Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. XV, Issue No. 4, June-2018, ISSN 2230-7540

A Research on Some Elementary Approaches of Group Theory: A Review

Divya*

Assistant Professor, Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar Govt. College, Kaithal, Haryana

Abstractct – In this paper investigates the idea of understudy information about group theory, bone-dry how an individual may build up a comprehension of specific points in this space. As a major aspect of a long haul innovative work venture in learning and showing undergrad mathematics, this report is one of a progression of papers oil the abstract algebra segment of that venture.

- x -

INTRODUCTION

Most addresses on group theory really begin with the meaning of what is a group. It might be worth however putting in a couple of lines to make reference to how mathematicians thought of such an idea.

Around 1770, Lagrange started the investigation of stages regarding the investigation of the solution of equations. He was keen on understanding solutions of polynomials in a few variables, and got this plan to examine the conduct of polynomials when their roots are permuted. This prompted what we currently call Lagrange's Theorem. In the event that a capacity f(x1, . . . , xn) of n variables is followed up on by all n! potential stages of the variables and these permuted capacities take on just r esteems, at that point r is a divisior of n!. It is Galois (1811-1832) who is considered by numerous individuals as the organizer of group theory.

He was the first to utilize the expression "group" in a specialized sense, however to him it implied a gathering of stages shut under augmentation. Galois theory will be examined a lot later in these notes. Galois was additionally inspired by the feasibility of polynomial equations of degree n. From 1815 to 1844, Cauchy began to take a gander at stages as a self-governing subject, and presented the idea of changes created by specific components, just as a few documentations still utilized today, for example, the cyclic documentation for changes, the result of stages, or the personality stage. He demonstrated what we consider today Cauchy's Theorem, to be specific that on the off chance that p is prime divisor of the cardinality of the group, at that point there exists a subgroup of cardinality p. In 1870, Jordan assembled every one of the uses of changes he could discover, from algebraic geometry, number theory, work theory, and gave a bound together introduction (counting crafted by Cauchy and Galois). Jordan made express the thoughts of homomorphism, isomorphism (still for stage groups), he presented reasonable groups, and demonstrated that the lists in two organization arrangement are the equivalent (presently called Jordan-H¨older Theorem). He likewise gave a proof that the substituting group An is straightforward for n > 4.

Separated stage groups and number theory, a third occurence of group theory which merits referencing emerged from geometry, and crafted by Klein (we currently utilize the term Klein group for one of the groups of request 4), and Lie, who contemplated change groups, that is changes of geometric articles.

The work by Lie is currently a subject of concentrate in itself, yet Lie theory is past the extent of these notes.

The abstract perspective in group theory developed gradually. It took something like one hundred years from Lagrange's work of 1770 for the abstract group idea to advance. This was finished by abstracting what was in commun to stage groups, abelian groups, change groups... In 1854, Cayley gave the cutting edge meaning of group just because:

"A lot of images every one of them extraordinary, and with the end goal that the result of any two of them (regardless of in what request), or the result of any of them into itself, has a place with the set, is said to be a group. These images are not by and large convertible [commutative], yet are cooperative."

In this| paper we would like to open a dialog concerning the idea of information about abstract algebra, specifically group theory, and how an individual may build up a comprehension of different subjects in this area. Our objective in making such an examination is to in the long run add to fundamental information about human deduction just as to fill the needs of this particular zone of mathematics. One approach to do this is to present an expanded level of particularity to an investigation of understudy challenges in understanding abstract ideas. Our present accentuation will be on translating the battles of a class of in-administration secondary school mathematics educators as they attempted to bode well out of various subjects in group theory.

Obviously, we are likewise keen on utilizing these and different perceptions in the advancement of academic methodologies that can improve understudy achievement in learning abstract algebra. The work detailed here is a piece of a long haul innovative work venture in learning and showing undergrad mathematics.

We incorporate, toward the end, a short talk of some educational recommendations emerging out of our perceptions, however a full thought of instructional methodologies parched their impact 011 learning this subject must anticipate future examinations yet to be directed. By the by, we offer the present discourse as an opening to what we expectation progresses toward becoming a proceeding with examination of this significant zone.

GROUP THEORY: AN OVERVIEW

Abstract algebra when all is said in done, and group theory specifically, presents a genuine instructive issue. Mathematics workforce and understudies for the most part believe it to be a standout amongst the most inconvenient undergrad subjects. It seems to give understudies a lot of trouble, both regarding managing the substance and the improvement of frames of mind towards abstract mathematics. The literature contains a few reports that help this judgment, for example, Hart, in press and Selden and Selden, 1987.

In numerous schools, abstract algebra is the principal course for understudies in which they should go past learning "imitative personal conduct standards" for mimicing the solution of countless minor departure from few subjects (issues). In such a course, understudies must understand abstract ideas, work with significant scientific standards, and figure out how to compose proofs. In spite of the fact that there are no formal contemplates, numerous understudies report that, in the wake of taking this course, they would in general mood killer from abstract mathematics. Since a critical level of the understudy crowd for abstract algebra comprises of future mathematics educators, it is especially significant that the calling of mathematics instruction create powerful educational systems for improving the demeanor of secondary school mathematics instructors towards scientific abstraction.

There is another reason, identified with abstraction, for the significance of abstract algebra all in all and remainder groups specifically. A person's learning of the idea of group ought to incorporate a comprehension of different scientific properties and developments autonomous of specific precedents, without a doubt including groups comprising of unclear components and a twofold activity fulfilling the sayings.

Regardless of whether one starts with an extremely solid group, the progress from the group to one of its remainders changes the idea of the components and powers an understudy to manage components (e.g., cosets) that are, for her or him, unclear. This connection between abstract groups and remainder groups has significant recorded forerunners (Nicholson, 2003).

GROUP AND SUBGROUP

In this area we propose that a person's improvement of the ideas of group and subgroup might be orchestrated all the while. Our perceptions are steady with a movement in understanding that travels through different middle of the road (and deficient) methods for getting groups and subgroups. That comprehension may move from considering groups to be subgroups as fundamentally sets of discrete components, to a phase where the tasks just as the group components are fused into the vital definition. At long last, an understudy may build an intensive comprehension of a group as an article to which activities can be connected.

It seems conceivable that a few understudies attempt to manage issue circumstances including a set and a task by absorbing the circumstances to a current set blueprint, disregarding the activity which is additionally present. We recommend that such a technique may speak to an early misinterpretation of the ideas of group and subgroup.

Groups as sets- In the absolute first period of learning the group idea, an understudy may decipher a group essentially as far as its components, that is, as a set. On the off chance that the individual stays at this rudimentary comprehension of groups, the person may not recognize a group by anything over the quantity of components in it.

One example of a student's response which may indicate a strong emphasis on groups as sets of elements occurred when Kim was asked if $Z_{(i}$ were isomorphic to a S_3?[2] Kim says the following :

Kim: Probably so, S_3 has 6 elements in it and Z_6 has 6 elements in it, so without going through the whole procedure, 1 would say yes.

In addition to confusion about isomorphism, this student's understanding seems to emphasize the number of elements as a characterizing feature of a group.

Thus, it may be that Z_3 is considered to be any set with three elements that is known to be a group. For example, in the written assessment and the interview, another student, Cal, variously considers Z_3 to be the set {0,1, 2}, {1, 2, 3}, {0, 2, 3}, or {0,2,4}.

Also consider Sue who answered Question 1(b) (on| subgroups of Z_6 on the written assessment, specifying a group by its elements; she wrote {10} for a subgroup of Z_6 with two elements and {2 10} for a subgroup of Z_6 with three elements.

At the earliest stages of understanding groups, the students may construct their own idea of group by considering familiar objects (elements of the group) and forming a process of associating these objects with each other in a set. Eventually, the students may encapsulate that process into an object which, for them, represents the group in question.

Subgroup as a subset-

Understanding a subgroup as a subset is similar to understanding a group as a set. For a student at this stage, sometimes "being a subset", that is, having all its elements included in a bigger set, is sufficient to conclude the existence of a subgroup. In other cases students require that such subsets of elements share a common property.

In looking for subgroups of D_3, many students correctly mentioned the "rotations". Similarly, but incorrectly, some listed "the flips" as a subgroup. Consider for example Cal who, in responding to Question 2(a) of the written assessment, listed the elements of D_3 as $\{R_0,R_1,R_2,D_1,D_2,D_3\}$ and identified the first three as the rotations and the second three as the flips. Then in responding to Question 2(c) he listed $\{R_0,R_1,R_2\}$ as a subgroup of D_A isomorphic to Z_3 and in responding to Question 2(d) he listed $\{D_1,D_2,D_3\}$ as a subgroup of D_3 also isomorphic to Z_3. In all cases, he mentions the correct operation. Here is what happens when the interviewer asks Cal about his choice of $\{D_1,D_2,D_3\}$ as a subgroup

I: And what about this out' here? You want it isomorphic t o Z3. What vou write he is $\{D_1,D_2,D_3\}$.

Cal: Yeah. I thought if you do them all...

I: The three flips.

Cal: Right.

I: You think it's a subgroup.

Cal: Well, like' you told me you have to have the same operation, it works on it the same as addition.

I: Well, that's not the point because it has to be a subgroup of this D_3. But is it a group at all under composition?

Cal: I thought it was. I didn't see anything that...I thought it was closed.

Individuals who have not progressed beyond this point would probably have no difficulty in considering the even integers to be a subgroup of Z. but they might also think that the odd integers were a subgroup as well.

This shows a misinterpretation brought about by certain understudies' endeavors to develop another idea (group) by relating it to a recognizable idea (set). This is a case of reequilibration by absorbing the circumstance to existing accessible blueprints before those mappings have been reproduced to accomplish a more elevated amount of advancement. It might happen that an understudy jumps over this progression, or goes through it all around rapidly.

In any case, in any case, as we saw over, a few understudies displayed remnants of this misinterpretation following five weeks (roughly 50 contact hours) of guidance in group theory.

THE SYLOW THEOREMS

We take a gander at requests of groups once more, however this time focusing on the event of prime variables. All the more accurately, we will fix a given prime p, take a gander at the halfway factorization of the group request n as n = prm where p does not separate m, and concentrate the presence of subgroups of request p or an intensity of p. It might be said, this is attempting to set up some sort of banter for Lagrange's Theorem. Review that Lagrange's Theorem tells that the request of a subgroup separates the request of the group. Here we on the other hand pick a divisor of the request of the group, and we attempt to discover a subgroup with request the picked divisor.

Definition. Let p be a prime. The group G is said to be a p-group if the order of each element of G is a power of p.

Examples. We have already encountered several 2-groups.

1. We have seen in Example 1.15 that the cyclic group C_4 has elements of order 1,2 and 4, while the direct product $C_2 \times C_2$ has elements of order 1 and 2.

2. The dihedral group D_4 is also a 2-group.

Definition. If $|G| = p^r m$, where p does not divide m, then a subgroup P of order p^r is called a Sylow p-subgroup of G. Thus P is a p-subgroup of G of maximum possible size.

The first thing we need to check is that such a subgroup of order pr indeed exists, which is not obvious. This will be the content of the first Sylow theorem.

Once we have proven the existence of a subgroup of order p^r, it has to be a p-group, since by Lagrange's Theorem the order of each element must divide p^r. We need a preliminary lemma.

Lemma. *If* $n = p^r m$ *where p is prime, then*mod p. *Thus if p does not divide m, then p does not divide* $\binom{n}{p^r}\binom{n}{p^r} \equiv m$

Proof. We have to prove that

$$\binom{n}{p^r} \equiv m \mod p,$$

after which we have that if *p* does not divide m, the $m \not\equiv 0$ mod *p* implying that $\binom{n}{p^r} \not\equiv 0$ mod *p* and thus *p* does not divide $\binom{n}{p^r}$

Let us use the binomial expansion of the following polynomial

$$(x+1)^{p^r} = \sum_{k=0}^{p^r} \binom{p^r}{k} x^{p^r-k} 1^k \equiv x^{p^r} + 1 \mod p$$

where we noted that all binomial coefficients but the first and the last are divisible by *p.* Thus $(x+1)^{p^r m} \equiv (x^{p^r}+1)^m \mod p$

which we can expand again into

$$\sum_{k=0}^{p^r m} \binom{p^r m}{k} x^{p^r m-k} \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{m} \binom{m}{k} (x^{p^r})^{m-k} \mod p.$$

We now look at the coefficient of x^{p^r} on both sides:

- on the left, take $k = p^r(m-1)$, to get $\binom{p^r m}{p^r}$,
- on the right, take $k = m-1$, to get $\binom{m}{m-1} = m.$

The result follows by identifying the coefficients of x^{p^r}. We are ready to prove the first Sylow Theorem.

Theorem. (1st Sylow Theorem). *Let G be a finite group of order* $p^r m$, *p a prime such that p does not divide m, and r some positive integer. Then G has at least one Sylow p-subgroup.*

Proof. The idea of the proof is to actually exhibit a subgroup of *G* of order p^r For that, we need to define a clever action of *G* on a carefully chosen set *X.* Take the set

$$X = \{\text{subsets of } G \text{ of size } p^r\}$$

and for action that *G* acts on *X* by left multiplication. This is clearly a well- defined action. We have that

$$|X| = \binom{p^r m}{p^r}$$

which is not divisible by *p* (by the previous lemma). Recall that the action of *G* on *X* induces a partition of *X* into orbits:

$$X = \sqcup B(S)$$

where the disjoint union is taken over a set of representatives. Be careful that here *S* is an element of *X*, that is *S* is a subset of size p^r. We get

$$|X| = \sum |B(S)|$$

and since *p* does not divide $|X|$, it does not divide $\sum |B(S)|$, meaning that there is at least one *S* for which *p* does not divide $|B(S)|$. Let us pick this S, and denote by *P* its stabilizer.

The subgroup *P* which is thus by choice the stabilizer of the subset $S \in X$ of size p^r whose orbit size is not divisible by *p* is our candidate: we will prove it has order p^r.

$|P| \geq p^r$. Let us use the Orbit-Stabilizer Theorem, which tells us that

$$|B(S)| = |G|/|P| = p^r m/|P|.$$

By choice of the *S* we picked, *p* does not divide $|B(S)|$, that is *p* does not divide $p^r m/|P|$ and $|P|$ has to be a multiple of p^r, or equivalently p^r divides $|P|$.

$|P| \leq p^r$. Let us define the map $\lambda_x, x \in S$, by

$$\lambda_x : P \to S, \; g \mapsto \lambda_x(g) = gx.$$

In words, this map goes from P, which is a subgroup of *G,* to S, which is an element of *X*, that is a subset of *G* with cardinality p^r. Note that this map is well-defined since $gx \in S$ for any $x \in S$ and any $g \in P$ by definition of P being the stabilizer of

S. It is also clearly injective *(gx* = *hx* implies *g* = *h* since *x* is an element of the group *G* and thus is invertible). If we have an injection from P to 5, that means $|P| \leq |S| = p^r$.

REFERENCES

1. Breidenbach, D., E. Dubinsky, J. Hawks, & D. Nichols (2001). 'Development of the process concept of function', Educational Studies in Mathematics, pp. 247-285.

2. Dubinsky, E. & U. Leron (2003). Learning Abstract Algebra with ISETL, New York: Springer-Verlag.

3. Hart, E.: in press, 'Analysis of the proof-writing performance of expert and novice students in elementary group theory' in E. Dubinsky & J. Kaput (Eds.), Research Issues in Mathematics Learning: Preliminary Analyses and Results.

4. J. A. Gallian (2008). *Contemporary Abstract Algebra* 4th edn. (Houghton Mi²in, Boston).

5. J.G. Belinfante (2005). *Group Theory*, lecture notes, unpublished.

6. Kaput, J. (2002). 'Patterns in students' formalization of quantitative patterns' in Harel & E. Dubinsky (Eds.), The Concept of Function: Aspects of Epistemology and Pedagogy. MAA Notes Series No. 25, Math. Assn. Amer., pp. 290-318.

7. Nicholson, J. (2003). 'The development and understanding of the concept of quotient group', Ilistoria Mathcmat ica 20. pp. 68-88.

8. O'brien, E. A. et. al. (2001). The groups of order at most 2000. Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc. 7: pp. 1–4 (electronic).

9. Ronan, M. (2006). Symmetry and the monster. One of the greatest quests of mathematics. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

10. Sfard, A. (2002). 'Operational origins of mathematical objects and the quandary of reification — the case of function.in G. Harel & E. Dubinsky (Eds.), The Concept of Function: Aspects of Epistemology and Pedagogy. MAA Notes, No. 25, Math. Assn. Amer., pp. 59-84.

11. Smith, S.D. et. al. (2004). The classification of quasithin groups. I, II, volume 111, 112 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI. Structure of strongly quasithin K-groups.

Corresponding Author

Divya*

Assistant Professor, Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar Govt. College, Kaithal, Haryana