Bridging Mathematical Content and Teaching Practice: A Document Analysis of a Primary-Grade Mathematics Learning Module

Eleanor Bullong

Abstract

This study examined the instructional architecture, mathematical integrity, and publication readiness of Teaching Math in the Primary Grades (E-Math-1), a learning module for prospective elementary teachers. A structured qualitative document analysis was conducted on the 68-page manuscript embedded in the supplied similarity-report PDF. The analysis inventoried lesson components and coded content coverage, mathematical knowledge for teaching, task demand, assessment and feedback, accuracy, editorial consistency, accessibility, and validation evidence. The module contains ten lessons: one institutional orientation, seven mathematics-content units, and two pedagogy-focused units on lesson planning and teaching approaches. All ten lessons state outcomes and use a pre-assessment-to-assessment sequence; nine explicitly include a culminating activity. Its strongest feature is the deliberate connection of content review with professional application. Learners analyze lesson plans, design materials, construct learning packages, reflect on inclusive practice, and prepare demonstrations alongside work on place value, rounding, money, whole-number operations, fractions, decimals, and geometry. The recurring sequence gives the resource coherence and supports active production rather than reading alone. However, most mathematical exposition privileges rules and procedures over representations of learner thinking. Several assessment prompts are broad, lack scoring criteria or explanatory feedback, and sometimes ask prospective teachers to perform primary-level procedures without analyzing misconceptions or alternative strategies. The audit also found consequential content and production defects: an incorrect rounding rule, a decimal place-value example with mismatched digits, an incomplete ascending-order example, ambiguous decimal-comparison prompts, inconsistent lesson numbering, omission of geometry from the table of contents, extensive language and notation errors, and no complete reference list. No expert validation, readability study, accessibility audit, field-test data, or learner outcomes were supplied; effectiveness therefore cannot be inferred. The module is a substantial practice-oriented draft with clear teacher-education value, but it requires mathematical review, curriculum mapping, representational enrichment, analytic rubrics, editorial correction, accessible digital production, and staged validation before formal publication or outcome claims.

Keywords: mathematics teacher education; primary-grade mathematics; learning module; mathematical knowledge for teaching; document analysis; instructional material evaluation

Introduction

Preparing elementary teachers requires more than rehearsing the mathematics taught in school. Prospective teachers must interpret pupils' strategies, select representations, diagnose errors, connect ideas across topics, and design tasks that make mathematical structure visible. Ball, Thames, and Phelps (2008) describe this professional work as mathematical knowledge for teaching, including specialized knowledge that is not reducible to ordinary procedural competence. Teacher-education materials should therefore join accurate content with opportunities to reason about learners, instruction, and assessment.

This expectation is consistent with standards for mathematics teacher preparation. The Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators (2017) emphasizes well-prepared beginning teachers' knowledge of mathematics, learners, teaching practice, equitable instruction, and professional learning. In the Philippine context, the K to 12 Mathematics Curriculum Guide organizes school mathematics across numbers and number sense, measurement, geometry, patterns and algebra, and statistics and probability, while linking competencies to content and performance standards (Department of Education, 2016). A methods-course module should help prospective teachers see how specific activities serve that broader progression.

The supplied source, Teaching Math in the Primary Grades (E-Math-1), identifies Lemyrose B. Balmaceda as its original author (Balmaceda, n.d.). The module combines institutional orientation, review of primary mathematics, lesson planning, assessment tasks, projects, and teaching-strategy discussion. It was supplied inside a 79-page similarity-report PDF rather than as an editable manuscript: one report cover is followed by the 68-page module and then ten similarity-source pages. Because the file contains no learner scores, classroom observations, or validation report, the defensible scholarly question is not whether the module is effective, but how its design supports teacher learning and what revisions are necessary before publication and empirical testing.

Purpose and Research Questions

This study evaluated the module as a teacher-education and publication artifact. It addressed four questions: (1) How is the module organized, and what mathematical and pedagogical domains does it cover? (2) To what extent do its explanations and tasks cultivate mathematical knowledge for teaching rather than procedural review alone? (3) What evidence do its assessments and culminating activities elicit? and (4) Which mathematical, curricular, editorial, accessibility, and validation issues should be resolved before publication or outcome research?

Methods

Design and Corpus

The study used structured qualitative document analysis with descriptive content counts. The analytic corpus comprised the 68 module pages occupying PDF pages 2-69 of the supplied file. The similarity-report cover and ten source-report pages were excluded because they are packaging artifacts, not instructional content. The module itself includes a cover, preface, table of contents, ten lessons, assessment and project pages, and an author biography.

A lesson was counted when it had a distinct title, overview, outcomes, and pre-assessment. This definition resolved an internal discrepancy: the table of contents lists nine lessons and identifies teaching strategies as Lesson IX, whereas the body contains a separate Basic Geometric Concepts lesson labeled Lesson 9 and a teaching-strategies lesson labeled Lesson 10. Content claims were based on the lesson bodies rather than on the incomplete table of contents.

Table 1

Ten-Lesson Architecture of the Module

Lesson	Focus	Domain	Primary professional opportunity
1	Classroom orientation	Professional	Connects institutional mission, policies, requirements, and learner identity
2	Place value and number forms	Mathematics	Designs an interactive place-value exhibit
3	Rounding whole numbers and decimals	Mathematics	Applies estimation through an allowance budget
4	Reading and writing money	Mathematics	Links notation with financial literacy and currencies
5	Elements of a lesson plan	Pedagogy	Analyzes samples and designs a primary mathematics lesson
6	Whole-number operations	Mathematics	Solves contextual problems and stages an operations activity
7	Fractions and operations	Mathematics	Uses a fraction market and contextual problem solving
8	Decimals and operations	Mathematics	Develops everyday applications, visuals, and reflection
9	Basic geometric concepts	Mathematics	Builds manipulatives and an associated lesson plan
10	Teaching strategies, methods, and techniques	Pedagogy	Reconstructs lessons and conducts a teaching demonstration

Analytic Framework

The coding framework combined document structure with six quality dimensions: (a) content and curriculum coverage; (b) mathematical knowledge for teaching, including attention to representations, misconceptions, and instructional choices; (c) task demand and transfer; (d) assessment evidence and feedback; (e) mathematical, linguistic, and bibliographic integrity; and (f) accessibility and validation readiness. A task was classified as professional application when it asked learners to plan, teach, critique, design, or justify, rather than merely compute or recall.

Accuracy checking involved recomputing examples where possible, comparing verbal rules with the displayed mathematics, testing lists and classifications for completeness, and tracing lesson labels across the table of contents and body. The review did not treat the similarity report as evidence of originality, quality, or misconduct. It also did not infer learning gains from the presence of activities.

Procedure and Trustworthiness

Analysis proceeded in four passes. The first mapped page boundaries and lesson sequence. The second inventoried recurring elements: overview, outcomes, pre-assessment, discussion, summary, assessment, reflection, and culminating activity. The third coded the mathematical and professional demands of explanations and tasks. The fourth audited mathematics, notation, navigation, references, and accessibility. Claims were retained only when tied to visible text or a reproducible count.

One analyst reviewed one supplied version, so no inter-coder agreement statistic was calculated. To reduce interpretive overreach, the article reports observable examples, separates document quality from effectiveness, and frames recommendations as design priorities rather than causal conclusions.

Results

Architecture and Content Coverage

The body contains ten lessons. Seven focus on mathematical content: place value, rounding, money, operations on whole numbers, fractions, decimals, and geometry. Three address professional formation: classroom orientation, lesson-plan elements, and strategies, methods, and techniques in teaching. All ten lessons state outcomes and begin with a pre-assessment. Each includes a later assessment, and nine explicitly label a culminating activity. The final lesson instead embeds large performance expectations in its assessment, including lesson-plan reconstruction, instructional-material preparation, and a classroom or video teaching demonstration.

This breadth is a practical strength. The module does not isolate calculation from teaching work. Prospective teachers design a place-value exhibit, prepare an allowance budget, compile representations of currencies, construct a lesson plan, participate in a whole-number 'Olympics,' operate a fraction market, investigate decimals in everyday life, build geometric manipulatives, and critique or reconstruct sample lessons. These products invite communication, collaboration, contextualization, and reflection.

Coverage is nevertheless uneven. Lesson 1 devotes four instructional pages to institutional orientation, while lesson 5 allocates approximately eleven pages to lesson planning and lesson 10 approximately twelve pages to teaching approaches and sample plans. Core mathematical topics typically receive four to six pages each. The selection also emphasizes number and operations. Measurement appears inside applications, but patterns and algebra, data and probability, early numeracy development, and the progression of children's strategies receive little or no sustained treatment. The module is therefore broad as a methods-course sampler but not comprehensive as a primary-mathematics preparation text.

Table 2

Evidence Profile Across the Quality Dimensions

Dimension	Evidence of strength	Limitation or risk
Architecture	Ten lessons use outcomes, pre-assessment, instruction, and assessment	Table of contents omits geometry and misnumbers the final lesson
Content breadth	Seven mathematics units span number, operations, money, decimals, fractions, and geometry	Patterns and algebra, data and probability, and developmental progressions are sparse
Teacher practice	Lesson plans, manipulatives, projects, reflection, and demonstrations	Few analyses of pupil strategies, misconceptions, or alternative representations

Dimension	Evidence of strength	Limitation or risk
Task demand	Several contextual and product-based culminating activities	Many exercises emphasize rule recall and lengthy procedure; targets are not always explicit
Assessment	Recurring checkpoints and multiple performance products	No answer key, model response, analytic rubric, or explanatory feedback
Integrity	Examples and instructions cover many practical situations	Mathematical errors, ambiguous prompts, inconsistent notation, and incomplete references
Accessibility	Section labels and some visual cues support navigation	Image-based distribution, dense pages, and no documented tagged or assistive-technology features
Evidence base	Design can support a staged validation study	No expert validation, readability, field test, or outcome evidence is supplied

Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching

The module repeatedly moves from knowing mathematics to planning its instruction. The lesson-plan unit asks learners to align objectives, activities, materials, differentiation, and assessment. The final unit distinguishes approaches, strategies, methods, and techniques; presents sample Grade 3 lessons; and asks learners to reconstruct and demonstrate them. These are credible openings for developing knowledge of content and teaching.

Several features also acknowledge pupils and learning: real-life contexts, concrete manipulatives, collaborative work, differentiation, inclusive practice, inquiry, technology, reflection, and mistake-friendly classrooms. Geometry culminates in manipulative design, and the strategies lesson explicitly describes a concrete-pictorial-abstract sequence. Such statements align with guidance that mathematics intervention use clear language, systematic instruction, representations, and deliberate problem-solving support (Fuchs et al., 2021).

Yet the content lessons themselves rely heavily on prose rules, completed numerical examples, and sets of exercises. Concrete-pictorial-abstract progression is discussed near the end but is rarely modeled across earlier explanations. Prospective teachers are seldom asked to compare pupils' solution methods, interpret authentic errors, sequence representations, anticipate misconceptions, or justify why an algorithm works. In Ball et al.'s (2008) terms, common content knowledge and lesson-format knowledge are more visible than specialized content knowledge and knowledge of content and students.

Task Demand, Assessment, and Feedback

The recurring pre-assessment-discussion-assessment-project architecture can support self-monitoring and gives instructors multiple opportunities to observe performance. Many culminating activities require tangible products and public explanation. These are stronger evidence sources than end-of-lesson recall questions alone because they can reveal planning, representation, and communication choices.

However, assessment purpose is not consistently distinguished. Pre-assessments sometimes ask for multi-paragraph responses rather than efficiently diagnosing prerequisite knowledge. Post-lesson sections mix computational exercises, factual questions, personal reflection, group projects, slide presentations, lesson plans, and teaching demonstrations without analytic scoring criteria. The module supplies no answer key, worked feedback, model response, checklist, or rubric. Consequently, the same task could be scored very differently across instructors, and learners receive little support for identifying what is correct, what needs revision, and what to do next. Formative assessment is most useful when evidence informs subsequent action (Black & Wiliam, 2009), while effective feedback clarifies goals, current performance, and next steps (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

Cognitive demand is also inconsistent. Some problems require multiple operations or contextual interpretation, but many activities ask learners to reproduce a rule, identify a lesson-plan part, or execute lengthy calculations. The project prompts are potentially rich, yet their breadth can conceal the target mathematics. A budgeting worksheet, for example, may assess spreadsheet completion and presentation as much as rounding unless the mathematical evidence is explicitly specified.

Mathematical and Editorial Integrity

The accuracy audit identified errors that must be corrected before classroom use. In the rounding lesson, Rule II tells readers to inspect the units digit when rounding to the nearest hundred; the decisive digit should be the tens digit. A later sentence says digits after the rounding position remain unaltered when rounding down, conflicting with the examples that replace them with zeros or discard them. These are consequential errors because the text presents them as general rules.

The decimals lesson contains additional defects. It states that in 0.84 the digit 8 represents eight tenths and 'the 7' represents four hundredths; the second digit is 4. Its ascending-order example begins with five values, including 1.28, but the displayed ordered list contains only four. Prompts asking for the 'next lesser' or 'greater' decimal are under-specified because the set of possible decimals is dense unless a place-value increment is given. The division explanation does not clearly state the equivalent-number transformation required to make the divisor a whole number. These issues can transmit misconceptions to prospective teachers and, subsequently, to pupils.

Production consistency is also weak. The table of contents omits the geometry lesson, misnumbers the final lesson, and points to a references section that does not appear as a complete bibliography. Lesson numbering, objective numbering, item letters, mathematical symbols, currency notation, spacing, capitalization, and page labels vary. Frequent grammar errors and awkward instructions increase processing demands. A publication version requires separate mathematical review and professional copyediting; proofreading alone is insufficient.

Accessibility and Digital Readiness

The source is visually colorful and uses recognizable section labels, but it is distributed as page images within a report, not as a clean, tagged learning document. Long text blocks, dense exercise pages, inconsistent visual hierarchy, and decorative elements may make navigation difficult. Mathematical meaning is often carried by layout alone, and no evidence of alternative text, keyboard navigation, reflow, or accessible equation encoding is supplied.

An accessible revision should use live text, tagged headings and tables, high contrast, concise directions, consistent notation, descriptive alternatives for meaningful images, and equations that remain intelligible to assistive technology. It should also provide multiple ways to engage with content and demonstrate learning, while preserving the mathematical goal. These priorities align with the CAST Universal Design for Learning Guidelines, which emphasize multiple representations, action and expression, graduated support, and accessible materials (CAST, 2024).

Discussion

Teaching Math in the Primary Grades has a valuable organizing idea: prospective teachers review foundational mathematics while producing artifacts that resemble the work of teaching. The sequence from place value to geometry, followed by an extended strategies unit, offers a usable course spine. Its projects can foster professional agency, particularly when learners must design exhibits, manipulatives, lesson plans, and demonstrations rather than merely complete worksheets.

The main design problem is the gap between the module's pedagogical aspirations and its enacted explanations. It advocates manipulatives, inquiry, inclusion, technology, and differentiated instruction, yet many content pages use text-heavy rules and procedural exercises. A revision should demonstrate the practices it recommends. Each mathematical lesson could begin with a pupil strategy or misconception, move through concrete and pictorial representations, connect these to notation and generalization, and conclude with a teaching rehearsal or analysis task.

Curriculum mapping should become explicit. For every lesson, the author should identify the intended grade span, relevant standards or competencies, prerequisite ideas, developmental progression, and evidence of learning. This would prevent a prospective teacher from treating primary mathematics as a list of isolated procedures. It would also reveal content gaps, especially patterns and algebra, data and probability, measurement progression, and early number development.

Assessment should be redesigned around interpretable evidence. Short diagnostic items can target prerequisites; guided practice can check concepts and procedures; transfer tasks can require strategy selection and justification; and performance products can use analytic rubrics. A lesson-plan rubric, for example, might score mathematical accuracy, alignment, representations, anticipation of pupil thinking, differentiation, questioning, assessment, and reflection. Model responses and misconception-specific feedback would make the module usable for independent learning as well as instructor-led courses.

Revision and Validation Priorities

Revision should precede any effectiveness study. Mathematical and navigational defects require immediate correction because inaccurate content and unstable task interpretation compromise both learning and measurement. Content experts and experienced primary teachers should then review curriculum alignment, developmental appropriateness, representations, and assessment criteria. A small usability pilot can examine clarity, workload, accessibility, completion time, and the kinds of reasoning learners actually produce.

Only after expert review, readability and accessibility checks, and pilot revision should the material be evaluated for outcomes. A staged study could compare pre- and post-performance on mathematical knowledge for teaching, analyze lesson plans with a common rubric, observe teaching rehearsals, and document implementation fidelity. Such evidence would support claims about what changed, for whom, and under what instructional conditions.

Table 3

Revision Road Map Before Publication and Outcome Testing

Stage	Required action	Verification evidence
1. Correct	Repair mathematical rules, examples, item wording, numbering, notation, navigation, and references	Signed content audit and copyedited master file

Stage	Required action	Verification evidence
2. Align	Map each lesson to grade span, competencies, prerequisites, progressions, and learning evidence	Curriculum-alignment matrix reviewed by specialists
3. Enrich	Model concrete-pictorial-abstract connections, pupil strategies, misconceptions, and questioning	Expert review of mathematical knowledge for teaching
4. Assess	Separate diagnostic, practice, transfer, and performance tasks; add keys, models, and rubrics	Item specifications and scoreable analytic rubrics
5. Make accessible	Produce clean live text, tagged structure, readable equations, contrast, alternatives, and response options	Accessibility audit plus user testing
6. Pilot	Test clarity, workload, usability, completion time, and implementation with a small group	Revision log, usability data, and item analysis
7. Evaluate	Study prospective teachers' knowledge, lesson planning, and teaching performance with fidelity measures	Predefined outcomes and appropriately designed empirical study

Limitations

This analysis concerns one supplied version of one module. The source was embedded in a similarity-report PDF, so visual and text extraction may not reflect an original editable file. The study did not interview the original author, observe instruction, test accessibility with users, or collect prospective-teacher outcomes. Coding was conducted by one analyst. Counts describe visible document features and do not establish instructional quality or effectiveness on their own.

Conclusion

Teaching Math in the Primary Grades is a substantial, practice-oriented draft that connects primary mathematics content with lesson planning, materials development, reflection, and teaching performance. Its ten-lesson architecture and recurring learning cycle provide a promising foundation for a teacher-education resource. The present version, however, contains consequential mathematical errors, incomplete navigation and references, uneven curricular coverage, limited modeling of pupil thinking and representations, unscored performance tasks, extensive editorial inconsistency, and no validation evidence. It should not yet be presented as an effective or publication-ready module. Mathematical correction, explicit curriculum mapping, richer knowledge-for-teaching tasks, analytic rubrics and feedback, accessible digital production, professional editing, and staged validation can transform the draft into a more credible learning resource and a stronger basis for future research.

References

Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators. (2017). Standards for preparing teachers of mathematics. https://amte.net/standards

Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? Journal of Teacher Education, 59(5), 389-407. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108324554

Balmaceda, L. B. (n.d.). Teaching math in the primary grades: E-Math-1 [Unpublished learning module].

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21(1), 5-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5

CAST. (2024). CAST Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0. https://udlguidelines.cast.org

Department of Education. (2016). K to 12 curriculum guide: Mathematics. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines. https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph/detail/5455

Fuchs, L. S., Newman-Gonchar, R., Schumacher, R. F., Dougherty, B., Bucka, N., Karp, K. S., Woodward, J., Clarke, B., Jordan, N. C., Gersten, R., & Jayanthi, M. (2021). Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Intervention in the elementary grades (WWC 2021006). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/26

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487