ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

TEACHING STRATEGIES IN MATHEMATICS 6 AT DUPAX DEL SUR DISTRICT, NUEVA VIZCAYA

Sheana Mae J. Vidal[1], Dr. Adriano G. Sabado[2]
Author[1], Research Adviser[2]

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the teaching strategies in Mathematics 6 at Dupax Del Sur District, Nueva Vizcaya, with emphasis on how these strategies influence pupils' performance in solving mathematical problems. The research utilized a descriptive survey method involving 20 Grade 6 teachers during the School Year 2025–2026. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire and supported by interviews, then analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, and weighted mean.

Findings revealed that the general objectives of Mathematics 6 were realized, particularly in the use of mathematical language and symbols. Instructional materials were found to be moderately adequate, with charts, pictures, and improvised materials being the most utilized. Learning activities such as partnership/triad, games, and group work were rated effective. Teachers commonly employed strategies like collaborative problem-solving, board work, and recitation, which were perceived as effective in enhancing learners' engagement. Motivational approaches, including reinforcement and student participation, also contributed positively to learning.

Despite these, several challenges were identified, including learners' lack of mastery of basic operations, slow learning pace, and difficulty in understanding mathematical problems. The study emphasizes the need for varied teaching strategies, improved instructional materials, and stronger motivational techniques to support learners' mathematical development.

KEYWORDS: *Teaching Strategies, Mathematics Performance, Problem Solving, Instructional Materials, Learning Activities, Motivation, Grade 6 Pupils*

INTRODUCTION

Ever since a child begins formal schooling, structured teaching and learning in mathematics take place. Within primary school classrooms, learners are regularly engaged in mathematical problem-solving activities, which are considered essential in developing deeper understanding of mathematical concepts. However, studies have shown that while problem solving plays a crucial role in learning, many children perceive such activities as difficult and demotivating (Callard, 2011). The positive influence of motivation on learning has been widely recognized; thus, the decline in learners' motivation during problem-solving tasks raises significant concern.

A noticeable shift in learners' attitudes occurs during these activities. While students generally demonstrate good behavior and engagement in mathematics, they tend to exhibit decreased interest, lower confidence, and a greater tendency to give up when faced with problem-solving tasks. Concepts that previously seemed understandable appear confusing, and essential skills such as persistence, risk-taking, and trial-and-error become less evident. This situation is particularly apparent in word problems, which have traditionally formed a major component of mathematical problem solving in primary education.

Teachers of mathematics employ various strategies, both traditional and modern, to effectively deliver lessons to learners. Although mathematics in the primary grades may appear simple, it can pose challenges to students who are not yet familiar with numbers and abstract concepts. Problem solving is widely regarded as the core of mathematics instruction; however, it is often viewed by students as intimidating, especially during assessments and mental exercises. Both teachers and learners require strong motivation to engage meaningfully in the teaching and learning process. While motivational activities are implemented, they are sometimes insufficient to completely eliminate learners' fear of the subject. Consequently, educators continuously seek effective pedagogical strategies to improve both teaching approaches and problem-solving skills.

Mathematical learning is a continuous process that evolves through meaningful experiences. Children encounter mathematical ideas in their daily lives, particularly during early childhood, where learning is largely influenced by interaction with concrete objects. This highlights the importance of providing an active learning environment that supports the development of mathematical concepts and skills. Learners must gradually transition from concrete to abstract thinking, from simple to complex ideas, and from guided attempts to independent problem solving. Research indicates that knowledge acquired through active learning environments is more likely to be retained (Fleege, 2000). Furthermore, problem-solving experiences play a vital role in strengthening understanding and engagement in mathematics.

Despite these efforts, some pupils continue to struggle with mathematical problem solving at different levels. These difficulties are often associated with poor study habits, limited foundational skills, and lack of confidence. On the other hand, there are learners who demonstrate competence in solving mathematical equations and applying appropriate strategies.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

In this context, the present study aims to assess the performance in mathematics of pupils at Dupax Del Sur District, Nueva Vizcaya, with particular focus on their problem-solving abilities and the factors influencing their learning.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to assess the Teaching Strategies in Mathematics 6 at Dupax Del Sur District, Nueva Vizcaya.

Specifically, it sought to answer to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher- respondents as to:
   a. Age
   b. Gender
   c. Civil Status
   d. Highest Educational Qualification
   e. Performance Rating
   f. Length of Mathematics Teaching Experience
   g. Trainings and Seminars attended related to Mathematics
2. What is the extent of realization of the general objectives of Mathematics 6.
3. How adequate are the instructional materials used by teacher in teaching Mathematics 6.
4. How effective are the learning activities and self-strategies in learning Mathematics?
5. How effective are the Strategies use or show to solve the mathematical problem given by the teacher?
6. What are the motivational strategies of teachers for the students to solve mathematical problems?
7. How clear is the understanding of Mathematical problems given by the Teacher?
8. What are the problems encountered by the pupils in solving mathematical problems?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive survey design to assess the teaching strategies in Mathematics 6 and the performance of pupils in solving mathematical problems at Dupax Del Sur District, Nueva Vizcaya during the School Year 2025–2026. The design enabled the researcher to gather relevant data on existing practices and describe the effectiveness of instructional strategies, learning activities, and motivational approaches used by teachers in mathematics instruction (Best, 1970).

Sampling Design

The respondents of the study were Grade 6 teachers in Dupax Del Sur District, Nueva Vizcaya during the School Year 2025–2026. A complete enumeration sampling technique was utilized, wherein all 20 teachers were included as respondents. This method ensured that the entire population was represented, allowing for a more comprehensive and accurate analysis of teaching strategies and their impact on pupils' mathematical performance.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a researcher-made structured questionnaire, supplemented by unstructured interviews. The questionnaire was developed based on related literature and aligned with the objectives of the study. It consisted of two main parts:

Part I – Respondents' Profile (age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, performance rating, length of teaching experience, and seminars/trainings attended)

Part II – Information Proper, which included:

Extent of realization of the general objectives of Mathematics 6
Adequacy of instructional materials used
Learning activities in Mathematics
Self-strategies in learning Mathematics
Strategies used in solving mathematical problems
Motivational strategies employed by teachers
Level of understanding of mathematical problems
Problems encountered by pupils in solving mathematical problems

A five-point Likert scale was used to measure responses. The instrument underwent validation and pilot testing to ensure reliability and clarity before its administration.

Statistical Design

The following statistical tools were used in analyzing the data:

a) **Frequency and Percentage** – used to describe the profile of the respondents

b) **Weighted Mean** – used to determine the level of effectiveness of teaching strategies, adequacy of instructional materials, learning activities, motivational strategies, and extent of problems encountered

All data collected were tallied, tabulated, and analyzed to facilitate interpretation and support the findings of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1
Respondents by School

SCHOOL	FREQUENCY	Percentage
Dupax Del Sur DISTRICT		
Dupax Central School	2	10.00
Abaca Elem. School	1	5.00
Betawang Elem School	1	5.00
Canabay Elementary School	1	5.00
Carolotan Elementary School	2	10.00
Ecameging Elem. School	2	10.00
Gabut Elementary School	1	5.00
Ganao Elementary School	1	5.00
Gov. Alfonso Castaneda Elementary School	1	5.00
Lukidnon Elementary School	1	5.00
Banila Elem School	1	5.00
Mangayang Elem. School	1	5.00
Palabotan ES	1	5.00
Sanguit ES	1	5.00
Talbec ES	1	5.00
Kinabuan ES	1	5.00
Total	20	100

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

The table shows that there are twenty teachers respondents for the entire study. Majority comes from Dupax Del Sur Central School,Carolotan and Ecameging with 2 respondents or 10.00 percent. Followed by rest of the schools with a single respondent.

Table 2

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
25 to 30	5	25.00
31 to 35	5	25.00
36 to 40	4	20.00
41 to 45	3	15.00
46 to 50	2	10.00
51 and above	1	5.00

With regards to the age of the teacher respondents, majority of the teachers are divided into two age brackets: 5 teachers affirmed to be 25 to 30 years old, and another 8 teachers confirmed that they belong to age bracket of 31 to 35 years of age, both equivalent to a single percentage of 25.00 percent. Four respondents are in the age bracket of 36-40 years of age with a percentage of 20.00. Three other teachers confirmed to be middle aged (41 to 45). Meanwhile, two responses were from the age brackets 46 to 50, and one for 51 and above.

Based on the data, some of the teachers are young and some are in their early mid -30s. Few teachers are in the late 30s and beyond.

The following table discusses the percentage distribution of respondents as to gender.

Table 3

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	4	20.00
Female	16	80.00
Total	**20**	**100**

As to the gender of the teacher respondents, 16 teachers, or 80.00 percent are females. The remaining four teachers, or 20.00 percent, are males.

It can be observed from the table that female grouped outnumbered the male teachers. It can be concluded that teaching is a predominantly female profession, also surfaced at in other studies.

The following table discusses the percentage distribution of respondents as to civil status.

Table 4

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	6	30.00
Married	13	65.00
Widow	1	5.00
Total	**20**	**100**

As to the civil status of the teacher respondents, majority are married equivalent to 65.00 percent. Six teachers are singles or 30.00 percent. A single response was from a widow.

Civil status define in a great way in terms of job performance. In teaching, where children are cared for, married respondents are more inclined to it, considering their own families and home responsibilities.

The following table discusses the percentage distribution of respondents as to position.

Table 5

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Position

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher I	8	40.00
Teacher II	6	30.00
Teacher III	4	20.00
Master Teacher I	2	10.00
Total	**20**	**100**

With regards to teaching position, Teacher I holders dominated the population, as affirmed by 8 respondents, or 40.00 percent. 6 other teachers are Teacher II holder, two teachers are Master Teacher I holders, and a four respondents for a teacher who is a Teacher III holder.

Based on the data gathered, it can be said that majority of the teachers are holding the lowest position in the teaching profession, the Teacher I position, they who comprised the younger set among the service.

The next table reflects the percentage distribution of respondents as to their highest educational attainment.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 6

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	13	65.00
Masters Degree	7	35.00
Total	**20**	**100**

As to the highest educational attainment of the teacher respondents, majority are Bachelor's Degree holders to which 13 respondents confirmed, or 65.00 percent. 7 other teachers affirmed as Masters Degree holders.

Majority of the teachers hold the most basic qualification to enter in the teaching profession. Luckily, there are teachers who managed to pursue higher education in the Graduate School, which at the time in the conduct of the study confirmed that they presently enrolled in the Masters Degree program.

The next table reveals the percentage distribution of respondents as to number of years in the service.
The next table reflects the percentage distribution of respondents as to their Performance Rating.

Table 7

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Performance Rating

Performance Rating	Frequency	Percentage
Outstanding	13	65.00
Very Satisfactory	7	35.00
Total	**20**	**100**

As to the Performance Rating of the teacher respondents, majority are Outstanding to which 13 respondents confirmed, or 65.00 percent. 7 other teachers affirmed as Very Satisfactory.

Majority of the teachers were really performing well in their field of endeavor while are on the process of development and improvement for they are
still new in the service.

Table 8

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Number of Years in the Service

Number of Years in the Service	Frequency	Percentage
1 to 5 years	6	30.00
6 to 10 years	2	10.00
11 to 15 years	5	25.00
16 to 20 years	3	15.00
21 years and above	4	20.00
Total	**20**	**100**

As to the number of years in the service, 6 teachers of which are the majority are teaching for 1 to 5 years, or 30.00 percent, followed by Five teachers who are teaching for 11 to 15 years. Four teachers are teaching for more than 21 years, or 20.00. The two remaining teachers are teaching for 6 to 10 years.And lastly 3 respondents are in the service of 16 to 20 years.

The number of years one had stayed in the job reflects not only their loyalty, but more so of expertise in it.

Table 8 reveals the percentage distribution of respondents as to the level of seminars attended.

Table 9

Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Level of Seminars Attended

Seminars	Frequency	Rank
International Level	2	5
National Level	16	4
Regional Level	18	3
Division Level	20	1.5
School Level	20	1.5

Frequency of Mention

Based on the level of seminars attended by the teacher respondents, majority have attended in the School and division level. National level seminars are attended by 16 teachers. 18 teachers, on the other hand, attended the Regional level seminars, and the last, only two teachers managed to attend international level seminars.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

It is very interesting to note that teachers are generous in upgrading themselves by attending in various levels of seminars for their personal and professional development.

Part II. Information Proper

Table 10

Extent of Realization of the General Objectives of Mathematics 6

Particulars	Mean	QD	Rank
1. Recognize that mathematics permeates the world around us	3.76	R	8
2. Appreciate the usefulness, power and beauty of mathematics	3.63	R	10
3. Enjoy mathematics and develop patience and persistence when solving problems	3.85	R	7
4. Understand and be able to use the language, symbols and notation of mathematics	4.30	FR	1
5. Develop mathematical curiosity and use inductive and deductive reasoning when solving problems	4.08	R	3
6. Become confident in using mathematics to analyze and solve problems both in school and in real-life situations	3.87	R	6
7. Develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to pursue further studies in mathematics	3.91	R	5
8. Develop abstract, logical and critical thinking and the ability to reflect critically upon their work and the work of others	3.67	R	9
9. Develop a critical appreciation of the use of information and communication technology in mathematics	4.06	R	4
10. Appreciate the international dimension of mathematics and its multicultural and historical perspectives.	4.14	R	2
Average Weighted Mean	3.93	Realized	

On respondent's perception on the extent of realization of the general objectives of Mathematics, first in rank is "Understand and be able to use the language, symbols and notation of mathematics" with weighted mean of 4.30 and a qualitative description of "Fully Realized." Second in rank is "Appreciate the international dimension of mathematics and its multicultural and historical perspectives." with a weighted mean of 4.14 and a qualitative description of "Realized". Third in rank is "Develop mathematical curiosity and use inductive and deductive reasoning when solving problems" with a weighted mean of 4.08 and a qualitative description of "Realized". Fourth in rank is "Develop a critical appreciation of the use of information and communication technology in mathematics" with a weighted mean of 4.06 also labeled as "Realized". Also Labeled as "Realized" are "Develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to pursue further studies in mathematics" with a weighted mean of 3.91; "Become confident in using mathematics to analyze and solve problems both in school and in real-life situations" with a weighted mean of 3. 87; "Enjoy mathematics and develop patience and persistence when solving problems" with a weighted mean of 3.85; "Recognize that mathematics permeates the world around us" ranked eight with a weighted mean of 3.76. Ninth in rank is "Develop abstract, logical and critical thinking and the ability to reflect critically upon their work and the work of others" with a weighted mean of 3.67. And last on rank is "Appreciate the usefulness, power and beauty of mathematics" with a weighted mean of 3.63 also labeled as " Realized".

The average weighted mean is 3.93 described as "Realized".

Table 11

Respondent's Perception on the Extent of Adequacy of the Instructional Materials Used by the Teachers in Teaching Mathematics

Particulars	Mean	QD	Rank
1. Magazines and Periodicals	3.29	MA	10
2. Books and other References	3.39	MA	5.5
3. Curriculum Guides	3.27	MA	13
4. Charts	3.66	A	1
5. Pictures and Illustrations	3.58	A	2
6. Abacus	3.24	MA	15
7. Chalkboard	3.29	MA	10
8. Compass	3.05	MA	21
9. Demonstration Clock	3.24	MA	15
10. Electric Meter	3.34	MA	7
11. Water Consumption Meter	3.29	MA	10
12. Flannel Board	3.30	MA	9
13. Geometric Model	3.56	A	3
14. Hundred Board	2.81	MA	24
15. Place Value Board	3.24	MA	15
16. Table of Basic Foots	2.77	MA	27.5
17. Unit Square	2.53	MA	30
18. Attribute Blocks	2.57	MA	29
19. Protractor	3.39	MA	5.5
20. Collection of Small Adjustor	2.38	MA	31
21. Tape Recorders	2.81	MA	24
22. Films and Slides	3.24	MA	15
23. Radio	2.77	MA	27.5
24. Improvised Materials	3.56	A	4
25. Projects	2.96	MA	23
26. Liter Volume Set	2.81	MA	24
27. Weighing Scales	3.24	MA	15
28. Basic 3-Dimensional Models	2.98	MA	22
29. Classroom Thermometer	3.32	MA	8
30. Triangle Set	3.27	MA	13.5
31. Circle Area Demonstrator	3.22	MA	20
Average Weighted Mean	**3.14**	**Moderately Adequate**	

On respondent's perception on the extent of adequacy of the instructional materials used in teaching mathematics, first in rank is "Charts" with a weighted mean of 3.66 described as "Adequate". Second in rank is "Pictures and Illustrations" with a weighted mean of 3.68 also labeled as "Adequate". Also described as "Adequate" are "Geometric Model" with a weighted mean of 3.56 and "Improvised Materials" with a weighted mean of 3.56. Tied in rank 5.5 are "Books and other References" and "Protractor" with a weighted mean of 3.39 labeled as "Moderately Adequate". Rank 7 is "Electric Meter" with a weighted mean of 3.34 labeled as "Moderately Adequate". Also labeled as "Moderately Adequate" are "Classroom Thermometer" with a weighted mean of 3.32 followed by "Flannel Board" with a weighted mean of 3.30. Next in rank are "Water Consumption Meter", "Magazines and Periodicals" and "Chalkboard" with a weighted mean of 3.29 also labeled as " Moderately Adequate". Rank 13.5 are "Curriculum Guides" and " Triangle Set "with a weighted mean of 3.27. Rank 15 are "Weighing Scales", "Films and Slides " and "Abacus" with a weighted mean of 3.24. "Circle Area Demonstrator" with a weighted mean of 3.20 ranked 20. "Compass" with a weighted mean of 3.05 next in rank also labeled as "Moderately Adequate" followed by "Basic 3-Dimensional Models" with a weighted mean of 2.98. With a weighted mean of 2.96, "Projects" comes next. "Hundred Board", "Tape Recorders" and "Liter Volume Set" tied on rank 24 with a weighted mean of 2.81. Tied on Rank 27.5 is "Table of Basic Foots" and "Radio" with a weighted mean of 2.77. "Attribute Blocks" rank 29 with a weighted mean of 2.57 followed by "Unit Square" with a weighted mean of 2.53.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Last on rank is "Collection of Small Adjustor" with a weighted mean of 2.34 also labeled as "Moderately Adequate".
The average weighted mean is 3.14 with a qualitative description of "Moderately Adequate".

The Table 12 shows Weighted Mean and Qualitative Distribution on the Learning Activities in Mathematics

Table 12
Learning Activities in Mathematics

Variables	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description	Ranking
1. Games	4.26	VE	2
2. Quiz bee	3.89	E	5
3. Group activities	4.17	E	3
4. Recitation with a price	4.07	E	4
5. Partnership/Triad	4.38	VE	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.15	Effective	

The table shows that "Partnership/Triad" ranked first has a computed weighted mean of of 4.38 labeled as Very Effective. Same label as to "Games" with a computed weighted mean of 4.26. Effective learning activities such as "Group activities' got a computed weighted mean on 4.17; "Recitation with a price" has a computed weighted mean of 4.07; and, "Quiz bee" received a computed weighted mean of 3.89.

Overall, the Average Weighted Mean is 4.15 described as Effective.

Learning activities in Mathematics needs thorough study and carefull planning. This would make the students learn, enjoy and fight their fear in studying the subject. Activities in mathematics are very much scattered in out brain and imagination. We need only to be careful in choosing and doing what is appropriate to them.

The Table 13 shows Weighted Mean and Qualitative Distribution on the Self – Strategies in Learning Mathematics.

Table 13
Self œStrategies in Learning Mathematics

Particulars	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description	Ranking
1. Review before the class	3.93	E	3
2. Listen and Recite during the class	4.33	VE	2
3. Make own reviewer	3.21	ME	5
4. Review after the class	3.38	ME	4
5. Review before exam	4.41	VE	1
6. Private tutor	2.84	ME	6
Average Weighted Mean	3.68	Effective	

Ranked First on the gathered data is "Review before Exam" with a computed weighted mean of 4.41 labeled as Very Effective. Next in rank is "Listen and Recite During the Class" with a computed weighted mean of 4.33 labeled as Very Effective. Third on the rank is "Review before class" with a computed weighted mean of 3.93 labeled as Effective. The Moderately Effective label is "Review after Class" with a computed weighted mean of 3.38. Same label is given to "Make own Reviewer" with a computed weighted mean of 3.21. Same label also to "Private Tutor" with a computed weighted mean of 2.84. Overall, the respondents rated this data with an Average Weighted Mean of 3.68 or Effective.
Self – strategies in learning mathematics seem to be effective depending on the self – discipline of an individual learner. There are possibilities that the learner may fail due to wrong practice of the strategy.

The Table 14 shows Weighted Mean and Qualitative Distribution on the Strategies Use or Show to Solve the Mathematical Problem given by the Teacher.

Table 14
Strategies Use or Show to Solve the Mathematical Problem given by the Teacher.

Particulars	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description	Ranking
1. Solve on the board	4.37	VE	2
2. Explain the problem before solution	3.78	E	5
3. Trial and Error	3.21	ME	9
4. Solving as recitation	4.26	VE	3
5. Take home activity	4.17	E	4
6. Small group activity	3.44	E	6
7. Partners in Crime	4.56	VE	1
8. Group Quiz bee	3.29	ME	8
9. Solve through a game format	3.37	ME	7
10. Mental solution	3.01	ME	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.75	Effective	

Very Effective Strategies were the following: first in rank is "Partners in Crime" with a computed weighted mean of 4.56; ranked second is "Solve on the Board" with a computed weighted mean of 4.37; and ranked third is "Solving as recitation" with a computed weighted mean on 4.26.

Moderately effective factors are: the least is "Mental solution" with a computed weighted mean of 3.01; second least is "trial and Error" with a computed weighted mean of 3.21; and, third least is "Group Quiz bee" with a computed weighted mean of 3.29.

The Average Weighted Mean is 3.75 and described as Effective. Teachers care in the selection, planning and preparation of instructional materials is a must consideration. To come about this, much efforts towards curriculum improvements have sought to diminish the use of textbooks as the curriculum was planned.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 15

Motivational Strategies of Teachers for the Students to Solve Mathematical Problem

Particulars	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description	Ranking
1. Life related question & answer portion	2.67	ME	8
2. Resolve previous problems with careful solution	4.19	E	3
3. Showing of figures/sketches on the board	3.63	E	6
4. Teacher gives the problem, a student solve	4.49	VE	1
5. Giving Reward and reinforcement strategy	4.23	VE	2
6. Encouragement and parental motivation	4.03	E	4
7. Joke time yet with sense	3.38	ME	7
8. Conducting a treasure hunting game	2.53	SE	9
9. Strict teacher for the students to follow	3.81	E	5
Average Weighted Mean	**3.66**	**Effective**	

Very Effective Motivational strategy are the following: ranked first is "teacher gives the problem, student solve" with a computed weighted mean of 4.49. Ranked second is "Giving reward and Reinforcement strategy" with a computed weighted mean of 4.23. Labeled Effective and Ranked third is "resolve previous problems with careful solution" with a computed weighted mean of 4.19.

Slightly Effective and least on the data is "Conducting a treasure hunting game" with a computed weighted mean of 2.53. Second least and labeled Moderately Effective is "Life related question & answer portion" with a computed weighted mean of 2.67. "Joke time yet with sense" is third least with a computed weighted mean of 3.38 labeled as Moderately Effective.

The Average Weighted Mean is 3.66 and described as Effective. Most students learning mathematics have fear in studying the subject. Teachers need to have a motivational strategy for the students to keep enjoying and learning thoroughly the topics in the subject. Teachers solving the problems on the boards with careful explanations make the students learn better with favorable understanding and comprehension.

Table 16

Understanding of Mathematical Problems Given By The Teacher

Particulars	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description	Ranking
1. The teacher gives instruction base on our topic.	3.51	C	9
2. The teacher explains the problem using the English language	3.40	C	10
3. The teacher shows problems on a written visual material	4.18	C	4
4. The teacher demonstrate the problem with all her efforts	4.28	VC	1
5. The teacher let the students listen to an audio material	3.78	C	8
6. The teacher gives the problem in a simple manner	4.03	C	6
7. The teacher shows the problem with a drawing	3.98	C	7
8. The teacher explains well the formula for the solution of the problem	4.11	C	5
9. The teacher gives different problems to solve in one formula	4.20	C	3
10. The teacher assign a student to explain the problem	4.22	VC	2
Average Weighted Mean	**3.97**	**CLEAR**	

The teacher demonstrate the problem with all her efforts" on the data gathered rank first with a computed weighted mean of 4.28 labeled as Very Clear. Same label is the rank second "The teacher assign a student to explain the problem" with a computed weighted mean of 4.22. Ranked third on the table is "The teacher gives different problems to solve in one formula" with a computed weighted mean of 4.20 labeled as Clear.

Least on the gathered data is "The teacher explains the problem using the English Language" with a computed weighted mean of 3.40 labeled as Clear. Second least on the data is "the teacher gives instruction base on our topic" with a computed weighted mean of 3.51 labeled as Clear. Third least is "The teacher let the students listen to an audio material" with a computed weighted mean of 3.78.

The Average Weighted Mean is 3.97 and described as Clear. Understanding mathematical problems need efforts on comprehension and ability to gasp the meaning of certain written situations. Some teachers tend to translate it in Filipino, yet, there are students who can still not understand the problem. There are also teachers who can not translate the English problem to the a vernacular explanation.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 17
Problems Encountered

Particulars	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Description	Ranking
1. Lack of knowledge of the fundamental operations	4.14	S	1
2. Lack of interest	2.51	SS	8
3. Weak understanding of the problem	3.39	MS	3
4. Weak sense of reasoning /inferences	2.63	MS	7
5. Absenteeism due to family problems	2.41	SS	10
6. Poverty	2.37	SS	11
7. Slow learner	3.51	S	2
8. Insufficiency of allowance	1.64	LS	14
9. Carelessness in the process of answering	2.76	MS	6
10. Inadequate instructional materials	3.26	MS	4
11. Big classes	2.43	SS	9
12. Lack of confidence in solving the problem	3.13	MS	5
13. No inspiration at all	1.73	LS	13
14. Emotional problems	1.86	SS	12
Average Weighted Mean	**2.70**	**Moderately Serious**	

Serious problems in Mathematics are the following: ranked first is "Lack of knowledge of the fundamental operations" with a computed weighted mean of 4.14. Second on the ranking is "slow learner" with a computed weighted mean of 3.51. Moderately Serious and ranked third is "Weak Understanding of the Problem" with a computed weighted mean of 3.39.

Labeled Not At All problems are the following: the least is "Insufficiency of Allowance" with a computed weighted mean of 1.64; second least is "No inspiration at all" with a computed weighted mean of 1.73. Slightly serious problem is "Emotional problems" with a computed weighted mean of 1.86.

The Average Weighted Mean is 2.70 and described as Moderately Serious.

CONCLUSION

Students who are learning the subject mathematics are afraid to take quizzes especially when is a surprise quiz. They are also afraid to take the quiz when the formula is difficulty and the problem is also vague.

Learners doesn't like to have a private tutor when they know they are suffering difficulty in learning the solution of a certain mathematical problem. Private tutor are of great help in learning any subjects. However, pupils preferred not to hire such teachers.

Pupils rely on textbooks only. They do not appreciate creative visuals related to mathematical problems and or any topic being studied in the class. Teachers need to change their learning materials to please the learners.

Teachers using English language in explaining or discussing the Mathematical problems cannot be understood by the pupils. They are using the language because the subject is to be thought in English. Yet, pupils cannot comprehend.

Teachers make life related questions which are not appropriate in learning the subject. Some questions would only be considered if it is really favorable to their understanding of mathematics problem.

RECOMMENDATION

Based from the findings, the following recommendations are presented:

1. 1.Pupils should be motivated well in order to learn the subject with interest and courage to solve mathematical problems. They should also be encourage with outmost motivation to learn Mathematics especially the basic one.
2. Learners should be given ample time to learn every formula without needing a private tutor. Teachers should be the tutors of students learning mathematics especially they have the expertise in teaching the subject.
3. Pupils should be shown with multi-media instructional materials in learning mathematics for them to appreciate more the use of modern instructional media. Teachers need to have this kind of facilities, personally or school use.
4. Bilingual teaching and learning should be exercise for both the pupils and teachers learn with each other the subject mathematics. Everything in Math needs understanding and comprehension.
5. Teachers should employ different strategies in teaching that will enhanced nor encourage pupils to learn and have an interest in the subject Mathematics.
6. Teachers and School Head should focused on the numeracy development of learners.

REFERENCES

1. *F. Herbison, "The Failure of our Vocational Education," The Philippine Journal of Education, Vol. 48, 1992, p. 98.*
2. *Hollingshead, Elmston's Youth, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1987) p. 143.*
3. *Callard, Jayne. "Mathematical problem solving is boring": A study into the motivational impact of NRICH problem solving materials within the primary classroom.*
4. *Rogers, J. (2004). 'Autonomy and mathematical problem-solving: The early years',Education 3-13, 32:3, 24-31.*
5. *P.O Fleege (2000) From habitats to legs. Using science themed counting books to foster connections. Teaching Children Mathematics 7(2) 74-79*
6. *KS Sidhu (1995) The Teaching of Mathematics. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.*
7. *Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959), p 390*
8. *ME Canny (1984) The Relationship of Manipulative Materials to Achievement in Three Areas of Fourth-Grade Mathematics: Computation, Concept Development and Problem Solving. Dissertation-Abstracts International, 45 A. 775-776.*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 4| April 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

9. *K. Bhatia (1992) Identification and Remedy of Difficulties in Learning Fractions with Programmed Instructional Material. Indian Educational Review, 27(3). 102-106*
10. *Stanic, G. M. A., & Kilpatrick, J. (Eds.). (1988). Historical perspectives on problem solving in the mathematics curriculum (Vol. 3). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers ofMathematics.*
11. *Schoenfeld, A. H. (1994). Reflections on doing and teaching mathematics. In A. H. Schoenfeld (Ed.), Mathematical thinking and problem solving (pp. 53-70). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*
12. *Schoenfeld, A. H. (1994). Reflections on doing and teaching mathematics. In A. H. Schoenfeld (Ed.), Mathematical thinking and problem solving (pp. 53-70). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*
13. *K. S. Sidhu (1995) The Teaching of Mathematics. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.*
14. *NCERT (1971) Education and National Development, Report of The Education Commission 1964-66. New Delhi: NCERT.*
15. *RW Copeland (1970) How Children Learn Mathematics: Teaching Implications of Piaget's Research. Toronto: The Macmillan Company.*
16. *M.M Buswell, "The Relationship Between Social Structure of the Classroom and the Academic Success of Pupils," Journal of Experimental Educ. Vol. 2.*
17. *L. Eruschuer, "Moving Ahead in Mathematics", The Mathematics Teacher, Vol. 3, No. 5, May, 1976, p. 428.*
18. *Calen J. Taylor, et. al., "Curriculum Planning For Better Teaching and Learning" (Japan: Hot Saunders, International 1981), p. 65.*
19. *Ed Ibinowics, "The Piaget Primer: Thinking, Learning, Teaching," (US: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1980).*
20. *Rodrigo E. Duque, "Towards quality Education Via mathematics Teaching" The Modern Teacher; August 1999, pp. 91-93.*
21. *Jean A. Justo, "Teachers Must Teach Mathematics in a Significant Way", The Modern Teacher, August 1999, p. 95.*
22. *Belen C. Bautista, "Improving the Teaching Learning Abilities in Mathematics", The Modern Teacher, September 1996, p. 146.*
23. *Daisy E. Cagaanan, "Essential Theories of Mathematics Instruction", The Modern Teacher, January 1998, p. 388.*
24. *Ectuban, Jonathan O. "Computer Programming: Its Role and Impact in Teaching Mathematics." Surigao Island of Institute and Technology. Dapa, Surigao del Norte. The Modern Teacher. Vol. LVI, No. 4 (Sept. 2007)*
25. *Choate, Jill Noelle. A case study analysis of a mathematical problem-solving program*
26. *http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/ETD-UT-2012-12-6608*
27. *Henderson, Ery. Case Study of Problem Solving in a Grade Nine Classroom, Yorkdale Central School, Yorkton, Saskatchewan*
28. *Davis – Dorsey, J., Ross, S. M., & Morrison, G. R. (1991). The Role of Deworming and Context Personalization in the Solving of Mathematical Word Problems. Journal of Educational Psychlogy. 83(1), 61-68.*
29. *Naveh-Benjamin, M. (1991). A Comparison of Training Programs Intended for Different Types of Test-Anxious Students: Further support for an information-processingt model. Journal of Educational Psychology, 83 (1), 134-139.*
30. *Adams, N. A., & Holcomd,W. R. (1976). Analysis of the Relationship between Anxiety about Mathematics and Performance. Psychological Reports, 59, 943-948.*
31. *De Guzman L.S. (1986). Insights from the Workshops on Cosmic Mind Power. Guidance Journal. 15 (1), 47-48.*
32. *Middleton, J. A., & Spanais, P. A. (1999) Motivation for achievement in mathematics: Findings, generalisation and criticisms of the research. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 30(1), 65–68.*
33. *Muir, T., Beswick, K. & Williamson, J. "I'm not very good at solving problems": An exploration of students' problem solving behaviours. The Journal of Mathematical Behavior, Volume 27, Number 3 (January 2008), pp. 228-241.*
34. *Dweck, C. & Reppucci, N. (1973) Learned helplessness and reinforcement responsibility in children. Journal of personality and social psychology. 25, 109-116.*
35. *Joiner, R., Littleton, K., Faulkner, D. & Miell, D (2000) Rethinking collaborative*