WHIOCE PUBLISHING PTE. LTD.
PROVIDING FIRST-CLASS SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION FOR TOP SCHOLARS

2025 Volume 3, Issue 10
Educational Innovation Research
ISSN: 3029-1844(Print) ISSN: 3029-1852(Online)

Common Misconceptions of Infinity Among Middle School Students and Effective Correction Strategies

Yuexin Chen*
Higashihiroshima Shiritsu Saijo Junior High School, Higashihiroshima 7390041, Japan

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Abstract： Although infinity-related content is not presented within a rigorous analytic framework at the lower-secondary level, ideas such as number-line unboundedness, the infinite expansion of repeating decimals, the intuitive notion of limits as “approaching infinitely closely,” and infinite processes such as repeated halving and accumulation have entered classroom instruction in multiple forms. In teaching practice, students are often influenced by a completability presupposition—the assumption that an object should be finitely writable and a process finitely executable. Together with semantic drift between everyday meanings and mathematical meanings of intuitive expressions, and additional difficulties in preserving meaning across multiple representations, this presupposition can give rise to stable conceptual misconceptions that readily transfer across topics. Drawing on linguistic evidence from classroom dialogue and written justifications in students’ work, this paper typologizes these misconceptions into eight categories (A–H), covering key themes including unboundedness and density, equivalence of repeating decimals, conceptions of limits, and judgments about infinite accumulation.To address these misconceptions, we propose a corrective instructional framework that is classroom-feasible, observable for evaluation, and transferable across topics. Centered on four justificatory templates—constructive reasoning, difference quantification and algebraic transformation, threshold language (error control), and upper-bound constraints—the framework organizes learning through a “diagnosis–justification–transfer” sequence to support students’ shift from process-based intuition to object-oriented understanding. The study further provides classroom cases on number-line unboundedness, the equivalence 0.999…, and limit intuition, and uses students’ justificatory behaviors and transfer performance as key evaluation indicators. These results offer an explanatory yet actionable pathway for improving instructional transitions in infinity-related content at the lower-secondary level.

Keywords: infinity concept; lower-secondary mathematics; typical misconceptions; misconception correction; justificatory templates

Online publication: November 26, 2025

1. Introduction

“Infinity” runs through core themes such as number and operations, functions, and change. Although lower-secondary mathematics does not yet present it within a rigorous analytic framework, classroom instruction already involves ideas such as the unbounded extension of the number line, the infinite expansion of repeating decimals, the intuitive notion of limits as “approaching without bound,” and infinite processes including repeated halving and successive accumulation[1]. Teaching practice indicates that misunderstandings at this transition stage are both prevalent and persistent. Influenced by a tacit assumption of completion—namely, that an object should be fully writable and a process should be fully executable—students tend to interpret infinite processes as "indeterminate" or as yielding "only approximations." At the same time, intuitive expressions such as "extend infinitely" and "approach infinitely close," when not accompanied by clear mathematical semantic boundaries, are easily assimilated into everyday meanings. This can give rise to misconceptions such as "there is a farthest point but it is unreachable," "0.999… is close to 1 but not equal to 1," and "the limit is the last term," which may further transfer into upper-secondary learning[2]. In response, the present study synthesizes typical misconceptions and analyzes their underlying mechanisms, and proposes corrective strategies that are implementable, observable, and transferable, with the aim of helping students develop a stable understanding that an infinite process can converge toward a well-defined, determinate object.

2. A typological review and diagnosis of typical misconceptions

To enhance the operability of classroom diagnosis, this paper takes as its vehicle the "quasi-infinite" content commonly encountered during the lower-secondary transition period, and surveys students' high-frequency misconceptions from four perspectives: the unboundedness of the number line, the equivalence of repeating decimals, intuitive conceptions of limits, and infinite processes. Although these misconceptions arise in different knowledge contexts, they are structurally isomorphic at the level of cognition. Students tend to explain infinite phenomena through an implicit completability presupposition (i.e., that an object should be finitely writable and a process should be finitely executable). At the same time, they often exhibit semantic drift between everyday language (e.g., "infinitely close," "approach forever") and mathematical meaning, and they may fail to preserve meaning adequately when converting among multiple representations. On the basis of linguistic evidence drawn from classroom dialogue and written justifications in students' work, this paper classifies typical misconceptions into eight types (A–H) and provides, for each type, task cues and diagnostic criteria that can be used for identification.

2.1. Misconceptions related to number-line unboundedness and "infinity at a distance"

As a core representation linking "number" to "position," the number line is often students' earliest experiential source of unboundedness and density[3]. Yet it is also the setting most prone to deviations in which mathematical structure is interpreted through spatial experiences of endpoints. In the transition period, the main difficulty is not plotting or reading values, but rather forming a stable understanding of structural properties such as: there is no greatest (or least) number, "infinity" is not a point, and between any two numbers one can still insert new numbers.

2.1.1. Misconception A: "infinite extension" of the number line implies a "farthest point / greatest number"

Students often reify "infinite extension" into the belief that "there ought to be a farthest point or a greatest number, but one simply cannot reach it / write it down." Cognitively, this stems from transferring the everyday spatial schema of "boundary–endpoint" onto the number line, thereby misconstruing "infinity at a distance" as a referential location-like object. This misconception can be identified through tasks such as "Does there exist a greatest integer (or a greatest rational number)?" and "Given a number a, construct a larger number and justify why it is larger." The key diagnostic indicator is whether students can consistently employ the justificatory structure that for any given number, one can always construct a larger number (e.g., $a+1$), thereby rejecting the existence of a "greatest number / endpoint."

2.1.2. Misconception B: "Infinitely many points" implies the existence of "adjacent points / a smallest interval"

Students may infer that because there are "infinitely many points" on the number line, the points must be "squeezed together" and that "eventually one would finish splitting," leading them to posit a smallest gap or adjacent points. This typically originates from applying discrete counting experience to a continuous representation, replacing the structural idea of "insertability" with the notion of "an extremely large quantity." This misconception can be diagnosed through tasks such as "Generate new numbers repeatedly between 0 and 1 and explain whether the process can continue indefinitely," or "Does there exist a smallest positive rational number?" The crucial diagnostic indicator is whether students can provide an iteratable generation rule (e.g., taking midpoints) or a proof-by-contradiction line of reasoning (e.g., if m were smallest, then $\frac{m}{2}$ would be smaller), thus construing density as the fact that infinitely many numbers can be inserted between any two numbers.

2.2. Misconceptions related to repeating decimals and equivalence relations

Repeating decimals provide a focal entry point in lower-secondary mathematics for the relationship between infinite expansion and a determinate object[4]. However, students often infer "inexactness" from "cannot be written out completely," thereby misconstruing infinite representations as approximate representations and weakening the stability of their understanding of equivalence relations among rational numbers. Taking as core diagnostic perspectives the ideas that differences should be quantifiable and equivalence should be justifiable, this subsection summarizes two types of misconceptions.

2.2.1. Misconception C: A repeating decimal can only represent an approximation—"it is not exact because it cannot be fully written"

Students commonly equate "infinite expansion" directly with "approximate representation," for example claiming that 0.333… merely approaches 1/3 rather than being equal to it. The cognitive root lies in replacing object determinacy with the completability of writing: the non-terminating nature of the representational process is misread as indeterminacy of the represented number. This misconception can be diagnosed through tasks such as "Compare 0.333… and 1/3 and justify your answer," or "Convert a repeating decimal to a fraction and explain the key steps." The key diagnostic indicator is whether, under a claim of "not equal," students can specify a determinate numerical difference, or whether they accept the exact equivalence argument provided by algebraic transformation (introducing an unknown, scaling, and subtracting).

2.2.2. Misconception D: 0.999… "approaches 1 infinitely closely but is never 1"

Students often reject 0.999…= 1 on the grounds that "there are infinitely many digits after it" and "it is always short by a tiny bit." This view readily transfers and becomes entrenched in subsequent limit learning. Its root is an everyday-language commitment that "approaching" entails "never being equal," combined with viewing an infinite expansion as an "unfinished finite process." This misconception can be identified with two types of diagnostic tasks. First, ask students to provide a quantifiable difference under a "not equal" judgment, testing whether "short by a bit" can be turned into a determinate mathematical object. Second, probe their understanding of the algebraic equivalence proof (let x = 0.999…, then 10x = 9.999…, subtract to get 9x = 9, hence x = 1). The key diagnostic indicator is whether students accept the justification that "if two numbers are unequal, there must exist a fixed positive difference, yet such a difference cannot be sustained here," thereby reinterpreting "approach" as a relation in which the error can be made arbitrarily small and the difference can in fact be zero.

2.3. Misconceptions related to limit intuitions and the semantics of "Approaching"

In lower-secondary settings, limits typically appear in an intuitive form such as "trend of change" or "infinite approach."[5] If students retain a narrative frame of "endpoint—arrival," they may objectify the limit as a "last term," or misread "approaching" as "never equal." This paper adopts threshold language (error control) as the central diagnostic and corrective standard.

2.3.1. Misconception E: A limit is the "last term / final state"

Students often believe that "without a last term there can be no limit," treating a limit as the terminating state of a process. The root is the transfer of the completability presupposition into approaching contexts, with insufficient attention to the fact that limit identification depends on error control rather than process termination. This misconception can be diagnosed using examples that have no last term yet display a stable trend, asking students separately whether "a last term exists" and whether "a limit exists." The key diagnostic indicator is whether students can explain the existence of a limit in the form: "given any error threshold, from some term onward the error remains smaller than that threshold."

2.3.2. Misconception F: "Infinitely close" necessarily means "never equal"; therefore the limit value cannot be attained (or the limit does not exist)

Students may interpret "tending toward" as "cannot get there," and then wrongly infer from "not attained" that "the limit does not exist." The root lies in construing convergence as a failed-arrival narrative rather than an error-control relation, which collapses the distinction between "whether a value occurs" and "whether a limit exists." This misconception can be diagnosed by juxtaposing two kinds of processes (limit exists and is attained / limit exists but is not attained). The key diagnostic indicator is whether students can consistently use the threshold criterion to characterize approach in both cases, and can reliably distinguish "existence of the limit" from "whether the process reaches that value."

2.4. Misconceptions related to infinite processes and infinite summation

In contexts such as repeated halving and iterative accumulation, students often infer directly from "infinitely many steps" that "the result must be infinite" or "cannot be determined." Such misconceptions typically arise from dominant quantity intuitions and insufficient justificatory structure, overlooking the roles of upper-bound constraints and verifiable guarantees in constructing determinacy.

2.4.1. Misconception G: An infinite sum must be infinite or "indeterminate"

Students may infer from "infinitely many terms" that "the sum must be infinite," or from "one can never finish adding" that "the value cannot be determined." The root is substituting the question "Are there infinitely many terms?" for an analysis of partial-sum behavior and bounding structure. This misconception can be diagnosed via situational tasks with an evident upper bound (e.g., "If you travel half of the remaining distance each time, will the total distance traveled exceed twice the whole journey?"). The key diagnostic indicator is whether students can justify their conclusion on the basis of "the total is constrained by an overall bound / partial sums are bounded," rather than relying solely on "infinitely many steps" as the decisive reason.

2.4.2. Misconception H: An infinite process must be "completed" in order to yield a trustworthy conclusion

Students often equate mathematical certainty with the physical completion of an operation, believing that "if the process is not finished, the conclusion is unreliable." The root is a failure to distinguish two sources of certainty: "completion of an operation" versus "verifiable justification." This misconception can be diagnosed by asking students to explain, for instance, "Why can a repeating decimal represent a determinate number even if we never write all digits?" and "Why can we determine that a repeated-halving process does not exceed an upper bound even if we do not carry it out to completion?" The key diagnostic indicator is whether students can accept and use verification statements of the form: "for any given standard, there exists a finite number of steps that guarantees the error is below that standard," thereby construing an infinite process as pointing to a determinately justifiable object rather than as an unfinishable sequence of actions.

3. Theoretical rationale for misconception correction and the design of classroom interventions

Building on the misconception types (A–H) identified in Chapter 2, this paper proposes a set of corrective strategies that are feasible for classroom implementation, observable for evaluation, and transferable across topics. We conceptualize lower-secondary difficulties with infinity as the interactive outcome of three mechanisms: the completability presupposition (treating "writing it out / finishing it / the last step" as the source of certainty), intuitive semantic drift (interpreting expressions such as "infinitely close" and "approach forever" in everyday rather than mathematical terms), and insufficient meaning preservation in multi-representational translation. Accordingly, the focus of correction is not to increase procedural drill, but to provide—through sequenced tasks—verifiable justificatory pathways that enable students to form a stable understanding that infinite processes can point to determinate objects. We summarize the intervention pathway into four families of justificatory templates: constructive reasoning (for number-line unboundedness and density), difference quantification and algebraic transformation (for repeating-decimal equivalence), threshold language (for limit intuitions), and upper-bound constraints (for infinite accumulation). Across different instructional carriers, these templates preserve isomorphic diagnostic standards to strengthen stability and transfer.

3.1. Overall principles and an analytic framework for corrective design

3.1.1. Prioritize semantic clarification: setting mathematical boundaries for intuitive expressions

Infinity-related instruction frequently employs expressions such as "extend infinitely," "infinitely close," and "approach forever." Without explicit semantic boundaries, students readily interpret these as "an unreachable endpoint" or "a commitment to non-equality," thus construing infinite processes as "indeterminate." Correction should therefore begin with semantic specification: reinterpret "extend infinitely" as the structural claim of no upper bound / no lower bound; reinterpret "infinitely close" as the relational claim that error can be made arbitrarily small; and replace vague intuitions with testable formulations (e.g., using "for any given standard, it can be met" instead of "always short by a little"). This reduces sustained interference from semantic drift during conceptual construction.

3.1.2. An object-oriented stance: replacing "process completion" with "verifiable justification" as the basis of certainty

Many misconceptions share the completability presupposition: students judge determinacy by whether one can "finish writing" or "finish doing" the process. Corrective work should shift the basis of certainty from operational termination to verifiable justification. Through difference quantification, error control, and bounding arguments, students are supported to see that "a process may continue indefinitely, yet the object can still be determined." At the lower-secondary level, strict analytic formalism is unnecessary; however, students should be given reproducible and transferable templates of reasoning, such as: if unequal then there exists a determinate positive difference; given a threshold one can guarantee the error is below it in finitely many steps; total quantity may be constrained by an overall bound.

3.1.3. Representational coherence: maintaining meaning preservation through coordination across representations

Infinity-related learning involves multiple representational shifts—fractions and decimals, number-line positions, algebraic expressions, and contextualized processes. Students may substitute formal differences for meaning-based judgments, resulting in errors such as "different notation means different objects" or "an infinite process implies an indeterminate result." Corrective instruction should strengthen meaning preservation through cross-representational corroboration tasks: require that the same object maintain consistent relations of equivalence, magnitude, or error across representations, and make explicit that a representation is a way of describing an object, not the object itself, thereby reducing the recurrence and transfer of form-driven misjudgments.

3.2. Strategy templates and task designs targeting misconceptions A–H

3.2.1. Number-line unboundedness and density: the constructive-reasoning template

In correcting misconceptions about unboundedness and density, the key is to convert endpoint-based spatial imagination into structural understanding through repeatable constructions and contradiction. For the belief that "a greatest number or farthest point exists," one can begin from the assumption "suppose a greatest number M exists," and then have students test the order relation between M+1 and M, thereby grounding unboundedness in the property that for any given number, a larger number can be constructed. For misconceptions about "adjacent points / a smallest interval," it is especially important to foreground a generative mechanism that exhibits density—for example, repeatedly inserting new numbers between any two numbers (e.g., by taking midpoints) and arguing that the process can continue indefinitely, or using a contradiction such as "if *m* were the smallest positive rational, then $\frac{m}{2}$ would be smaller," thereby negating minimality. Classroom success is often reflected in whether students shift from narratives of "reaching the end / being packed full" to articulating construction rules and verification logic, and whether they can express conclusions as general structural propositions using formulations such as "for any given …, one can always …".

3.2.2. Repeating-decimal equivalence: the difference-quantification and algebraic-transformation template

Correcting misconceptions about repeating-decimal equivalence typically requires pulling the intuition "it cannot be exact because it cannot be fully written" back to a verifiable standard of equality. A core entry point is the quantifiability of the difference: once a student insists "not equal," they must be able to state a determinate positive difference and justify its origin; when "a tiny bit short" cannot be instantiated as a specific number, the provability of the inequality is forced back into question. Building on this, algebraic transformations (introducing an unknown, scaling, and subtracting) can secure the exact equivalence between a repeating decimal and a fraction, so that "infinite expansion" is no longer interpreted as "approximation." For the persistent misconception about 0.999…, it is often necessary to run difference-based and algebra-based arguments in parallel: on the one hand, show that if it were unequal to 1 then there should be a fixed positive difference, yet any truncation gap can be made smaller than any threshold, undermining the existence of such a fixed difference; on the other hand, use the standard transformation (let x = 0.999…, scale and subtract to obtain x = 1) to stabilize the equivalence. Stability of understanding is typically evident in whether students can turn "a tiny bit short" into a quantifiable proposition and accept the possibility that the difference is zero, and whether they can explain why algebraic manipulation preserves equivalence.

3.2.3. Limit intuitions: the threshold-language template

A common deviation in intuitive limit instruction is to equate a limit with "the last term," or to construe "tending toward" as "never equal." A key scaffold for dismantling these intuitive frames is threshold language: for any given error standard, one can always identify a stage beyond which the error remains below that standard. When activities are organized around this criterion, "whether there is a last term" can be separated from "whether a limit exists," and contrasting examples can be used to display two common cases—processes whose limits exist and are attained, and processes whose limits exist but are not attained—so that students recognize "approach" as an error relation rather than an arrival narrative. Stability is often reflected in whether students consistently distinguish "existence of the limit" from "whether the process ever takes the limit value," and whether they can use threshold formulations to explain why limits remain meaningful even without a last term.

3.2.4. Infinite processes and infinite accumulation: the upper-bound constraint template

In repeated-halving and accumulation contexts, students may infer directly from "infinitely many steps" that "the result must be infinite or indeterminate," and they may treat trustworthiness as requiring "completion." An effective pathway is to shift attention from "how many times" to "whether the total is bounded," prioritizing contexts with a transparent upper bound (e.g., repeatedly walking half the remaining distance; decreasing accumulations of area or length). Students are then guided to argue—via overall constraints—that partial sums cannot grow without bound, thus forming a judgment framework in which whether an infinite accumulation is finite depends on boundedness. At the same time, the source of certainty should be made explicit as a verifiable guarantee: given any standard, one can control the error below that standard in finitely many steps, and the non-termination of the process does not preclude a determinate conclusion. A deeper classroom shift is typically seen when students begin to actively search for and articulate bounds/limits, and use "verification-guarantee structures" to explain why reliable conclusions do not require "finishing" the process.

3.3. Classroom implementation and effect evaluation: from correct answers to transferable justification

3.3.1. Implementation sequence: diagnosis → justification → transfer

To avoid corrective work remaining as isolated patching, classroom interventions can be organized in a sequence of "diagnostic elicitation—justificatory construction—transfer stabilization." First, use the diagnostic tasks from Chapter 2 to surface students' prior conceptions. Next, use justificatory templates—construction, difference, threshold, and upper bound—to create explanatory pressure and support conceptual reconstruction. Finally, repeatedly invoke the same isomorphic criteria across different carriers (e.g., transferring difference quantification into threshold language, or transferring constructive reasoning into unboundedness judgments) to test transfer capability and consolidate the understanding structure.

3.3.2. Evaluation indicators: justificatory behavior as an observable marker of conceptual stability

Answer correctness alone cannot distinguish "recalling a conclusion" from "conceptual stability." This paper recommends taking justificatory behavior as the focus of evaluation: whether students can use construction formulations ("for any given …, one can construct …"), whether they can demand or produce quantifiable differences, whether they can describe approach using threshold language, and whether they can identify and state upper bounds in infinite-accumulation contexts. Combining classroom dialogue, written explanations, and transfer tasks can improve the credibility of evaluation and provide diagnostically located evidence for subsequent instructional refinement.

4. Instructional implementation framework and case analysis

4.1. Implementation framework and key points for classroom organization

Building on the strategy model in Chapter 3, classroom implementation can be organized around the sequence "semantic clarification → justificatory templates → cross-carrier transfer." The process proceeds as follows: first, diagnostic tasks are used to elicit students' prior conceptions and their stated reasons; next, conceptual objectification is achieved through justificatory templates such as constructive reasoning, difference quantification, threshold language, and upper-bound constraints; finally, cross-representational corroboration tasks are used to promote meaning preservation, and transfer-oriented problems are used to test whether students can invoke the same criterion in novel contexts. This framework emphasizes replacing intuitive assertions with verifiable justification, thereby enhancing the stability of students' understanding of infinity-related concepts.

4.2. Classroom case analysis

4.2.1. Number-line unboundedness

When students are guided to discuss "whether a greatest number exists," some interpret "infinite extension" as "there is a farthest point, but it cannot be reached." The intervention centers on a constructive contradiction: assume there exists a greatest number M; then $M + 1 > M$, which yields a contradiction. Unboundedness is thus grounded as the structural property that for any given number, one can always construct a larger number. The critical point is not merely stating the conclusion, but whether students can accept the indefinite iterability of the construction rule and, on that basis, abandon the endpoint imagination.

4.2.2. Understanding the equivalence 0.999…= 1

Students often reject equivalence with reasons such as "there are infinitely many digits after it" and "it is short by a tiny bit." The intervention runs difference quantification in parallel with an algebraic equivalence proof: if the two values are unequal, the difference must be a determinate positive number; yet for any truncation, the gap can be made smaller than any chosen threshold, so no fixed positive difference can exist. In addition, the standard scaling-and-subtracting argument (let x = 0.999…) stabilizes the equivalence relation. The main observational focus is whether students can transform "short by a little" into a quantifiable proposition and accept the conclusion that the difference can be zero.

4.2.3. Limit intuition

In sequence-approach contexts, some students treat the limit as "the last term" or assume that "approaching implies non-equality." The intervention introduces threshold language: given any error standard, from some term onward the error remains below that standard; therefore a limit may exist even when no last term exists. By contrasting two types of examples—processes in which the limit is attained versus not attained—students are prompted to distinguish "existence of the limit" from "whether the value occurs in the process." Evaluation focuses on whether students can replace the "cannot get there" narrative frame with threshold-based explanations.

4.3. Evaluation cues for implementation effects and directions for improvement

Implementation effects can be assessed along two dimensions: justificatory behavior and transfer performance—namely, whether students can spontaneously invoke criteria such as construction, difference, threshold, and upper bound across different instructional carriers, and whether they can preserve representational meaning consistency in novel tasks. Directions for improvement include: further refining semantic scaffolds to reduce semantic drift; increasing cross-representational corroboration tasks to strengthen meaning preservation; and using tiered task design to support students with different prior attainment in gradually converging on shared standards of verifiable justification.

5. Conclusion

This study examined typical misconceptions in students' understanding of infinity, drawing on classroom cases involving number-line unboundedness, repeating decimals, and intuitive conceptions of limits. We found that students frequently misconstrue "infinity" by analogy with either "the existence of a greatest/last element" or "approaching without ever being equal," reflecting an underlying lack of confidence in the determinacy of infinite processes. Instructional strategies such as constructive reasoning (for any given number, a larger number can be constructed), algebraic transformation (e.g., 0.999…= 1), and approach–error control tasks (a limit may exist even without a last term) can effectively generate cognitive conflict and support conceptual reconstruction. Over time, these interventions help students develop a stable framework in which infinite processes can yield determinate conclusions.

Looking ahead, future work could develop more systematic task chains and probing scripts for infinity-related concepts, conduct larger-sample and delayed assessments to examine the durability of understanding, and explore how dynamic visualization tools and multi-representational translation support learners at different levels, thereby improving both classroom implementability and learning quality in infinity-related content.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Du XY, 2025, A Brief Analysis of the Differences and Connections in Mathematics Teaching Between Primary and Junior High Schools: Taking the Field of Numbers and Algebra as an Example. Chinese Journal of Education, (S1): 95-97.

[2] Yu X, 2023, Research on the Teaching Design of the Initial Lessons of Junior High School Mathematics Chapters from the Perspective of HPM, Jiangxi Normal University.

[3] Li JW, 2025, Research on the Impact of Working Memory and Executive Function on Learning Performance: A Case Study of Personalized Mathematics Education Games. Journal of Guangzhou University (Social Sciences Edition), 1-13.

[4] Wang XM, 2025, Practical Exploration of Integrating Mathematical History into Mathematics Teaching. Education Research and Review (Middle School Education and Teaching), (04): 62-64.

[5] Dong CH, 2009, A Brief Discussion on the Method of Converting Decimal Fractions to Fractions - Application of Sequence Limits. Mathematics Learning and Research (Teaching and Research Edition), (02): 79.