

I aim to describe how teachers' beliefs and practices influence the way mathematical argumentation is conducted in lower secondary mathematics classroom within the Czech curricular context. I present results of two studies: the first one characterises the Czech curricular context, namely, the national curricular document and aspects of justification of mathematical statements in selected series of mathematics textbooks. The second study reports on characteristics of teachers' beliefs and practices as related to argumentation on an example of six purposefully selected teachers, via interviews and observations of their lessons. Finally, I select three teachers with differing approaches to teaching and describe specific observed instances in their practices in relation to classroom norms regarding argumentation, justification of general mathematical truths, and aspects of arguments. I show how teachers' beliefs, a textbook and pupils may influence the observed arguments. The studies show that a teachers' emphasis on efficiency (fulfilling school curriculum demands) on one hand and on sense-making on the other lead to distinct implemented curricula. The curricular context and teachers' practice analysis suggest that justification of general truths is generally seen as important but without clear cognitive aims for pupils. There are no specific guidelines regarding argumentation as an activity to promote sense-making and the learning of particular modes of reasoning.