Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers
The PROFESIOLab electronic, peer-reviewed, open-access Magazine

ISSN 1989 – 9572

DOI: 10.47750/jett.2023.14.03.086

Exploring Mathematics Education In The 21st Century

Nelson P. Cipriano

Journal for Educators,Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (3)

https://jett.labosfor.com/

Date of reception:14 Mar 2023

Date of revision: 20 Apr 2023

Date of acceptance: 28 May 2023

Nelson P. Cipriano (2023). Exploring Mathematics Education In The 21st Century..*Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers,*Vol. 14(3). 749-758

[1]Faculty, College of Teacher Education,Cagayan State University, Philippines

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers
The LabOSfor electronic, peer-reviewed, open-access Magazine

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (3)
ISSN 1989 –9572
https://jett.labosfor.com/

Exploring Mathematics Education In The 21st Century

Nelson P. Cipriano
Faculty, College of Teacher Education,Cagayan State University, Philippines
Email:olympiadmath2020@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Mathematics education in 21st century as explored in this study has shown developmental challenges in the attainment of objectives, meeting teacher qualifications, employing strategies, and conducting assessments. The harmonization of these areas that make up mathematical pedagogy remains a journey in progress toward 21st century skills development in mathematics education. The systematic review of literature provides insights into the direction of teaching of mathematics by teachers possessing the teaching qualifications with implication on the integration of strategies, educational resources, and teaching assessments for 21st century teaching and learning of mathematics.

Keywords: assessment, educational resources, mathematics education, strategies, 21st century skills

INTRODUCTION

The blanket focus on Mathematics education in the global landscape stands to reason as Mathematics remains conceivably one of the most internationalized subjects in tertiary education. This global focus paves the gateway to economic progress with many national leaders concerned to see better results in international performance indicators such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) or Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (Schleicher, 2018; Wardat et al., 2022). Consequently, it is the same focus that brings an extensive re-engineering of mathematics curricula which objectifies to better integrate mathematical content such as facts and procedures), deep theoretical understanding and mathematical processes which warrants fluency development, logical reasoning and problem-solving. These are believed to be prerequisites for effective mathematical functioning in the twenty-first century. Accordingly, authors posit that this is not an easy feat which can be achieved in an instant(Cresswell & Speelman, 2020; Li & Schoenfeld, 2019; Golding, 2018).

The importance of Mathematics cannot be discounted as it furnishes an effective avenue of building discipline, logical reasoning and rigor of the mind, which are all fundamental in understanding the world and its people. Likewise, mathematical comprehension plays a key role in processing the contents of other courses such as sciences, social studies, music and art, among several others (Park et al., 2021). As a mathematical gatekeeper, mathematical knowledge and skills are considered as students' key to both personal and professional opportunities for academic success and for fostering scientific and technical skilled workforce. (Tavares et al., 2023; Bone, et.al., 2021). These learning potentials that mathematics education develop in students make an increasing demand for the teaching of mathematics at higher levels of education. Necessarily, as the learning potentials are great, so too are the learning difficulties that students possibly face (Chand et al., 2021; Mazana et al., 2020; Tong et al., 2022).

To address students' struggles, mathematics curriculum underwent educational reform. In its unwavering efforts towards academic excellence, the Philippines instituted K to 12 curriculum program consonant with RA 10533 titled Enhanced Basic Education Act 2013. This program is the national response to the demands and challenges of the twenty-first century with the intention of reforming the educational system with mathematics education as one of the major emphases. While the impact of educational reform is yet to be witnessed, the curriculum guides released by the Department of Education express how Filipino youths are envisioned to face the challenges of the twenty-first century (Haw et al., 2021). Helping in the national government goals, two national organizations namely the Philippine Council of Mathematics Teachers Educators (MATHTED), Inc. and the Science Education Institute of the Department of Science and Technology designed Philippine Mathematics Framework for basic education underscoring the roles of mathematics in furthering involvement for productive life activities, advancing measures of making sense of the world, and bridging communication and serving as gateway to national development. Emphatically, it is the goal of mathematics education to hone mathematically empowered Filipinos equipped with critical and analytical thinking skills. The focus goal through the teaching of a solid mathematical content is the envisioned development of high cognitive skills and values to all Filipino students regardless of their circumstances (Golla & Reyes, 2020; Verzosa & Vistro-Yu, 2020).

The reformed curriculum emphasizes skills development which are cognitive, generic, technological and other relevant issues to assist the young generation satisfy the demands of the contemporary times. However, PISA in 2018 study reveal Filipino students' scores which are lower in reading, mathematics and science than those in most of the country-participants. In addition, TIMSS 2019 reveals that Filipino students performed unsatisfactorily as compared with other countries in the same areas as mathematics and science. The Philippines scores in mathematics and science "significantly lower" than any other participating countries, stressing the country's lamentable performance in the global landscape.

Given the above dismal performance in mathematics, this paper explores studies conducted to address the challenges of mathematics education in the Philippines with the hope to clear understanding on status of mathematics education in the 21st century. Purposefully, this paper meta-synthesizes studies in mathematics education along have a glimpse on the development and direction of 21st century mathematics education.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a qualitative investigation employing systematic literature as research method. Systematic reviews are employed in this study as it synthesizes research findings systematically, transparently, and reproducibly. Also, a systematic review can be construed as a research method and process for identifying and critically appraising relevant research and for collecting and analyzing data from said research. The objective is to identify all empirical evidence that fits the pre-specified inclusion criteria to answer a particular research interest. Bias can be minimized when explicit and systematic methods are in reviewing articles and when all available evidence reliable findings are provided from which conclusions can be drawn and decisions made (Snyder, 2019; Davis et al., 2014; Liberati et al., 2009; Moher et al., 2009).

In this study, the areas covered for review are areas in mathematics education inclusive of overview of 21st century teaching and learning skills, general view of mathematics education, its objectives, teacher qualifications, strategies, instructional materials, and assessment in teaching mathematics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

21st Century Teaching and Learning Skills

To set a clearer picture on what is expected as skills to be developed not only by students, but by teachers themselves as well, there is a need to look explore on the 21st century teaching and learning skills which capture the knowledge, life and career skills, habits, and traits crucial to student success in today's world, particularly as students move up to higher education, become part of the workforce, and live an adult life.

The framework called Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21) combines topic knowledge, skills, expertise, and literacies, that students must master to excel in school and in life. According to P21, acquiring fundamental academic subject knowledge serves as the foundation of 21st century learning, and schools must build on this foundation by teaching students other skills such as learning skills namely critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity, life skills inclusive of flexibility, initiative, social skills, productivity, leadership, and literacy skills covering information, media, and technology literacies. Similarly, the Word Health Organization identifies the fundamental life skills as decision making and problem solving, creative thinking and critical thinking, communication and interpersonal skills, self-awareness and empathy, and coping with emotions and stress.

Three key topics—curriculum and instruction, professional development, and strategies and conditions for 21st century skill implementation at the national and school levels—seem to be the focus of discussion when it comes to the implementation of 21st century skills across various frameworks.

In general, and notwithstanding the method used for its integration, Voogt & Roblin (2010) noted that all frameworks demonstrate that incorporating 21st-century skills into the curriculum will need significant curriculum revisions. These adjustments relate to the curriculum's requirement for revision to make way for 21st century abilities as well as the demand for fresh approaches to instruction and evaluation. The development of 21st century skills can be best fostered, according to P21 and the EU frameworks, by particular pedagogical strategies such problem-based learning, cooperative learning, experiential learning, and formative assessment. Along with these cutting-edge teaching strategies, the majority of frameworks also place a strong emphasis on the necessity of making extensive use of technology to improve student learning and encourage the acquisition of 21st century skills.

The recognition of change in teaching and learning hinges on the attitudes, beliefs, skill sets, and practices of teachers. All frameworks make some mention, in varying degrees of detail, of the importance of teachers in the development of 21st century skills and the ensuing requirement for teacher assistance. Due to their cross-curricular character, the capacity to use ICT to boost learning, and the requirement to be proficient in a variety of teaching tactics and evaluation techniques, these abilities pose several didactic challenges for teachers (Trier, 2002). Furthermore, teachers are required to not only assist their pupils to cultivate 21st century abilities, but also to acquire these skills themselves, confirming the suggestions made by the European Union (Gordon et al, 2009).

According to the results of the study conducted by the panel, children who perform well have a greater chance of being successful in college and will be equipped for career possibilities in the global economy of the 21st century. This highlights the crucial function of mathematics for students' growth where they become ready for the 21st century and beyond.

General View on Mathematics Education

Scholars of mathematics education have differentiated between a variety of forms of knowledge, such as conceptual knowledge as opposed to procedural knowledge, intuitive knowledge as opposed to analytical knowledge, knowing that, knowing how, knowing why, and knowing how, among other forms of information. These various works make the overarching claim that the forms represent distinct dimensions of information; in other words, they explain some significant knowledge structure (Stockton & Wasserman, 2017). This is the thesis that is presented in each of the works.

As a result, it is possible for an individual to have procedural knowledge regarding the computing area while concurrently having no conceptual knowledge of what is being computed — or vice versa. At other times, there may be cognitive structures that are inherently present throughout the various forms. This progression may describe how knowledge develops and the forms may be represented by nested sets. Therefore, one might "know that" without also knowing "why," but "knowing why" requires also having "knowledge of that." (Al-Fedaghi, 2022).

The many forms provide an overview of the various educational paths that lead to an understanding of advanced mathematical concepts. These are different in nature from the descriptions and characterizations of advanced mathematical thinking because they represent diverse ways that one can know advanced mathematics. This is because the descriptions and characterizations of advanced mathematical thinking focus on the thinking itself. That is to say, for any concept found in advanced mathematics, there is a wide variety of ways in which it might be known to an individual and cognitively constructed within that person (Moyo, 2022).

Examples of particular considerations and moves (such as unpacking), for example, are frequently used in teaching to connect the discussion of various forms of knowledge to practice; however, the most important categorizations are not of how knowledge is applied, but rather the forms in which one needs to know that knowledge in order to be able to apply it effectively in teaching (Crisan, 2022).It is possible to establish a connection between specific practices that teachers participate in, such as abridging, hiding, foreshadowing, bridging, and unpacking, and a number of different types of knowledge, including evolutionary, axiomatic, logical, and inferential knowledge. Additionally, peripheral, evolutionary, and logical knowledge can be connected to inferential knowledge. In addition, these forms contribute to a more robust understanding of the conceptualization of teachers' horizon content knowledge. This is because they describe particularly fruitful ways of creating crucial developmental understandings for teachers, which is one of the ways in which they contribute to this understanding. It is possible that by analyzing advanced mathematical content through this lens, teacher educators will be better able to conceptualize and structure mathematics courses for teachers, highlighting content that truly informs the work of K-12 teaching and in a manner that facilitates teachers' formation of those connections (Stockton & Wasserman, (2017)).According to Cardino and Cruz 2020, the major goal of teaching at every level of school is to bring about a fundamental transformation in the learner. It is fitting to say that this is the basic objective of teaching. It is expected that a mathematics teacher should have the knowledge and a high degree of comprehension, which is one of the areas in mathematics that students found difficult to pass. In order to reach this goal, a mathematics teacher should have the knowledge and an understanding that is high. According to Odumosu et al. (2018), there is a significant amount of evidence to suggest that there is a considerable association between the mathematical content knowledge of teachers and the mathematical performance of their students.

Objectives of Mathematics Education

As stated by Vasu (2019), the secondary math curriculum should have the following goals:

Objectives in Knowledge and Understanding. The student gains a working knowledge of the language of mathematics, distinct concepts, mathematical ideas, the history of the subject's growth over the ages, the interactions between various branches and areas of mathematics, and the fundamental character of the discipline.

Aims for skills. The subject aids in fostering the growth of the following abilities in the student: use and comprehension of mathematical abilities language; speed, neatness, accuracy, brevity, and precision in mathematical calculations; technique for problem-solving; ability to perform calculations mentally and orally; ability to use mathematical methods and apparatus; and, to name a few, ability to use mathematical tables and ready references.

Applications' goals. The subject aids the student in putting the aforementioned knowledge and abilities to use in the following ways: independently solve mathematical problems; use mathematical concepts and processes in

everyday life; think and express clearly, precisely, and systematically by using mathematical language; and apply thematic knowledge to the study of other subjects, particularly sciences.
Goals for attitude. With his own independent efforts, the student learns to examine problems, acquire the habit of systematic thinking and objective reasoning, and understands and values the logical, critical, and independent thinking of others.
According to P21, 21st century skills, Uysal & Zkan Elgün (2020) examined the essential course objectives in courses like mathematics. When linked important objectives are taken into account, it becomes clear that each of them is connected to life skills, however their distribution in terms of subject areas and skills varies. Learning and creativity skills are generally more closely tied to crucial goals and the level of the course. Additionally, both in terms of course level and generally, life and job skills are not usually taken. Additionally, these abilities are not taught in classes like mathematics and others. When considering the course and topic areas/skills, more emphasis is placed on the critical thinking, problem-solving, and information literacy abilities.

Qualifications in the Teaching of Mathematics
According to Guler and Celik (2021), teachers' abilities are one of the most crucial variables in students' academic success (Blömeke et al., 2016; Hattie, 2009). Professional expertise is among the first issues that come to mind in this context. Many research have been undertaken in the past three decades since Shulman (1986) published his domains of knowledge framework, even though the literature on teacher education in general and the professional knowledge kinds that teachers should acquire in particular is relatively recent. Studies that were especially designed to pinpoint knowledge elements in fields like mathematics education were among them (e.g., Osta, 2020; Ball et al., 2008).
According to three areas, content knowledge (CK), pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), and general pedagogical knowledge (GPK), professional knowledge, and teacher knowledge in particular, are frequently classified (Baki, 2018). Although there have been more studies on teacher education, according to Jacob et al. (2020), who corroborate König et al. (2011), the precise nature of GPK and what this knowledge domain entails have still not been defined.It has been demonstrated that mathematics teachers' own content knowledge, as well as their understanding of how students think and how they use their knowledge in the classroom, are critically important (Mutiani et al., 2021; Wasserman, 2015).
It has been demonstrated that math educators can enhance their instruction by considering student ideas and conducting a group reflection on their teaching methods. However, Hodgen et al. (2018) point out that teaching strategies that are effective in the short term could nonetheless result in misunderstandings over time, particularly when used to a difficult subject like mathematics.
According to Kilhamn & Roj-Lindberg (2019), teachers are skilled at using their mathematical knowledge when collaboratively reflecting on content-related issues with students or teaching. They apply decompression, cutting, and bridging techniques in their daily job as well as in the focus groups. However, we could also observe how their understanding of mathematics was tested as they struggled to justify arithmetic operations, apply specific terminology, and decipher the underlying meanings of mathematical concepts and symbols.
It is common to mention curricula as one of the things that limit a teacher's knowledge. This study examines the qualifications for teachers that are outlined in the curricula for mathematics education in the three OECD-member countries of Latin America in the context of educating students about sustainability. For this, a content analysis of the meaning associated with the teaching and learning of mathematics that would enable the development of essential sustainability skills has been conducted. The findings reveal a weak alignment between the teaching-learning process of mathematics and education for sustainable development, as well as a lack of important competences for sustainability. These findings serve as a road map for teacher education programs and innovative instructional strategies that will enable mathematics education to support the teaching of sustainability in primary school. This innovative method ought to enhance students' comprehension of the various issues—social, economic, and environmental—that we confront as well as the steps that must be taken to change and act in favor of a more sustainable world (Vásquez et al., 2022).

Strategies in Mathematics Education
Kilhamn and Roj-Lindberg (2019) explored bridging, trimming, and decompression techniques. Decompressing draws attention to complexity by either revealing a mathematical idea's hidden aspects or by adding difficulty as a prelude to more complicated mathematical concepts.
Additionally, Wasserman & Stockton (2014) emphasize the use of appropriate terminology and caution while reducing presentation and symbols. The definition of bridging is the linking of mathematics across topics, courses, concepts, representations, and goals or the linking of basic mathematical principles with more complex ones. Choike (2000) offers methodologies for instruction that support his own university teaching and in-service presentations. Over the years, these tactics have changed. Emphasize conceptual understanding, or the "big ideas," eliminate numbers as a barrier for comprehending new concepts, ensure entry into a problem or activity, emphasize multiple representations, such as words, tables of data, graphs, and symbols, revisit rich or well-

known settings, engage students in guided explorations, and use learning-by-discovery teaching strategies are just a few of the solutions that have emerged as a result of the challenges.

By analyzing the errors produced by students, Maharani et al. (2018) came to the conclusion that cognitive conflict has a significant influence in changing the students' conceptualization. Students experience internal conflict as a result of fresh information clashing with what they already know.

Mulungye, et al. (2016) said that to correct misconceptions, their research showed that teachers' intentional use of students' mathematical concepts can enhance teacher-student engagement in mathematics classes. The majority of the professors, however, hardly ever used the pupils' mathematical concepts. The results showed that whereas 38% of the teachers used student-based methods, 62% of the teachers utilized subject-based methods. According to the study, rather than teachers' awareness of the faults, the main challenge appears to be their capacity to use their knowledge of student error. This resulted in instructional tactics that did not address students' problems and it also made it clear that there are issues with the way mathematics is taught.

Instructional Resources in Mathematics Education

The three fundamental types of mathematical thinking tools are problem-solving abilities, representational abilities, and reasoning abilities (Sibgatullin et al., 2022).

Quantitatively literate people often use these thinking strategies in their daily lives and the job. They are crucial in many subject areas, including mathematics.

Mathematical skills are necessary for problem-solving in order to determine what to do when one is unsure of what to do. Students that possess a toolbox of problem-solving techniques (such as guess and check, build a list, work backwards, utilize a model, solve a simpler problem, etc.) are more adept at starting a problem, attacking the problem, and determining what to do with it. Additionally, since there is no answer key in the real world, creating mathematical problems with multiple solutions or exploring mathematical problems from different angles allows students to practice problem-solving skills and gain an understanding of the usefulness of mathematics (Verschaffel et al., 2020; Schoenfeld, 2016).

Students are given quantitative communication tools when they can connect various representations of mathematical knowledge. Mathematical relationships can be represented in a variety of ways, such as visually (in the form of diagrams, drawings, or graphs), numerically (in the form of tables, lists, or computations), symbolically, or vocally. Several of these representations are frequently used in a good mathematics explanation since each one helps the reader comprehend the concepts being discussed. Students are given powerful tools for mathematical reasoning when they can develop, interpret, and translate across representations (Sibgatullin et al., 2022).

Since performing calculations on "naked numbers" is rarely necessary in applications of mathematics, the ability to analyze issues in order to extract and quantify pertinent information is a crucial thinking ability. Examining specific situations, finding patterns and correlations between them, and expanding the patterns and relationships are all steps in the inductive reasoning process. In deductive reasoning, conclusions are reached through analyzing the structure of a situation. These kinds of reasoning are frequently used by citizens who are numerate (Lüken & Sauzet, 2021; Chalmers et al., 2017).

Assessment in Mathematics Education

Assessment may not necessarily have to include writing anything down with a pencil and paper; rather, it can take the form of a project, an observation, or a work that demonstrates that a student has absorbed a concept and is able to create logical connections and links with other concepts that are related to it. According to Chigonga (2020), meaningful learning occurs when the student understands how the information being learnt relates to other information that they already possess.The following are the "three fundamental educational principles which form the foundation of all assessment that supports effective education" that are outlined in Measuring What Counts: (1)The Content Principle states that the mathematics that students should focus their attention on learning should be reflected in the examination. (2) The Learning Principle, which states that assessments should help students get better at arithmetic and should encourage teachers to use sound pedagogical practices. (3) The Equity Principle states that assessing ought to promote every student's opportunity to learn. This is a key principle.A more thorough picture of the learning that has taken place among the pupils can be obtained by using a number of assessment strategies. A number of the different forms of assessment activities offer information regarding the pupils' levels of capability to carry out various mathematical procedures. Others require higher-level thinking and problem-solving abilities, relevant educational activities, and/or the invocation of real-world applications. These can be distinguished by their use of the phrases "higher-level thinking" and "problem-solving skills."

According to Chigonga (2020), the interactions between the three components of an instructional unit—the students, the teacher, and the material—are the primary area of concentration in the field of mathematics education. To put it another way, the potential of an individual teacher to give high-quality education is dependent not only on the intellectual and personal resources that the teacher possesses, but also on the interaction that the teacher has with certain groups of students and materials.

Suurtamm, et al. (2016) expanded the usage of an assessment design through didactic model based on work from Freudenthal Institute positing that mathematics activates students to generate meaning for themselves. Through opportunities given to them, students demonstrate and share ideas that serve as reference for meaningful debate in classroom context. This can be a very valuable practice as it offers the potential benefits that can accrue to classroom teachers who design assessment tasks in accordance with the principles.

In addition, findings from Van den Heuvel-Panhuizen and Becker (2003) opine that evaluation activities should capture challenges that were constructed while keeping the following criteria in mind:

(i) Assignments are designed with many answers so that students can exercise their critical thinking and deductive reasoning skills while making choices. Both jobs with various pathways leading to a single solution and several solutions themselves could be involved in the process of finding multiple solutions.

(ii) Tasks may be reliant on one another. This means that tasks may be paired with one another or have many parts, and a solution to a problem encountered in an earlier part may be used to a problem encountered in a later part. The assessment can disclose whether or not the learners reflect into the interplay on whether or not they can use the information. This is one advantage of having dependent tasks.

(iii) Assignments in which the approach taken to finding a solution, rather than the answer itself, is the focus of attention. Teachers are able to consider the methods that determine instances of students' recognition and utilization of relationships as solutions for complex approach. This allows teachers to differentiate between scenarios where students understand and employ the interplay of the concepts to seek timely for answers.

They went on to note that designed tasks in view of these principles make rich opportunities for students to engage with problems that interest them, for them to own their learning, and for them to further think of classroom instruction and discourse to move mathematically move the learners forward.

Cheang et al. (2012) suggest that teachers can analyze which of the disciplinary (or contextual) principles on task design are illustrated in each task or sub-task as part of classroom assessment. For emphasis, the principles cover demonstration of problem analysis information elicitation, computations completion, reasoning application, and representations computations, among others.

Assessment activities can be altered to ensure that students are presented with a diverse range of challenges in the event that particular concepts do not make themselves sufficiently clear. For the purpose of evaluating students in the classroom, they may also think about using other forms such as oral presentation of individual or group work projects. Mathematical knowledge for teaching (MKT) is a framework that was developed by Ball, Thames, and Phelps (2008) with the goal of understanding, creating, and assessing essential mathematical knowledge for teachers. This was accomplished by identifying six mathematical content knowledge areas that make up MKT. Three of the domains are openly tied to pedagogical content knowledge, which is the knowledge of how to connect content to students, to teaching, or to the curriculum. The other three domains are explicitly related to different qualities of subject matter knowledge. When planning, carrying out, and commenting on their teaching practices, teachers frequently make use of the mathematical information they possess.

Marton (2015) references Ball and Bass (2000), who established the concept of "unpacking" as one piece of knowledge a teacher requires when organizing a lesson. For instance, when making choices about what to vary and what to leave invariant in order to attract attention to fundamental features of an idea, a teacher must have this information in order to create an effective lesson.

A teacher also needs to make judgments on what to unpack during the lesson, which complexity to reveal and make pupils aware of, and, conversely, when and how to simplify and decrease complexity (Wasserman, 2015). This is another aspect of the decision-making process that a teacher needs to complete. When a teacher is reflecting on her practice, she needs to be able to distinguish between the aspects of an idea that her students were able to understand and the aspects of the notion that were too difficult or out of reach for them.

In addition, one of the primary challenges in the development of tasks, examples, and arguments is to preserve the mathematical integrity of the material while simultaneously simplifying it and tailoring it to the needs of particular groups of pupils.

According to Wasserman (2015), the application of the framework can be expanded outside the realm of mathematics and used for a variety of purposes in addition to assessment. He proposes that investigations of what mathematical knowledge instructors draw upon when planning, teaching, and reflecting on their teaching have consequences for the training of teachers and for professional growth in the teaching profession. Guler and Celik (2021) came to the conclusion that, while taking into account the various areas of mathematical knowledge, the class tended to place a greater emphasis on "core concepts and procedures" and "representations" than it did on some of the other domains. The challenges and shortcomings of the students in relation to these aspects were taken into consideration during the development of the course. Despite the fact that the importance of real-world examples in comprehending mathematical principles and operations was highlighted and shown, the students were given less chances to investigate and construct real-world examples in depth throughout the material covered in the course. In a similar vein, Richardson (2009) claimed that a significant portion of the mathematics educational reform pushes for teachers' promotion of technology application and teacher knowledge structures that combine information about subject matter, learners, pedagogy, curriculum, and schools. It is possible for instructors and students to access more sophisticated concepts, inspire mathematical conversation, and portray abstract concepts through the integration of such methodologies in an effective manner.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mathematics education in 21st century as explored in this study has shown developmental challenges in the attainment of objectives, meeting teacher qualifications, employing strategies, and conducting assessments. The harmonization of these areas that make up mathematical pedagogy remain a journey in progress toward 21st century skills development in mathematics education. The systematic review of literature provides insights into the direction of teaching of mathematics by teachers possessing the teaching qualifications with implication on the integration of strategies, educational resources, and teaching assessments for 21st century mathematics education.

While the review is systematic, it still comes with limitations such that it has simply accessed literatures relative to mathematics education and presented them as sources of information to give light to areas in mathematics that are presumed to have issues and concerns. The review did not aim to arrive at any model or hypothesis to test assumption, nor did it critically analyze each of the literature that is being reviewed.

Thus, it is the strong recommendation of this study to validate review through other methods of review such as semi-systematic or integrative methods to deepen the interrelationships and the analysis that can be made in the light of the searched literatures.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Fedaghi, S. (2022). Change in Conceptual Modeling and Systems Reconfiguration. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04034.
2. Bone, E., Bouck, E., & Witmer, S. (2021). Evidence-Based Systematic Review of Literature on Algebra Instruction and Interventions for Students with Learning Disabilities. Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 19(1), 1-22.
3. Cardino Jr, J. M., & Cruz, R. A. O. D. (2020). Understanding of learning styles and teaching strategies towards improving the teaching and learning of mathematics. LUMAT: International Journal on Math, Science and Technology Education, 8(1), 19-43.
4. Chalmers, C., Carter, M., Cooper, T., & Nason, R. (2017). Implementing "big ideas" to advance the teaching and learning of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 15, 25-43.
5. Chand, S., Chaudhary, K., Prasad, A., & Chand, V. (2021). Perceived causes of students' poor performance in mathematics: A case study at Ba and Tavua secondary schools. Frontiers in Applied Mathematics and Statistics, 7, 614408.
6. Cresswell, C., & Speelman, C. P. (2020). Does mathematics training lead to better logical thinking and reasoning? A cross-sectional assessment from students to professors. PloS one, 15(7), e0236153.
7. Crisan, C. (2022). From a Personal to a Pedagogically Powerful Understanding of School Mathematics. International Perspectives on Knowledge and Quality: Implications for Innovation in Teacher Education Policy and Practice, 205.
8. Chigonga, B. (2020). Formative Assessment in Mathematics Education in the Twenty-First Century. Theorizing STEM Education in the 21st Century, 127.
9. Chokie, J. (2000). Mathematics Teacher. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc. Vol. 93, No. 7. www.nctm.org
10. Davis, J., Mengersen, K., Bennett, S., & Mazerolle, L. (2014). Viewing systematic reviews and meta-analysis in social research through different lenses. SpringerPlus, 3, 1-9.
11. Golla, E. F., & Reyes, A. G. (2020). PISA Mathematics Literacy Framework vis-à-vis the Philippine Kto12 Mathematics Curriculum. Challenges of PISA: The PNU report, 57.
12. Golding, J. (2018) 'Mathematics education in the spotlight: Its purpose and some implications'. London Review of Education, 16 (3): 460–473. DOI https://doi.org/10.18546/LRE.16.3.08
13. Guler, M., & Celik, D. (2021). The Effect of an Elective Algebra Teaching Course on Prospective Mathematics Teachers' Pedagogical Content Knowledge. International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 16(2), em0636.

14. Haw, J. Y., King, R. B., & Trinidad, J. E. R. (2021). Need supportive teaching is associated with greater reading achievement: What the Philippines can learn from PISA 2018. International Journal of Educational Research, 110, 101864.
15. Hiller, S. E., Kitsantas, A., Cheema, J. E., & Poulou, M. (2022). Mathematics anxiety and self-efficacy as predictors of mathematics literacy. International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology, 53(8), 2133-2151.
16. Jacob, F. I. L. G. O. N. A., John, S. A. K. I. Y. O., & Gwany, D. M. (2020). Teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and students' academic achievement: A theoretical overview. Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science, 14(2), 14-44.
17. Li, Y., & Schoenfeld, A. H. (2019). Problematizing teaching and learning mathematics as "given" in STEM education. International journal of STEM education, 6(1), 1-13.
18. Liberati, A., Altman, D. G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P. C., Ioannidis, J. P., ... & Moher, D. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. Annals of internal medicine, 151(4), W-65.
19. Lüken, M. M., & Sauzet, O. (2021). Patterning strategies in early childhood: a mixed methods study examining 3-to 5-year-old children's patterning competencies. Mathematical Thinking and Learning, 23(1), 28-48.
20. Maass, K., Geiger, V., Ariza, M. R., & Goos, M. (2019). The role of mathematics in interdisciplinary STEM education. Zdm, 51, 869-884.
21. Mazana, M. Y., Montero, C. S., & Casmir, R. O. (2020). Assessing students' performance in mathematics in Tanzania: the teacher's perspective. International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 15(3), em0589.
22. Mitchell, L., & George, L. (2022). Exploring mathematics anxiety among primary school students: Prevalence, mathematics performance and gender. International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 17(3), em0692.
23. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & PRISMA Group*, T. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Annals of internal medicine, 151(4), 264-269.
24. MOYO, P. C. (2022). Perceptions of Current Secondary Mathematics Teachers about their Teacher Preparation.
25. Mutiani, M., Supriatna, N., Abbas, E. W., Rini, T. P. W., & Subiyakto, B. (2021). Technological, pedagogical, content knowledge (TPACK): A discursions in learning innovation on social studies. The Innovation of Social Studies Journal, 2(2), 135-142.
26. Odumosu, Olisama, and A. Fisayi. "Teachers' content and pedagogical knowledge on students' achievement in algebra." International Journal of Education and Research 6.3 (2018): 83-94.
27. Osta, I. (2020). Mathematics curriculum evaluation. In Encyclopedia of mathematics education (pp. 576-582). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
28. Park, K., Brombacher, A., & Brocardo, J. (2021). The role of mathematics in the overall curriculum. Publications of ICME proceedings materials from ICME-11 MexicoICME-11-Topic Study Group ReportsTSG25 .
29. Pirrone, C., Di Corrado, D., Privitera, A., Castellano, S., & Varrasi, S. (2022). Students' mathematics anxiety at distance and in-person learning conditions during COVID-19 pandemic: Are there any differences? An Exploratory Study. Education Sciences, 12(6), 379.
30. Schleicher, A. (2018). Insights and interpretations. Pisa 2018, 10.
31. Schoenfeld, A. H. (2016). Learning to think mathematically: Problem solving, metacognition, and sense making in mathematics (Reprint). Journal of education, 196(2), 1-38.
32. Sibgatullin, I. R., Korzhuev, A. V., Khairullina, E. R., Sadykova, A. R., Baturina, R. V., & Chauzova, V. (2022). A Systematic Review on Algebraic Thinking in Education. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 18(1).
33. Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of business research, 104, 333-339.
34. Tavares, O., Sin, C., Sá, C., Pereira, F., & Amaral, A. (2023). Graduate employment: Does the type of higher education institution matter?. Bulletin of Economic Research.

35. Tong, D. H., Nguyen, T. T., Uyen, B. P., Ngan, L. K., Khanh, L. T., & Tinh, P. T. (2022). Realistic Mathematics Education's Effect on Students' Performance and Attitudes: A Case of Ellipse Topics Learning. European Journal of Educational Research, 11(1), 403-421.
36. Uysal, F., & Özkan Elgün, I. (2020). The Analysis of Critical Attainments Determined during Pandemic Process in Eighth Grade Curriculum According to 21st Century. International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies, 10(2), 339-358.
37. Vasu, D. (2019). Aims and objectives of teaching mathematicshttp://pedagogybyvasu.blogspot.com › ...
38. Vásquez, C., Piñeiro, J. L., & García-Alonso, I. (2022). What Challenges Does the 21st Century Impose on the Knowledge of Primary School Teachers Who Teach Mathematics? An Analysis from a Latin American Perspective. Mathematics, 10(3), 391.
39. Verschaffel, L., Schukajlow, S., Star, J., & Van Dooren, W. (2020). Word problems in mathematics education: A survey. ZDM, 52, 1-16.
40. Verzosa, D. M. B., & Vistro-Yu, C. P. (2020). Prospects and challenges in implementing a new mathematics curriculum in the Philippines. School mathematics curricula: Asian perspectives and glimpses of reform, 207-226.
41. Wardat, Y., Belbase, S., Tairab, H., Takriti, R. A., Efstratopoulou, M., & Dodeen, H. (2022). The influence of school factors on students' mathematics achievements in trends in international mathematics and science study (TIMSS) in Abu Dhabi Emirate schools. Education Sciences, 12(7), 424.