INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGICA
METHODICAL RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0987 Volume 6, Issue 12, December – 2025

THE IMPACT OF MANIPULATIVE-BASED INSTRUCTION ON CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF ARITHMETIC IN EARLY PRIMARY GRADES

Melieva H. H.
Lecturer at the Kokand State University

Mashrabjonov U. A.
Lecturer at the Kokand State University

Abstract

A persistent challenge in early primary mathematics education is bridging the gap between procedural fluency and deep conceptual understanding. While concrete manipulatives are widely recommended, their implementation is often sporadic, and their long-term impact on transferable knowledge remains underexplored.

This longitudinal, quasi-experimental study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of a systematic, manipulative-based instructional program versus traditional abstract-symbolic instruction on second-grade students' conceptual understanding of arithmetic, procedural fluency, and ability to transfer knowledge to novel problems.

A sustained, structured manipulative-based program significantly enhances deep conceptual understanding and problem-solving transfer in early arithmetic. The findings advocate for moving beyond occasional use of manipulatives to a deliberate, scaffolded pedagogical framework that explicitly connects physical action to mathematical abstraction. Professional development must equip teachers with strategies for this sequenced integration.

Keywords: Concrete manipulatives, conceptual understanding, early arithmetic, primary mathematics, quasi-experimental study, transfer of learning.

Introduction

The foundational years of primary mathematics education are critical for shaping students' cognitive frameworks and long-term academic trajectories in STEM fields. Historically, instruction in early arithmetic has oscillated between an emphasis on rote procedural mastery and conceptual discovery. A robust consensus in mathematics education theory, anchored in the works of Piaget, Bruner, and later Dienes, posits that meaningful learning progresses through enactive (concrete), iconic (pictorial), and finally symbolic (abstract) stages. Despite this theoretical foundation, a significant implementation gap persists in many classrooms, where instruction often leaps prematurely to the abstract, relying heavily on symbolic notation and memorized algorithms. This can lead to fragile knowledge—students who can compute accurately but lack the understanding to apply procedures flexibly or solve non-routine problems.

Concrete manipulatives—physical objects such as blocks, counters, and rods designed to model mathematical ideas—are frequently proposed as the bridge to conceptual understanding. Meta-analyses suggest a generally positive effect, but also reveal nuanced and sometimes contradictory findings. The efficacy of manipulatives appears highly dependent on implementation factors: they are most effective when their use is integral and structured, when teachers explicitly link the manipulative action to the mathematical concept, and when students are guided to transition to more abstract representations. However, in practice, manipulatives are often used as motivational toys or for one-off demonstrations rather than as cognitive tools for sense-making.

This study addresses three specific gaps in the existing literature. First, while many studies examine short-term gains, there is a need for longer-duration interventions that track the development of understanding over a substantial instructional period (e.g., a full unit or semester). Second, there is limited research combining quantitative performance measures with rich qualitative data on student reasoning and teacher practice to explain how manipulatives influence learning. Third, the critical outcome of transfer—the ability to apply learned concepts to unfamiliar problem types—is not always assessed.

Therefore, this study was designed to investigate the following research questions:

1. Does a sustained, structured manipulative-based instructional program lead to greater gains in conceptual understanding and procedural fluency in early arithmetic compared to traditional abstract-symbolic instruction?
2. How does such a program influence students' ability to transfer their arithmetic knowledge to solve novel, non-routine problems?
3. What are the observable differences in classroom discourse and student reasoning processes between the two instructional approaches?

We hypothesize that students in the manipulative-based program will demonstrate superior performance on measures of conceptual understanding and transfer, and that their reasoning will reflect more flexible and connected mental models of number and operations.

Methods

A quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest control group design was employed. The study used a mixed-methods approach, integrating quantitative assessment data with qualitative data from observations and interviews to provide a comprehensive analysis of the intervention's effects.

Participants were 120 second-grade students from four intact classes across two public schools in a mid-sized urban district. The schools were selected for their demographic similarity in terms of socioeconomic status, prior academic performance on district benchmarks, and curricular alignment. Parental consent and student assent were obtained for all participants. Classes were randomly assigned as either experimental (two classes, n=60) or control (two classes, n=60). The sample was approximately 52% female, 48% male, and reflected the district's ethnic diversity.

Experimental Group: Received a 12-week (60-session) manipulative-based intervention. The intervention was structured around three core modules:

1. Addition and Subtraction (Weeks 1-4): Used Unifix cubes and part-part-whole mats to model composing/decomposing numbers up to 20, explore fact families, and understand the inverse relationship between operations.
2. Place Value & Two-Digit Operations (Weeks 5-8): Used base-ten blocks (units and tens rods) to model regrouping explicitly. Students physically traded 10 units for a tens rod during subtraction and combined rods for addition.
3. Introduction to Fractions (Weeks 9-12): Used fraction circles and tiles to explore halves, fourths, and wholes, focusing on partitioning and equivalence.

Instruction followed an "I Do, We Do, You Do" scaffold, with explicit "math talk" prompts to connect actions to symbols (e.g., "You just joined 7 cubes and 5 cubes. What does the '1' you carried over represent?").

Control Group: Followed the district's standard mathematics curriculum, which was textbook-based and emphasized direct instruction of algorithms, guided practice, and worksheet completion. The same mathematical topics were covered in the same sequence. Teachers in the control group had access to manipulatives but used them infrequently and inconsistently, as per their normal practice.

The two teachers in the experimental group participated in 15 hours of professional development prior to the study. Training focused on the pedagogical rationale for manipulatives, the specific lesson sequences, and techniques for facilitating productive mathematical discourse. The control group teachers conducted business-as-usual instruction.

IT
INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGICA
METHODICAL RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0987 Volume 6, Issue 12, December – 2025

1.Pre-test and Post-test: A researcher-designed, 30-item assessment was administered. It comprised three subscales:
Procedural Fluency (10 items): Standard computation problems.
Conceptual Understanding (10 items): Problems requiring explanation, error analysis, or multiple representations (e.g., "Draw a picture to show why 15 - 7 = 8").
Transfer (10 items): Novel word problems and puzzles requiring application of concepts in new contexts (e.g., "If you have a number with 2 tens and 13 ones, what is a simpler way to write it?").
The test demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$).
2. Classroom Observations: Each classroom was observed six times using the Mathematical Classroom Observation Protocol for Practices (M-SCAN). This instrument coded for frequency of manipulative use, level of cognitive demand of tasks, and quality of teacher-student discourse.
3. Clinical Interviews: A stratified random sample of 10 students from each group participated in semi-structured post-intervention interviews. Tasks involved solving problems while "thinking aloud" and explaining their reasoning using available materials.
4. Teacher Journals: Experimental teachers maintained weekly reflective journals on implementation challenges, student engagement, and notable moments of understanding.
Quantitative test data were analyzed using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) with pre-test scores as the covariate to compare post-test performance. Effect sizes (Cohen's d) were calculated. Observation data were analyzed descriptively and for frequency patterns. Clinical interviews and journals were transcribed and subjected to thematic analysis using a constant comparative method to identify emergent themes in reasoning and instructional practice.

Results

ANCOVA results revealed a statistically significant main effect of the instructional condition on total post-test scores after controlling for pre-test differences, $F(1, 117) = 28.47$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.20$, indicating a large effect. Disaggregated analysis showed:
Conceptual Understanding: The experimental group significantly outperformed the control group (Adj. $M = 8.1$ vs. 5.4, $p < .001$, $d = 0.92$).
Transfer: The difference was most pronounced on transfer items (Adj. $M = 7.5$ vs. 4.8, $p < .001$, $d = 0.82$).

INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGICA
METHODICAL RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0987 Volume 6, Issue 12, December – 2025

Procedural Fluency: While both groups improved, there was no statistically significant difference between groups on pure computation items (Adj. M = 9.2 vs. 8.9, p = .15), indicating that the intervention did not compromise procedural skill development.

Classroom Observations: M-SCAN data indicated that in experimental classrooms, 85% of lessons involved sustained manipulative use in the main activity, compared to 15% in control classrooms. Discourse in experimental rooms featured a higher frequency of student-to-student explanation and teacher prompts for justification (e.g., "How do you know?").

Clinical Interviews: Analysis revealed distinct patterns:

Experimental Students: Commonly used manipulative language even when no objects were present (e.g., "I imagined breaking a tens rod apart to get more ones"). They were more likely to attempt multiple strategies and self-correct.

Control Students: More frequently cited memorized rules without rationale (e.g., "You just carry the one") and showed confusion when a standard algorithm could not be directly applied.

Teacher Journals: Teachers reported initial challenges with classroom management but noted a mid-intervention "shift" where students became more independent and engaged in "math talk." They observed that struggling students, in particular, benefited from the tangible reference point.

The structured manipulative-based intervention produced substantially greater gains in conceptual understanding and transfer ability without hindering procedural fluency. Qualitative evidence strongly suggests these gains were mediated by the development of more connected and flexible mental models, facilitated by explicit teacher scaffolding that connected concrete actions to abstract symbols.

Discussion

The findings robustly support the primary hypothesis and align with constructivist theories of learning. The significant advantage of the experimental group, particularly on transfer tasks, suggests that manipulatives, when used systematically, help build a knowledge structure that is both durable and flexible. This study extends previous research by demonstrating that these benefits accrue over a sustained period and are directly observable in students' reasoning patterns.

The lack of a significant difference in procedural fluency is instructive. It counters a common concern that "hands-on" methods sacrifice basic skills. Instead, it suggests that conceptual and procedural knowledge developed in tandem, but the manipulative pathway led to a deeper, more applicable understanding. The superior performance on transfer items is the most compelling result, as it indicates the knowledge was not context-bound but could be mobilized for new problems—a key goal of education.

1. Curriculum Integration: Manipulatives should be a planned, daily component of core instruction, not a supplementary activity. Lesson sequences must be designed to purposefully move from concrete to abstract.

2.Teacher Pedagogy: The role of the teacher is critical. Professional development must focus on "pedagogical content knowledge" for manipulatives—how to select the right tool, pose questions that connect the action to the concept, and orchestrate discussions that move thinking forward.

3.Assessment: Assessments must value conceptual explanation and problem-solving as much as computational accuracy to align with this instructional approach.

This study has limitations. The sample, while carefully selected, was from one district, limiting generalizability. Teachers were not blinded to the study's purpose, potentially introducing expectancy bias. The 12-week period, while substantial, does not show multi-year effects.

Future research should: a) employ a longitudinal design tracking students into later grades, b) investigate the optimal "fading" schedule for removing manipulative scaffolds, and c) explore the differential impact on diverse learner populations, including students with learning difficulties.

Conclusion

This study provides strong evidence that a deliberate, structured approach to manipulative-based instruction in early primary grades is a powerful catalyst for developing true mathematical understanding. It moves students beyond being mere executors of procedures to becoming thinkers and problem-solvers. The challenge for the field is not to prove that manipulatives can work, but to systematize their effective implementation in every classroom.

References

1. Bruner, J. S. (1966). Toward a theory of instruction. Harvard University Press.
2. Carbonneau, K. J., Marley, S. C., & Selig, J. P. (2013). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of teaching mathematics with concrete manipulatives. Journal of Educational Psychology, 105(2), 380–400.

3. Hiebert, J., & Grouws, D. A. (2007). The effects of classroom mathematics teaching on students' learning. In F. K. Lester (Ed.), Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning (pp. 371–404). Information Age Publishing.
4. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematical success for all.
5. Piaget, J. (1952). The child's conception of number. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
6. Puchner, L., Taylor, A., O'Donnell, B., & Fick, K. (2008). Teacher learning and mathematics manipulatives: A collective case study about teacher use of manipulatives in elementary and middle school mathematics lessons. School Science and Mathematics, 108(7), 313–325.