



SCAFFOLDED INSTRUCTION AND MATHEMATICS LEARNING PERFORMANCE AMONG LEARNERS IN A SELF-CONTAINED CLASS

Dayang Fatimah Ailyn M. Candero
Manalipa Integrated School

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra31962>
DOI No: 10.36713/epra31962

ABSTRACT

This study examined scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School during School Year 2026 to 2027. Specifically, it sought to determine the extent of scaffolded instruction in terms of teacher guidance and support, step by step instruction, modeling and demonstration, guided practice, and gradual release of responsibility. It also described mathematics learning performance in terms of conceptual understanding, computational skills, problem solving skills, and application of mathematical concepts. The study employed a quantitative descriptive correlational research design. The target population consisted of 75 learners, and a sample of 63 was calculated using Slovin's formula with a 5 percent margin of error. Data were gathered through a researcher made questionnaire with responses measured on a five point scale. Weighted means were used to describe the variables, while Pearson's product moment correlation was proposed to examine their relationship. Findings indicated that scaffolded instruction was practiced to a Very High extent, while mathematics learning performance was generally High, with conceptual understanding identified as the primary area needing further support. The reported correlation value remains hypothetical, as it was not calculated from actual paired data; therefore, no definitive conclusion can be drawn until the data are fully analyzed. Still, this study suggests that consistent teacher support and guidance are valuable in helping learners build stronger mathematical foundations.

KEYWORDS: *Scaffolded Instruction, Mathematics Learning Performance, Self-Contained Class, Descriptive-Correlational Research, Teacher Support*

INTRODUCTION

Mathematics plays an important role in developing learners' logical reasoning, problem-solving abilities, and critical-thinking skills. Because learners differ in their readiness, pace, and understanding, teachers need instructional strategies that respond to individual learning needs. Scaffolded instruction provides temporary, structured assistance through explanations, modeling, guiding questions, feedback, and guided practice, with support gradually reduced as learners become more independent. Kusmaryono and Wijayanti (2020) highlighted the value of scaffolding strategies and teacher-learner interaction in mathematics education, while Reinhold et al. (2020) reported that interactive and adaptive scaffolds supported mathematics learning, particularly for lower-achieving students learning fractions.

Scaffolded instruction may be particularly relevant in a self-contained class, where a teacher must respond to differences in learners' mathematical abilities and progress within one classroom. However, the extent to which scaffolded practices are experienced by learners and how these practices are associated with mathematics learning performance require examination in specific contexts. Biza et al. (2022) emphasized the need to address diverse learner needs when considering scaffolding in mathematics. Although previous studies have investigated

scaffolding and mathematics achievement, the source manuscript identifies a contextual gap concerning the relationship between scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance in a self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School. The present study addresses this gap without assuming that an association necessarily demonstrates causation.

Objective of the Study

This study aimed to (1) determine the extent of scaffolded instruction and the level of mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School during School Year 2026–2027, and to (2) establish whether a significant relationship existed between the two variables. Scaffolded instruction was examined in terms of teacher guidance and support, step-by-step instruction, modeling and demonstration, guided practice, and gradual release of responsibility. Mathematics learning performance was considered in terms of conceptual understanding, computational skills, problem-solving skills, and application of mathematical concepts.

Statement of the Problem

The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What was the extent of scaffolded instruction among learners in a self-contained class in terms of:



- 1.1. Teacher guidance and support
- 1.2. Step-by-step instruction
- 1.3. Modeling and demonstration
- 1.4. Guided practice
- 1.5. Gradual release of responsibility
2. What was the level of mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class in terms of:
 - 2.1. Conceptual understanding,
 - 2.2. Computational skills,
 - 2.3. Problem-solving skills
 - 2.4. Application of mathematical concepts
3. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School. The quantitative approach involved numerical data and statistical analysis to describe the study variables. Creswell and Creswell (2023) explained that quantitative research examines variables through measurable data and statistical procedures.

The descriptive component was intended to determine the extent of scaffolded instruction and the level of mathematics learning performance, while the correlational component was intended to test whether the variables were statistically associated. Privitera (2020) described correlational research as an approach for examining associations without manipulating variables or establishing cause and effect. No experimental intervention was introduced in this study.

Research Locale

The study was situated at Manalipa Integrated School during School Year 2026–2027. The locale was selected because the research focused on learners in a self-contained class in this school. Data collection was to be conducted with school authorization and in accordance with privacy and ethical requirements.

Population Design

The target population consisted of 75 learners enrolled in the identified self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School. The manuscript specified a sample of 63 learners, equivalent to 84% of the population, calculated using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error; the remaining 12 learners were not included in the stated sample.

Sampling Design

The sample size of 63 learners was determined from the population of 75 using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error, as stated in the source manuscript. This sample was intended to provide information about the reported instructional

practices and mathematics learning performance of learners in the identified class.

The source manuscript did not clearly name the specific sampling technique used to select the 63 learners. The final paper should identify and verify the actual selection procedure—for example, whether respondents were chosen randomly or through another method—rather than infer a technique that is not documented. Parent or guardian consent and learner assent were to be secured before participation.

Procedures

The researcher was to secure permission from the school head of Manalipa Integrated School and coordinate with the concerned teacher regarding the schedule and administration of the questionnaire. Before data collection, the purpose and procedures were to be explained to participants. Because the respondents were elementary learners, parent or guardian consent and learner assent were to be obtained. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality of the information was to be maintained.

The 45-item questionnaire was to be distributed to the selected respondents with clear instructions. Completed questionnaires were to be collected, checked for completeness, coded, and organized for analysis. Frequency, percentage, and weighted mean were specified for descriptive analysis, while Pearson's product-moment correlation was proposed to test the relationship between the variables at the .05 level of significance, provided that the data met the test's assumptions.

Instrumentation

The study used a researcher-made questionnaire with two parts. Part I contained 25 statements measuring scaffolded instruction across five indicators: teacher guidance and support, step-by-step instruction, modeling and demonstration, guided practice, and gradual release of responsibility. Part II contained 20 statements measuring learners' reported mathematics learning performance across conceptual understanding, computational skills, problem-solving skills, and application of mathematical concepts.

The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale from 5 (Always) to 1 (Never). Weighted-mean interpretations were Very High (4.21–5.00), High (3.41–4.20), Moderate (2.61–3.40), Low (1.81–2.60), and Very Low (1.00–1.80). The manuscript proposed expert review for content validation and a pilot test with similar learners who were not part of the actual sample; Cronbach's alpha was proposed to assess internal consistency. Actual validity and reliability results should be reported only after these steps have been completed. Because Part II measures self-reported abilities, actual mathematics grades or a validated achievement test would be needed if the intended outcome is objective academic performance.

Hypothesis

Null hypothesis (H_0): There is no significant relationship between scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning



performance among learners in a self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School during School Year 2026–2027.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results and discussion present the findings on scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance

among learners in a self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School for School Year 2026–2027. The results are organized according to the study's research questions and interpreted using descriptive statistics and relevant literature to explain the observed levels of scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance.

Table 2
Teacher Guidance and Support

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. My teacher explains mathematics lessons clearly.	4.56	Very High
2. My teacher helps me when I have difficulty understanding a mathematical concept.	4.83	Very High
3. My teacher answers my questions during mathematics lessons.	4.71	Very High
4. My teacher gives me hints to help me solve mathematical problems.	4.62	Very High
5. My teacher provides feedback to help me improve my mathematics skills.	4.60	Very High
Average Weighted Mean	4.66	Very High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

Overall, teacher guidance and support were practiced to a Very High extent (AWM = 4.66), indicating that learners consistently experienced assistance, feedback, hints, and opportunities to ask questions during mathematics lessons. The highest-rated indicator emphasized the teacher's support when learners had difficulty understanding mathematical concepts (WM = 4.83), while the lowest-rated indicator concerned the clarity of mathematics lesson explanations (WM = 4.56), which still

received a Very High interpretation. These findings highlight the importance of accessible and responsive teacher support in scaffolded mathematics instruction, consistent with Sun et al. (2021) and Stovner et al. (2021). Teachers may sustain these supportive practices while strengthening explanations through concrete examples and step-by-step demonstrations to promote learners' understanding and gradual development of independent problem-solving skills.

Table 3
Step-by-Step Instruction

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. My teacher explains mathematical procedures one step at a time.	3.62	High
2. My teacher breaks difficult mathematics tasks into smaller steps.	4.32	Very High
3. My teacher explains the correct order of steps in solving mathematical problems.	3.81	High
4. My teacher checks whether I understand each step before proceeding.	4.32	Very High
5. My teacher provides simple examples before introducing more difficult mathematics tasks.	3.81	High
Average Weighted Mean	3.98	High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

Overall, step-by-step instruction was practiced to a High extent (AWM = 3.98), indicating that learners generally experienced organized and manageable mathematics instruction. Breaking difficult tasks into smaller steps and checking learners' understanding before proceeding received the highest ratings (WM = 4.32 each), both interpreted as Very High. In contrast, explaining mathematical procedures one step at a time received the lowest rating (WM = 3.62), although it remained within the

High category. These findings suggest that teachers effectively simplify complex tasks but may further improve the consistency and clarity of sequential explanations and provide more simple examples before introducing difficult problems. Consistent with Cho and Kim (2020) and Stovner et al. (2021), structured instructional support and feedback may help learners navigate mathematical procedures and develop their problem-solving skills.



Table 4
Modeling and Demonstration

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. My teacher demonstrates how to solve mathematical problems.	4.87	Very High
2. My teacher provides sample solutions before asking me to solve problems independently.	4.40	Very High
3. My teacher explains why particular mathematical procedures are used.	4.43	Very High
4. My teacher shows different examples to help me understand mathematical concepts.	4.29	Very High
5. My teacher demonstrates how mathematical concepts can be applied to real-life situations.	4.43	Very High
Average Weighted Mean	4.48	Very High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 4 indicate that modeling and demonstration were practiced to a Very High extent, as evidenced by the Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 4.48. Among the indicators, demonstrating how to solve mathematical problems received the highest weighted mean of 4.87, suggesting that learners strongly recognized their teachers' ability to model mathematical procedures. Explaining the reasons behind mathematical procedures and demonstrating the application of mathematical concepts to real-life situations also received high ratings, indicating that teachers helped learners understand both the processes and practical relevance of mathematics. Providing

sample solutions before independent practice and presenting different examples likewise received Very High ratings, although the latter ranked lowest among the indicators. Overall, these results suggest that modeling and demonstration were evident components of scaffolded mathematics instruction in the self-contained class, allowing learners to observe problem-solving procedures, understand mathematical reasoning, and develop confidence before working independently. These practices may be further strengthened by incorporating varied examples, visual representations, and real-life applications while gradually encouraging learners to solve mathematical problems on their own.

Table 5
Guided Practice

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. My teacher allows me to practice solving mathematics problems with guidance.	4.67	Very High
2. My teacher assists me when I make mistakes during mathematics activities.	4.24	Very High
3. My teacher provides practice exercises to strengthen my mathematics skills.	4.56	Very High
4. My teacher checks my answers and explains my mistakes.	4.73	Very High
5. My teacher gives me opportunities to practice similar problems before working independently.	4.43	Very High
Average Weighted Mean	4.53	Very High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 5 indicate that guided practice was implemented to a Very High extent, as reflected by the Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 4.53. Among the indicators, checking learners' answers and explaining their mistakes received the highest weighted mean of 4.73, suggesting that learners strongly recognized the importance of teacher feedback in understanding and correcting errors. Allowing learners to practice solving mathematics problems with guidance also received a high rating, indicating that teachers provided support during mathematical activities. Providing practice exercises and opportunities to solve similar problems before working independently likewise received Very High ratings, demonstrating that learners were given opportunities to reinforce their mathematical knowledge and

develop their problem-solving skills. Meanwhile, assisting learners when they made mistakes received the lowest weighted mean of 4.24, although it remained within the Very High interpretation. Overall, these findings suggest that guided practice was an evident component of scaffolded instruction in the self-contained class, particularly through feedback, error correction, and supported practice. These practices are consistent with Calor et al. (2022), who emphasized the importance of scaffolding in promoting learners' participation and understanding during mathematics instruction. Teachers may sustain these strategies while providing more individualized assistance and gradually reducing support as learners develop greater confidence and independence in solving mathematical problems.



Table 6
Gradual Release of Responsibility

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. My teacher first demonstrates how to solve a mathematics problem before I try it myself.	4.63	Very High
2. My teacher allows me to solve problems with assistance before doing them independently.	4.76	Very High
3. My teacher gradually reduces assistance as I become more confident in solving mathematics problems.	4.44	Very High
4. My teacher encourages me to explain my own solutions to mathematics problems.	4.63	Very High
5. My teacher gives me opportunities to complete mathematics tasks independently after guided practice.	4.43	Very High
Average Weighted Mean	4.58	Very High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 6 indicate that the gradual release of responsibility was practiced to a Very High extent, as evidenced by the Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 4.58. Among the indicators, allowing learners to solve problems with assistance before working independently received the highest weighted mean of 4.76, suggesting that teachers commonly provide support before expecting learners to complete mathematical tasks on their own. Demonstrating how to solve mathematics problems and encouraging learners to explain their solutions also received Very High ratings, indicating that teachers guide learners in understanding mathematical procedures and articulating their reasoning. Gradually reducing assistance as learners become more confident and providing opportunities to complete tasks independently after guided

practice likewise received Very High ratings, although these indicators obtained the lowest weighted means among the statements. Overall, the findings suggest that the gradual release of responsibility was an evident component of scaffolded instruction in the self-contained class, as teachers supported learners through demonstration and guided practice before encouraging independent problem-solving. These results are consistent with Calor et al. (2022), who emphasized the importance of instructional scaffolding in supporting learners' participation and understanding, and Stovner et al. (2021), who highlighted the value of substantive feedback in mathematics instruction. Teachers may further strengthen this approach by providing more opportunities for independent practice while gradually reducing assistance according to learners' developing skills and confidence.

Problem 2. What is the level of mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class in terms of: Conceptual understanding, Computational skills, Problem-solving skills, and Application of mathematical concepts

Table 7
Conceptual Understanding

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. I can explain the meaning of mathematical concepts discussed in class.	3.11	Moderate
2. I can identify the relationships between mathematical ideas.	3.02	Moderate
3. I can explain why a mathematical procedure works.	3.49	High
4. I can distinguish between different mathematical concepts.	4.17	High
5. I can explain mathematical ideas using my own words.	3.67	High
Average Weighted Mean	3.49	High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 7 indicate that learners' conceptual understanding of mathematics was at a High level, as reflected by the Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.49. Among the indicators, distinguishing between different mathematical concepts received the highest weighted mean of 4.17, suggesting that learners generally recognize differences among mathematical ideas. Explaining mathematical ideas using their own words and understanding why mathematical procedures

work also received High ratings, indicating that learners demonstrate a relatively positive understanding of mathematical concepts and processes. However, explaining the meaning of mathematical concepts discussed in class and identifying relationships between mathematical ideas received Moderate ratings, with weighted means of 3.11 and 3.02, respectively. These findings suggest that although learners can distinguish mathematical concepts, some may experience difficulties explaining their meanings and connecting related ideas. This is



consistent with Reinhold et al. (2020), who emphasized the importance of considering learners' varying needs and achievement levels in mathematics instruction. Overall, the findings indicate that learners demonstrate a generally positive level of conceptual understanding, but further instructional support is needed to strengthen their ability to explain

mathematical reasoning and recognize relationships among concepts. Teachers may address these areas by incorporating concrete examples, visual representations, guided questioning, and activities that connect prior knowledge with new concepts, thereby providing learners with opportunities to develop deeper mathematical understanding.

Table 8
Computational Skills

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. I can perform basic mathematical operations correctly.	3.83	High
2. I can follow the correct procedures when solving numerical exercises.	3.62	High
3. I can compute answers to mathematics exercises accurately.	3.83	High
4. I can use mathematical symbols and numbers correctly.	4.02	High
5. I can check my calculations to identify possible errors.	3.84	High
Average Weighted Mean	3.83	High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 8 indicate that learners' computational skills were at a High level, as evidenced by the Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.83. Among the indicators, using mathematical symbols and numbers correctly received the highest weighted mean of 4.02, suggesting that learners generally perceive themselves as capable of using mathematical notation appropriately. Checking calculations for possible errors, performing basic mathematical operations correctly, and computing accurate answers also received High ratings, indicating positive perceptions of their computational abilities. However, following the correct procedures when solving numerical exercises obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.62, although it remained within the High interpretation. This

suggests that while learners generally feel confident in performing calculations, some may require additional support in following mathematical procedures systematically. These findings are consistent with Reinhold et al. (2020), who emphasized the importance of addressing differences in learners' mathematics learning needs and achievement levels. Overall, the results suggest that learners demonstrate a generally high perceived level of computational skills, but teachers may further strengthen these abilities through step-by-step demonstrations, worked examples, guided exercises, and repeated practice before transitioning to independent problem-solving. Nevertheless, the findings reflect learners' self-reported perceptions and do not necessarily represent their objectively measured computational performance.

Table 9
Problem-Solving Skills

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. I can identify the information needed to solve a mathematics problem.	3.87	High
2. I can determine the appropriate mathematical operation to use in solving a problem.	3.83	High
3. I can solve mathematics word problems by following appropriate steps.	3.87	High
4. I can explain the process I used to solve a mathematical problem.	3.73	High
5. I can check whether my solution to a mathematics problem is reasonable.	4.06	High
Average Weighted Mean	3.87	High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 9 indicate that learners' problem-solving skills were at a High level, as reflected by the Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.87. Among the indicators, checking whether a mathematical solution was reasonable received the highest weighted mean of 4.06, suggesting that learners generally perceived themselves as capable of evaluating their answers and determining their accuracy. Identifying the information needed to solve mathematical problems and following appropriate steps in solving word problems both received weighted means of 3.87,

while determining the appropriate mathematical operation obtained 3.83, indicating that learners generally perceived themselves as capable of applying relevant problem-solving processes. However, explaining the process used to solve a mathematical problem received the lowest weighted mean of 3.73, although it remained within the High interpretation. This suggests that learners may need further support in articulating their mathematical reasoning and explaining the steps they follow when solving problems. These findings are consistent with Calor et al. (2022), who emphasized the role of instructional scaffolding



in supporting learners' participation and reasoning during mathematical discussions. Overall, the results suggest that learners demonstrate a generally positive perception of their problem-solving abilities, but teachers may further strengthen these skills through worked examples, guided questioning, visual

representations, and opportunities for learners to explain their solutions systematically before gradually transitioning to independent problem-solving. Nevertheless, the findings represent learners' self-reported abilities rather than independently measured problem-solving performance.

Table 10
Application of Mathematical Concepts

Statements	Weighted Mean	Description
1. I can use mathematics to solve problems encountered in everyday life.	4.00	High
2. I can apply mathematical operations when solving practical problems.	3.87	High
3. I can use mathematics when dealing with money, prices, and change.	4.00	High
4. I can apply mathematical concepts to situations described in word problems.	3.89	High
5. I can use what I have learned in mathematics to solve unfamiliar problems.	3.63	High
Average Weighted Mean	3.88	High

Legend: 4.21 – 5.00 – Very High, 3.41 – 4.20-High, 2.61-3.40-Moderate, 1.81 – 2.60 – Low, 1.00 – 1.80- Very Low

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 10 indicate that learners' application of mathematical concepts was at a High level, as reflected by the Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.88. Among the indicators, using mathematics to solve everyday problems and handling money, prices, and change both received the highest weighted mean of 4.00, suggesting that learners generally perceived themselves as capable of applying mathematical knowledge to familiar and practical situations. Applying mathematical concepts to word problems and using mathematical operations to solve practical problems also received High ratings, indicating that learners could relate mathematical knowledge to common problem-solving activities. However, applying previously learned mathematical concepts to unfamiliar problems received the lowest weighted mean of 3.63, although it remained within the High interpretation. This suggests that

learners may experience greater difficulty transferring their existing knowledge to new or unfamiliar situations. These findings highlight the importance of scaffolded instruction in helping learners connect mathematical concepts with practical experiences, consistent with Calor et al. (2022), who emphasized the role of teacher scaffolding in supporting mathematical discussions and learning. Overall, the results suggest that learners perceive themselves as capable of applying mathematics in familiar contexts, but further opportunities to solve contextualized problems, engage in practical activities involving money and measurement, and explore unfamiliar situations may help strengthen their ability to transfer mathematical knowledge across different contexts. Nevertheless, these findings reflect learners' self-reported perceptions rather than direct measurements of their actual mathematics achievement.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class?

Table 11. Significant Relationship Between Scaffolded Instruction and Mathematics Learning Performance

Variables	Pearson $\backslash(r)$	p-value	Decision on $\backslash(H_0)$	Interpretation
Scaffolded Instruction and Mathematics Learning Performance	0.624	0.000	Reject Null Hypothesis	Significant positive relationship

Summary Interpretation

The findings in Table 11 present a hypothetical positive relationship between the extent of scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance among learners in a self-contained class at Manalipa Integrated School during School Year 2026–2027. The illustrative Pearson correlation coefficient of $\backslash(r = 0.624)$ suggests a moderate-to-strong positive association, indicating that higher levels of scaffolded instruction tend to correspond with higher mathematics learning performance in the hypothetical dataset. The illustrative p-value of $\backslash(p < .001)$ is below the 0.05 level of significance; therefore,

the null hypothesis would be rejected if these were the actual results. These hypothetical findings suggest that teacher modeling, step-by-step instruction, guided practice, and the gradual release of responsibility may be associated with learners' conceptual understanding, computational skills, problem-solving abilities, and application of mathematical concepts. However, since the statistical values are illustrative and not derived from actual learner-level data, they cannot establish a genuine relationship between the variables. The descriptive results presented in Tables 2–10 are insufficient to calculate Pearson's correlation coefficient and its corresponding p-value. Actual



paired scores for scaffolded instruction and mathematics learning performance must be analyzed to determine whether a statistically significant relationship exists. Furthermore, even if the actual analysis reveals a significant correlation, the result would establish an association between the variables rather than demonstrate that scaffolded instruction directly causes improved mathematics learning performance.

CONCLUSION

The source manuscript's descriptive results indicate that learners reported a high or very high extent of scaffolded instruction and generally high mathematics learning performance. Teacher guidance and support, modeling and demonstration, guided practice, and gradual release of responsibility were rated Very High, whereas step-by-step instruction was rated High. Among the reported mathematics indicators, application of mathematical concepts received a higher mean than conceptual understanding. However, the existence of a statistically significant relationship between the two main variables remains undetermined because the correlation values presented in the source manuscript were hypothetical rather than calculated from actual paired data.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mathematics teachers may continue providing clear demonstrations, guided practice, constructive feedback, and opportunities for independent problem-solving while strengthening sequential explanations and learners' conceptual connections. School administrators may support teachers with instructional materials, manipulatives, visual resources, and professional development related to scaffolded instruction. Parents and guardians may reinforce mathematics through practical activities involving money, prices, change, and measurement. Future researchers should verify the sampling procedure, complete instrument validation and reliability testing, and use actual learner-level paired data and objective mathematics assessment results where appropriate.

REFERENCES

1. Biza, I., González-Martín, A. S., & Pinto, A. (2022). 'Scaffolding' or 'filtering': A review of studies on the diverse roles of calculus courses for students, professionals and teachers. *International Journal of Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education*, 8(2), 389–418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40753-022-00180-1>
2. Calor, S. M., Dekker, R., van Drie, J. P., & Volman, M. L. L. (2022). Scaffolding small groups at the group level: Improving the scaffolding behavior of mathematics teachers during mathematical discussions. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 31(3), 369–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2021.2024834>
3. Cho, M. K., & Kim, M. K. (2020). Investigating elementary students' problem solving and teacher scaffolding in solving an ill-structured problem. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology*, 8(4), 274–289. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1268767>
4. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Kusmaryono, I., & Wijayanti, D. (2020). Tinjauan sistematis: Strategis scaffolding pada pembelajaran matematika. *Phenomenon: Jurnal Pendidikan MIPA*, 10(1), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.21580/phen.2020.10.1.6114>
6. Landas, E. C., & Alova, C. A. R. (2022). Effect of localized lesson plans to the interest and performance of pupils in mathematics. *Journal of Mathematics and Science Teacher*, 2(2), Article em016. <https://doi.org/10.29333/mathsciteacher/12345>
7. Masinading, Z. M. B., & Gaylo, D. N. (2022). Differentiated scaffolding strategies in triangle congruence: Their effects on learners' academic performance and confidence in mathematics. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 10(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.10n.2p.131>
8. Obafemi, K. E., Saadu, U. T., Yahaya, O., Obafemi, T. O., & Yakubu, F. M. (2022). Exploration of the effect of scaffolding instructional strategy on pupils' academic performance in mathematics. *ASEAN Journal for Science Education*.
9. Privitera, G. J. (2020). *Research methods for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
10. Reinhold, F., Hoch, S., Werner, B., Richter-Gebert, J., & Reiss, K. (2020). Learning fractions with and without educational technology: What matters for high-achieving and low-achieving students? *Learning and Instruction*, 65, Article 101264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101264>
11. Republic Act No. 11650. (2022). An act instituting a policy of inclusion and services for learners with disabilities in support of inclusive education, establishing inclusive learning resource centers of learners with disabilities in all schools districts, municipalities and cities, providing for standards, appropriating funds therefor, and for other purposes. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2022/ra_11650_2022.html
12. Republic Act No. 12028. (2024). An act establishing an Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program and appropriating funds therefor. <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/97912>
13. Stovner, R. B., Klette, K., & Nortvedt, G. A. (2021). The instructional situations in which mathematics teachers provide substantive feedback. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 108, 533–551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-021-10065-w>
14. Sun, L., Ruokamo, H., Siklander, P., Li, B., & Devlin, K. (2021). Primary school students' perceptions of scaffolding in digital game-based learning in mathematics. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 28, Article 100457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2020.100457>
15. The Department of Education. (2023, July 6). DepEd to conduct National Learning Camp to enhance learning outcomes, support teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/07/06/deped-to-conduct-national-learning-camp-to-enhance-learning-outcomes-support-teachers/>
16. Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x>