class through a basic derivation, it was not interactive, and students rarely asked questions beyond clarification. Group discussion was absent, and misconceptions were not thoroughly addressed. While a simple problem related to the lower central series was included, students appeared unsure and lacked confidence in abstract reasoning. Overall, Teacher B's lesson was content-accurate but did not sufficiently engage students in deeper mathematical thinking.

Teacher C presented an interactive and inquiry-based lesson that successfully promoted abstract thinking, even though some technical depth was less emphasized. Definitions of solvable and nilpotent groups were introduced through questions and dialogue, helping students co-construct meaning. The teacher effectively linked familiar group theory concepts to more abstract definitions, and encouraged students to share and analyze their own examples. Visual representations such as diagrams and symbols were used, and analogies like organizational hierarchies made the concepts more accessible. The exploration of commutator subgroups was student-driven, fostering conceptual understanding. Teacher C frequently encouraged reflection, generalization, and reasoning. Students participated in problem-solving tasks, worked through derivations in groups, and engaged in vibrant discussions that clarified misconceptions. Their questions demonstrated curiosity and a willingness to grapple with abstract ideas. By the end of the lesson, students showed increased comfort and fluency with abstract mathematical abstraction. Overall, Teacher C's approach successfully balanced student engagement, conceptual depth, and collaborative learning for the abstract algebra.

Conclusion

We explored the abstraction of nilpotent and solvable groups such as in conclusion, understanding solvable and nilpotent groups requires a high level of abstract thinking, which is often a significant hurdle for students in advanced algebra. These group structures demand a conceptual grasp of derived and central series, commutators, quotient groups, and the roles of abelian and center-related properties topics that rarely have intuitive or concrete counterparts. The transition from learning basic group operations to analyzing hierarchical subgroup structures necessitates not only mathematical maturity but also the ability to visualize abstract progressions and understand their theoretical significance. Students often face difficulties due to a lack of exposure to concrete examples, insufficient foundational knowledge, and limited opportunities for conceptual visualization or exploration. Without strong scaffolding, learners may struggle to make meaningful connections and are prone to rely on memorization rather than deep comprehension.

To effectively teach these concepts, educators should integrate strategies that build abstract reasoning and metacognitive awareness. This includes using visual representations of group series, computational tools to model complex group behaviors, and tasks that encourage students to generalize and reflect on patterns within algebraic structures.

Activities such as exploring symmetric, permutation group, cyclic groups and quaternion groups, constructing group series, or examining solvability in historical contexts like Zassenhaus theorem can promote engagement and insight. Most importantly, instruction should prioritize gradual abstraction linking new content to prior knowledge and building from concrete examples to formal definitions. By fostering both conceptual understanding and cognitive flexibility, educators can help students navigate the abstract nature of solvable and nilpotent groups, ultimately deepening their appreciation of higher algebra**.**

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the **University Grants Commission (UGC)** for providing the faculty research grant to study the learning difficulties in abstract algebra at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. We hope that UGC will continue to support similar academic initiatives in the near future as well.

References

Agustyaningrun, N., Abodi, A. M., Sari, R. N & Mahmudi, A. (2018). An analysis of students' error in solving abstract algebra tasks. Journal of Physics: Conf. Series https://doi.org/10.1088/1742.65961109711/012118

Agustyaningrun, N., Sari, R. N., Abodi, A. M. & Mahmudi, A. (2021). Dominant factors that cause students' difficulties in learning abstract algebra: A case study at a University of Indonesia. International Journal of Instruction, 14(1), 847- 866 https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14/15a

Ayres, F., Jr., & Jaisingh, L. R. (2004). Schaum's outline of theory and problems of abstract algebra (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Barz, N., Benick, M., Dörrenbächer-Ulrich, L., & Perels, F. (2024). The effect of digital game-based learning interventions on cognitive, metacognitive, and affective-motivational learning outcomes in school: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 94(2), 193-227. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231167795

Bhattacharya, P. B., Jain, S. K., & Nogpaul, S. R. (2007). *Basic abstract algebra*. Cambridge University Press.

Bhattrai, B. N. (2011). Introduction of group theory. Subhakamana Prakashan.

Burton, D. M. (2010). Elementary number theory (7th edition). McGrow – Hill.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*: Choosing among five approaches (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach* (3rd Ed). Sage Publication.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., Shope, R., Plano Clark, V. L., & Green, D. O. (2006). How interpretive qualitative research extends mixed methods research. Research in the Schools, 13(1), 1-11.

Dummit, D. S., & Foote, R. M. (2008). *Abstract algebra*. India: Wiley Wast House.

Faizah, S., Nusantara, T., Sudirman, S., & Rahardi, R. (2020). Exploring students' thinking process in mathematical proof of abstract algebra based on Mason's framework. *Journal for the Education Gifted, 8*(2), 871-884, https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.689809

Fraleigh, J. B. (1984). A first course in abstract algebra. Narosa Publishing house.

Gallian, J. A. (2013). Contemporary abstract algebra. Delhi: Cengage Learning India Pvt.

Gaonkar, V. S. (2017). A study on algebra of groups and rings structures in mathematics. *International Journal of Scientific and Innovative Mathematical Research, 5*(1), 24-29 https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3142.0501006

Goyal, J. K., Gupta, K. P., Gupta, G. S., & Gupta, S. S. (2015). *Advanced course in modern algebra*. Meerut: Pragati Prakashan.

Hausberger, T. (2020). Abstract algebra teaching and learning. In: Lerman, S. (eds) Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education. Springer, Cham https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15789-0_100022

Hazzan, O. (1999). Reducing abstraction level when learning abstract algebra concepts. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 40*(1), 71-90, https://doi.org/10.1023/1003780613628

Herstein, I. N. (2006). Topic in algebra. India: John Wiley and Sons.

Howe, R. M. (2022). *The group algebra.* In an invitation to representation theory. Springer undergraduate mathematics series. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98025-2_6

Hungerford, T. W. (1974). *Algebra*. New York Inc. Springer Verlog.

Israel, K. (2007). *A history of abstract algebra*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4685-1

Johnson, E., Keller, R., Fukawa, - Connelly, T. (2017). Results from a survey of abstract algebra instructors across the United States: Understanding the choice to (Not) Lecture. Int. J. Res. *Undergraduate Math Education*, 1-32 https://doi.org/10.1007/s40753-017-0058-1

Kanna, V. K., & Bhambri, S. K. (2013). A Course in abstract algebra. Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd.

Khanna, V. K., & Bhambri, S. K. (2013). *A course in abstract algebra.* Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd.

Lang, S. (1994). *Algebra.* Inc, Springer Verlog.

Lanski, C. (2010). *Concepts in abstract algebra.* American Mathematical Society.

Leron, U., & Dubinsky, E. (1995). An Abstract Algebra Story, *The American Mathematical Monthly,* 102:3, 227-242, https://doi.org/10.1080/00029890.1995.11990563

Maharjan, H. B. (2007). Group theory. Kathmandu: Bhudipuran Prakasn.

Manandhar, R., & Sharma, L. (2021). Strategies of learning abstract algebra. *International Journal of Research,* GRANTHAALAYAH, 9(1), 1-6 https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v9.i1.2021.2697

McGinn, K. M., Lange, K. E., & Booth, J. (2015). A worked example for creating worked examples. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School, 21*(1), 27-33 https://doi.org/10.5951/mathteacmiddscho.21.10026

Saracino, D. (2017). *Abstract algebra.* Waveland Press, Inc.

Setianingrum, R. S., Syamsuri, S., & Setiani, Y. (2020). Analyzing the students' learning difficulties in algebra. *Jurusan Pendidican Matematika, 8*(1), 19-34

Shikalepo, E. E. (2020). Defining a conceptual framework in educational research. *International University of Management,* 1-8, https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26293.09447

Sleeman, D. (1986). Introductory algebra: A case study of student misconceptions. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior, 5*(1), 25-32

Ticknor, C. S. (2012). Situated learning in an abstract algebra classroom. Educ. Stud Math, 81, 307-323. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-012-9405-y

Ticknor, C. S. (2012). Situated learning in an abstract algebra classroom. *Educational. Students Math*, 81, 307-323. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-012-9405-y

Vasishtha, A. R., & Vasishtha, A. K. (2000). *Modern algebra.* Krishna Prakashan Media (P) Ltd, Meerut.

Veith, J. M., Bitzenbauer, P., & Girnat, B. (2022). Exploring learning difficulties in abstract algebra: The case of group theory. Education Science, 12(8), 1-21 https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12080516

Wasserman, N. H. (2017). Making sense of abstract algebra: Exploring secondary teachers understanding of inverse functions in relation to its group structure. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning, 19*(3), 18201, https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10986065.2017.1328635

Xue, Z. (2022). Group theory and ring theory. *Journal of Physics Conference Series, 2386*(1), 012024 https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2386/1/012024

Ying, C. L., &Osman, S. (2020). Difficulties that students face when learning algebraic problem solving. *Universal Journal pf Educational Research, 8*(1), 1-17 https://doi.org/10.13189/4jer.2020.081143

Zaffar, A., Qureshi, S. M., & Ansari, R. K. (2013). Teaching of abstract algebra at undergraduate level. The S. U. *Journal of Edu,* 39, 1-12 https://shorturl.at/cekqs