CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICS (ISSN: 2767-3278)

VOLUME: Vol.07 Issue01 2026
Page: - 01-06

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Early Numeracy Interventions, Teacher Beliefs, And Inclusive Pedagogical Practices In Addressing Mathematical Learning Difficulties: A Comprehensive Research Synthesis

Dr. Sofia Lindqvist

Department of Educational Sciences, University of Helsinki, Finland

Received: 03 November 2025 **Accepted:** 02 December 2025 **Published:** 01 January 2026

ABSTRACT

Mathematical learning difficulties constitute one of the most persistent and complex challenges in contemporary education systems, particularly during the early years of schooling when foundational numeracy skills are established. This article presents a comprehensive, theoretically grounded research synthesis examining early numeracy development, intervention strategies, teacher beliefs, instructional competence, and inclusive educational practices for learners experiencing mathematical learning difficulties. Drawing exclusively on a robust corpus of international peer-reviewed literature, policy documents, and methodological frameworks, the study integrates quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods evidence to explore how early identification, targeted instructional interventions, and adaptive teaching practices influence mathematical outcomes. Special emphasis is placed on counting-focused interventions, number sense development, formative assessment, differentiated instruction, and teacher knowledge for teaching mathematics. The analysis further interrogates the socio-cultural, institutional, and belief-based dimensions shaping instructional decision-making and learner inclusion, highlighting tensions between standardized curricula and individualized educational needs. Methodologically, the article adopts a systematic narrative synthesis combined with thematic analytical techniques to generate nuanced insights into intervention effectiveness and implementation fidelity. Findings reveal that early numeracy competencies serve as powerful predictors of later mathematical achievement, while well-designed, responsive interventions significantly mitigate long-term learning difficulties. However, results also expose persistent gaps related to teacher preparedness, belief systems, and structural conditions that constrain inclusive practice. The discussion situates these findings within contemporary theoretical debates on learning difficulties, inclusive education, and assessment for learning, offering critical reflections on limitations and future research trajectories. The article concludes by advocating for integrated, evidence-informed approaches that align pedagogical expertise, early intervention, and inclusive educational policy to enhance equity and mathematical learning outcomes for all students.

Keywords: Early numeracy, mathematical learning difficulties, inclusive education, teacher beliefs, differentiated instruction, formative assessment.

INTRODUCTION

Mathematics occupies a central position in modern education systems, functioning not only as a foundational academic discipline but also as a gateway to participation in scientific, technological, and civic domains. Yet, for a substantial proportion of learners, mathematics represents a persistent source of difficulty, anxiety, and exclusion. Mathematical learning difficulties, encompassing a heterogeneous range of cognitive, developmental, and instructional challenges, emerge early and often endure across schooling if not addressed through timely and targeted educational responses (Dowker, 2005; Mazzocco & Myers, 2003). The early years of education are particularly critical, as foundational numeracy skills developed during this period strongly predict later mathematical achievement and academic trajectories

(Aunio & Niemivirta, 2010; Jordan et al., 2006).

Despite decades of research on mathematics difficulties, educational systems continue to struggle with effective identification, prevention, and intervention. Learners with mathematical learning difficulties frequently experience cumulative disadvantage, characterized by widening achievement gaps, diminished self-efficacy, and limited access to inclusive learning opportunities (Geary et al., 2012; Lunde, 2010). These challenges are exacerbated by inconsistencies in instructional quality, teacher preparedness, and systemic support structures, underscoring the need for comprehensive, evidence-based approaches that integrate early intervention, pedagogical expertise, and inclusive educational practices (Gersten et al., 2005; Molbaek, 2018).

Early numeracy, encompassing skills such as counting, number recognition, quantity comparison, and basic arithmetic reasoning, has been identified as a critical foundation for mathematical development (Aunio et al., 2021; Fuchs et al., 2005). Research demonstrates that deficits in early numeracy are among the most robust predictors of later mathematics difficulties, suggesting that early identification and targeted intervention hold significant potential for altering developmental trajectories (Gersten et al., 2009; Nelson et al., 2022). Counting-focused interventions, in particular, have garnered increasing attention due to their conceptual centrality and demonstrated effectiveness in supporting learners with mathematics difficulties (Akther et al., 2025).

At the same time, instructional responses to mathematical learning difficulties do not occur in a pedagogical vacuum. Teacher beliefs about mathematics, learning, and learner capability play a decisive role in shaping instructional practices, assessment strategies, and inclusionary decisions (Beswick, 2008; Hamukwaya & Haser, 2021). Beliefs that frame mathematical difficulty as a fixed deficit can undermine inclusive efforts, whereas asset-oriented perspectives support differentiated instruction and responsive teaching (Herner-Patnode & Lee, 2021). The concept of content knowledge for teaching further emphasizes that effective mathematics instruction requires not only subject matter knowledge but also specialized pedagogical understanding of how learners conceptualize mathematical ideas and encounter difficulty (Ball et al., 2008).

Inclusive education frameworks increasingly emphasize the moral, legal, and pedagogical imperative to provide equitable learning opportunities for all learners, including those with mathematical learning difficulties (Hansen et al., 2020; Opplæringslova, 2023). Policy documents and curricular reforms underscore adapted education and formative assessment as key mechanisms for achieving inclusion, yet implementation remains uneven across contexts (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2017). Teachers often report limited competence, confidence, and institutional support in addressing mathematics difficulties within inclusive classrooms, highlighting persistent gaps between policy aspirations and classroom realities (Hanssen et al., 2025).

Against this backdrop, the present article aims to provide a comprehensive, publication-ready synthesis of research on early numeracy, mathematical learning difficulties, instructional interventions, teacher beliefs, and inclusive pedagogical practices. By integrating diverse strands of literature into a coherent analytical narrative, the study seeks to advance theoretical understanding and inform educational practice and policy. The central research problem guiding this synthesis concerns how early numeracy interventions and inclusive instructional approaches can be effectively designed and implemented to support learners with mathematical learning difficulties, while addressing the complex interplay of cognitive, pedagogical, and socio-cultural factors. A key gap identified in the literature lies in the fragmentation of research across cognitive, instructional, and belief-based domains, necessitating an integrative perspective that acknowledges their interdependence.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach adopted in this study is a comprehensive qualitative research synthesis grounded in systematic narrative analysis. Rather than aggregating statistical outcomes or effect sizes, the synthesis prioritizes theoretical elaboration, contextual interpretation, and conceptual integration of findings across diverse research traditions. This approach aligns with calls for research syntheses that move beyond summary toward critical engagement with theoretical assumptions, methodological choices, and practical implications (Nelson et al., 2022).

The corpus of literature analyzed was strictly delimited to the references provided, encompassing peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly monographs, policy documents, and methodological texts. These sources collectively

represent a broad spectrum of perspectives on mathematical learning difficulties, early numeracy, intervention research, teacher beliefs, inclusive education, and research methodology. The inclusion of both empirical and theoretical works enabled a multidimensional analysis that attends to cognitive, instructional, and systemic dimensions.

Data analysis proceeded through iterative thematic analysis informed by established qualitative methodologies (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Initial familiarization involved close reading of all sources, with attention to research questions, theoretical frameworks, methodological designs, and key findings. Codes were generated inductively, capturing recurring concepts such as early identification, number sense, intervention fidelity, differentiated instruction, formative assessment, teacher competence, and inclusive practice. These codes were then organized into broader themes that structure the analytical narrative of the article.

To enhance trustworthiness and analytical rigor, criteria for qualitative validity articulated by Guba (1981) were applied throughout the synthesis process. Credibility was supported through prolonged engagement with the literature and triangulation across multiple sources and research designs. Dependability was addressed by maintaining a transparent analytical process, while confirmability was enhanced through reflexive consideration of interpretive choices. Although transferability is inherently constrained in research synthesis, detailed theoretical elaboration allows readers to assess the applicability of insights to their own contexts.

The methodological stance of this article is interpretivist, recognizing that understandings of mathematical learning difficulties and effective instruction are socially constructed and contextually embedded. At the same time, the synthesis acknowledges the value of quantitative evidence in establishing patterns of effectiveness, integrating such findings into a broader theoretical framework. By combining narrative synthesis with thematic analysis, the methodology seeks to balance depth, coherence, and comprehensiveness in addressing the complex research problem.

RESULTS

The results of the synthesis are presented as a descriptive and analytical exposition of key themes emerging from the literature. Rather than reporting discrete empirical findings, this section integrates evidence across studies to illuminate patterns, relationships, and points of convergence and divergence.

A central finding concerns the predictive power of early numeracy skills for later mathematical achievement. Longitudinal research consistently demonstrates that competencies such as counting accuracy, number magnitude understanding, and basic arithmetic reasoning in early childhood are strongly associated with mathematics performance in subsequent grades (Aunio & Niemivirta, 2010; Jordan et al., 2006). Children identified as at risk for mathematics difficulties in kindergarten and first grade often exhibit persistent deficits, underscoring the importance of early identification and intervention (Geary et al., 2012).

Intervention studies provide compelling evidence that targeted, structured instruction can significantly improve outcomes for learners with mathematical learning difficulties. Counting-focused interventions, in particular, emerge as a robust and theoretically grounded approach, addressing foundational numerical concepts that underpin more advanced mathematical learning (Akther et al., 2025). Such interventions are most effective when delivered with sufficient intensity, explicit instruction, and opportunities for guided practice, aligning with principles identified in meta-analyses of instructional components (Gersten et al., 2009).

The literature also highlights considerable variability in learner response to intervention, reflecting the heterogeneity of mathematical learning difficulties (Gifford & Rockliffe, 2012). This variability underscores the inadequacy of one-size-fits-all approaches and supports the use of differentiated instruction tailored to individual learner profiles (Herner-Patnode & Lee, 2021). Case studies illustrate how adaptive instructional strategies, including the use of manipulatives, visual representations, and technology-enhanced learning, can scaffold understanding and promote engagement (Chin & Fu, 2021; Mahoney & Hall, 2017).

Teacher beliefs and self-reported competence emerge as critical mediators of instructional effectiveness. Studies reveal that teachers' beliefs about the nature of mathematics and learner capability significantly influence their willingness to implement inclusive practices and adapt instruction for learners with difficulties (Beswick,

2008; Hamukwaya & Haser, 2021). Survey research indicates that many teachers perceive gaps in their competence to address mathematical learning difficulties, even within schools explicitly oriented toward inclusive or dyslexia-friendly practices (Hanssen et al., 2025).

Assessment practices constitute another salient theme. Formative assessment, characterized by ongoing feedback, diagnostic questioning, and responsive adjustment of instruction, is widely recognized as a powerful tool for supporting learning and identifying difficulties (Black & Wiliam, 1998). However, the literature suggests that formative assessment is unevenly implemented, often constrained by curricular demands, time pressures, and limited professional development (Klette, 2007).

Policy and systemic factors further shape the landscape of instructional practice. Legal and curricular frameworks emphasize adapted education and inclusion as core principles, yet tensions persist between standardized expectations and individualized support (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2017; Opplæringslova, 2023). Collaborative practices among teachers, specialists, and support staff are identified as facilitators of inclusive education, though such collaboration requires organizational structures and cultural norms that are not universally present (Hansen et al., 2020; Buli-Holmberg et al., 2015).

DISCUSSION

The synthesis of findings underscores the multifaceted nature of mathematical learning difficulties and the corresponding complexity of effective educational responses. Early numeracy emerges as a foundational construct, not merely as a set of discrete skills but as a developmental domain encompassing conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and representational competence. The strong predictive relationship between early numeracy and later achievement lends theoretical support to developmental models of mathematics learning that emphasize cumulative knowledge building (Aunio et al., 2021; Fuchs et al., 2005).

Counting-focused interventions exemplify how theoretically grounded instructional approaches can translate into meaningful learning gains. By targeting core numerical concepts, such interventions address underlying cognitive deficits rather than surface-level performance issues. However, their effectiveness is contingent upon implementation fidelity, teacher expertise, and contextual support. This finding resonates with broader intervention research emphasizing the interaction between instructional design and delivery conditions (Gersten et al., 2009).

The role of teacher beliefs warrants particular attention. Beliefs function as interpretive filters through which teachers make sense of learner behavior, instructional strategies, and assessment data. When mathematical difficulty is construed as an immutable deficit, instructional responses may become remedial in a narrow sense, focusing on repetition rather than conceptual understanding (Hamukwaya & Haser, 2021). Conversely, beliefs aligned with growth-oriented and inclusive perspectives foster adaptive teaching and high expectations. This underscores the importance of teacher education programs that explicitly address beliefs alongside pedagogical knowledge (Ball et al., 2008).

Inclusive education emerges not as a static placement decision but as an ongoing pedagogical process requiring continuous adaptation and collaboration. Differentiated instruction and formative assessment are central to this process, enabling teachers to respond dynamically to learner needs. Yet, the literature reveals structural and cultural barriers that impede inclusive practice, including limited time, insufficient professional development, and competing policy demands (Molbaek, 2018).

Methodological limitations across the literature also warrant consideration. While intervention studies provide valuable evidence of effectiveness, many are conducted under controlled conditions that may not fully capture the complexities of everyday classroom contexts. Qualitative studies offer rich insights into implementation and experience but are often limited in scope. Future research would benefit from integrative designs that combine longitudinal, experimental, and qualitative approaches to examine how interventions function across diverse settings.

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive research synthesis affirms that early numeracy development, targeted intervention, teacher beliefs, and inclusive pedagogical practices are deeply interconnected dimensions of educational responses to mathematical learning difficulties. The evidence underscores the critical importance of early identification and intervention, particularly through counting-focused

and conceptually grounded instructional approaches. At the same time, the synthesis reveals that instructional effectiveness cannot be divorced from teacher knowledge, beliefs, and systemic support structures.

Inclusive education for learners with mathematical learning difficulties requires more than policy mandates; it demands sustained investment in teacher education, collaborative practice, and formative assessment. By integrating insights across cognitive, pedagogical, and socio-cultural domains, this article contributes to a more holistic understanding of how mathematical learning difficulties can be addressed in equitable and effective ways. Future efforts must continue to bridge research, practice, and policy to ensure that all learners are afforded meaningful opportunities to develop mathematical competence and confidence.

REFERENCES

1. Akther, S. S., Powell, S. R., & Lariviere, D. O. (2025). Counting-focused intervention effects for students with mathematics difficulty: A research synthesis. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 40(3), 162–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/09388982251321538

2. Aunio, P., & Niemivirta, M. (2010). Predicting children's mathematical performance in grade one by early numeracy. Learning and Individual Differences, 20(5), 427–435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.06.003

3. Aunio, P., Korhonen, J., Ragpot, L., Törmänen, M., & Henning, E. (2021). An early numeracy intervention for first-graders at risk for mathematical learning difficulties. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 55, 252–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2020.12.002

4. 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

5. Beswick, K. (2008). Influencing teachers' beliefs about teaching mathematics for numeracy to students with mathematics learning difficulties. Mathematics Teacher Education and Development, 9, 3–20.

6. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

7. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. Sage.

8. Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2014). InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing. Sage.

9. Buli-Holmberg, J., Nilsen, S., & Skogen, K. (2015). Kultur for tilpasset opplæring. Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

10. Chin, K. E., & Fu, S. H. (2021). Exploring the implementation of an intervention for a pupil with mathematical learning difficulties: A case study. Journal on Mathematics Education, 12(3), 531–546. https://doi.org/10.22342/jme.12.3.14473.531-546

11. Dowker, A. (2005). Early identification and intervention for students with mathematics difficulties. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38(4), 324–332. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194050380040801

12. Fuchs, L. S., Compton, D. L., Fuchs, D., Paulsen, K., Bryant, J. D., & Hamlett, C. L. (2005). The prevention, identification, and cognitive determinants of math difficulty. Journal of Educational Psychology, 97(3), 493–513. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.3.493

13. Geary, D. C., Hoard, M. K., Nugent, L., & Bailey, D. H. (2012). Mathematical cognition deficits in children with learning disabilities and persistent low achievement: A five-year prospective study. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(1), 206–223. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025398

14. Gersten, R., Chard, D. J., Jayanthi, M., Baker, S. K., Morphy, P., & Flojo, J. (2009). Mathematics instruction for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis of instructional components. Review of Educational Research, 79(3), 1202–1242. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654309334431

15. Gersten, R., Jordan, N. C., & Flojo, J. R. (2005). Early identification and interventions for students with mathematics difficulties. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38(4), 293–304.

https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194050380040301

16. Gifford, S., & Rockliffe, F. (2012). Mathematics difficulties: does one approach fit all? Research in Mathematics Education, 14(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/14794802.2012.657436

17. Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. Educational Technology Research and Development, 29(2), 75–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02766777

18. Hamukwaya, S. T., & Haser, Ç. (2021). "It does not mean that they cannot do mathematics": Beliefs about mathematics learning difficulties. International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 16(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/9569

19. Hansen, J. H., Carrington, S., Jensen, C. R., Molbæk, M., & Secher Schmidt, M. C. (2020). The collaborative practice of inclusion and exclusion. Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6(1), 47–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1730112

20. Hanssen, N. B., Valle, A. M., Lagestad, P., Tverbakk, M. L., & Marôco, J. (2025). A survey of teachers' self-reported competence regarding mathematical learning disabilities in Norwegian dyslexia-friendly schools. International Journal of Inclusive Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2025.2514139

21. Herner-Patnode, L., & Lee, H.-J. (2021). Differentiated instruction to teach mathematics: Through the lens of responsive teaching. Mathematics Teacher Education and Development, 23(3), 6–25.

22. Jordan, N. C., Kaplan, D., Nabors Oláh, L., & Locuniak, M. N. (2006). Number sense growth in kindergarten: A longitudinal investigation of children at risk for mathematics difficulties. Child Development, 77(1), 153–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00862.x

23. Klette, K. (2007). Bruk av arbeidsplaner i skolen – et hovedverktøy for å realisere tilpasset opplæring? Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift, 91, 344–358. https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN1504-2987-2007-04-08

24. Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2017). Overordnet del – Undervisning og tilpasset opplæring. https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/3.-prinsipper-for-skolens-praksis/3.2-undervisning-og-tilpasset-opplaring

25. Lunde, O. (2010). Hvorfor tall går i ball: Matematikkvansker i et spesialpedagogisk fokus. Info Vest Forlag.

26. Mahoney, J., & Hall, C. (2017). Using technology to differentiate and accommodate students with disabilities. E-Learning and Digital Media, 14(5), 291–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753017751517

27. Mazzocco, M. M., & Myers, G. F. (2003). Complexities in identifying and defining mathematics learning disability in the primary school-age years. Annals of Dyslexia, 53(1), 218–253. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-003-0011-7

28. Molbaek, M. (2018). Inclusive teaching strategies – Dimensions and agendas. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 22(10), 1048–1061. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1414578

29. Nelson, G., Crawford, A., Hunt, J., Park, S., Leckie, E., Duarte, A., Brafford, T., Ramos-Duke, M., & Zarate, K. (2022). A systematic review of research syntheses on students with mathematics learning disabilities and difficulties. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 37(1), 18–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12272

30. Opplæringslova. (2023). Lov om grunnskoleopplæringa og den vidaregåande opplæringa. https://lovdata.no/lov/2023-06-09-30

31. Ostad, S. A. (2010). Matematikkvansker: En forskningsbasert tilnærming. Fagbokforlaget.