InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal
Peer Reviewed International, Open Access Journal.
ISSN : 3065-7857 / Website: https://ibrj.us / Volume-3, Issue-6 / June - 2026

Original Article

Innovative Teaching and Learning Strategies in Mathematics Education

Shisode Nikita Vijaysing
Salunkhe Nagar, Dhule Road Near postal Colony Chalisgaon.

Manuscript ID:
IBMIIRJ -2026-030606

Submitted: 10 May 2026

Revised: 16 May 2026

Accepted: 06 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

ISSN: 3065-7857

Volume-3

Issue-6

Pp. 23-29

June 2026

Correspondence Address:
Shisode Nikita Vijaysing
Salunkhe Nagar, Dhule Road Near postal Colony Chalisgaon. Pin-424101
Email: nikitashisode25@gmail.com

Quick Response Code:

Web. https://ibrj.us

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23633813

DOI Link:

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23633813

Creative Commons

Abstract

This paper reviews innovative teaching and learning strategies in mathematics education, focusing on inquiry-based learning, problem-based learning, collaborative learning, flipped classrooms, and technology-integrated instruction. It considers how these approaches may support conceptual understanding, mathematical reasoning, problem-solving, learner engagement, and flexible application of knowledge. The review is grounded in the supplied manuscript and its references, which include conceptual papers, research syntheses, classroom studies, and literature reviews. A descriptive bibliographic analysis is added to show the distribution of publication years represented in the supplied reference list. The available source text reports that achievement effect sizes discussed through a secondary synthesis fall between 0.05 and 0.59; because the underlying study-level data and calculation details are not supplied, this range is presented as reported rather than recalculated. The review suggests that innovation is most useful when meaningful tasks are paired with deliberate teacher facilitation, high-quality mathematical discussion, timely feedback, and assessment aligned with conceptual goals. It also emphasizes that the presence of technology or group work does not by itself guarantee better learning. The paper concludes with recommendations for classroom implementation, teacher professional development, and more transparent empirical research across grade levels and educational contexts.

Keywords: *Mathematics education; innovative pedagogy; inquiry-based learning; problem-based learning; collaborative learning; flipped classroom; educational technology; conceptual understanding; student engagement.*

Introduction

Mathematics is central to scientific literacy, technological development, economic decision-making, and everyday problem-solving. Yet many learners experience mathematics as a collection of rules and procedures to memorize rather than as a connected system of ideas that can be explored, explained, and applied. An important goal of mathematics education is therefore to help students develop procedural fluency alongside conceptual understanding, reasoning, communication, and the capacity to transfer knowledge to unfamiliar situations.

Innovative teaching and learning strategies have emerged as ways of responding to this goal. Innovation does not simply mean introducing a digital device or replacing a textbook with an application. It involves reconsidering how mathematical tasks are selected, how learners participate, how teachers guide discussion, and how progress is assessed. Maaß et al. (2019) emphasize that innovative approaches can be implemented in different ways and at different scales; therefore, a method's success depends on the educational context and the support provided to teachers.

The supplied literature identifies inquiry-based learning, problem-based learning, collaborative learning, flipped classrooms, and technology-integrated instruction as recurring approaches. These strategies share an emphasis on active participation, although they differ in the role assigned to the teacher, the structure of the task, and the type of learner interaction encouraged. Inquiry-based learning foregrounds questions and conjectures; problem-based learning begins with a complex situation; collaborative learning organizes peer interaction; flipped teaching rearranges the timing of content exposure and guided practice; and technology-integrated instruction uses digital representations or feedback to support mathematical activity.

Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)
This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations ae licensed under the idential terms.

How to cite this article:
Shisode, N. V. (2026). Innovative Teaching and Learning Strategies in Mathematics Education. InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal, 3(6), 23–29. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23633813

However, the effectiveness of a teaching strategy cannot be judged solely by its novelty or by whether students appear busy. Meaningful participation requires learners to explain their thinking, connect representations, justify steps, identify errors, and compare alternative methods. Research on classroom tasks and mathematical discourse suggests that the intellectual demand of a task can be reduced if implementation focuses only on completing steps rather than reasoning about relationships (Stein et al., 1996). This paper expands the supplied chapter into a longer research-review format. It synthesizes the main strategies discussed in the source, describes their potential contributions and implementation requirements, presents the available quantitative information with appropriate limitations, and identifies directions for classroom practice and future research.

Review of Literature

1. Student-centred and constructivist perspectives

Student-centred approaches position learners as active participants in developing mathematical meaning. Rather than receiving a finished procedure and reproducing it, students investigate examples, identify patterns, test conjectures, and explain why a method works. This does not mean that teacher explanation is unnecessary. Instead, teacher guidance is used strategically to connect student ideas to formal mathematical concepts, address misconceptions, and help learners move from informal observations toward precise reasoning.

The supplied literature describes innovation as a broad set of pedagogical decisions rather than one universal method. Madi and Gusni (2025) review innovative pedagogical models and the challenges associated with their implementation, while Koskinen and Pitkäniemi (2022) synthesize approaches associated with meaningful learning in mathematics. These sources support the view that a strategy should be selected in relation to the learning objective, learner needs, subject matter, and classroom context.

2. Inquiry-based learning

Inquiry-based learning begins with a question, pattern, situation, or mathematical relationship that students are invited to investigate. Learners may generate examples, compare cases, formulate conjectures, test whether a pattern holds, and present evidence for a conclusion. For example, students studying linear relationships might compare tables, graphs, and equations to determine how changes in one variable affect another. The teacher's role is to create a productive problem space, ask probing questions, and help students distinguish a pattern that appears in several examples from a statement that has been justified more generally.

Inquiry can support curiosity and mathematical communication, but open exploration can also become unfocused if the task is too broad or students lack prerequisite knowledge. Effective implementation therefore requires careful scaffolding, access to examples and representations, and explicit expectations about how conclusions should be supported. Teachers should plan questions that move students from observation to explanation and, where appropriate, to proof.

3. Problem-based learning

Problem-based learning organizes learning around a problem that requires students to identify relevant information, determine what they need to know, select mathematical tools, and defend a solution. Contextual problems can help students understand why a concept is useful and how mathematics connects to real situations. Examples include comparing mobile data plans, estimating water consumption, planning a school event within a budget, or analyzing travel time and distance.

The mathematical value of a contextual problem depends on more than the realism of its story. The problem must require the intended mathematical ideas and leave room for students to make meaningful decisions. Teachers may need to help learners separate relevant from irrelevant information, make assumptions explicit, and evaluate whether a numerical answer is reasonable in the original context. Problem-based learning should also include a consolidation stage in which the teacher connects the methods developed by students to formal notation and general principles.

4. Collaborative learning and mathematical discourse

Collaborative learning gives students opportunities to explain a strategy, question a peer's reasoning, compare approaches, and revise an argument. Such interaction can make thinking visible to both students and teachers. However, group work is not automatically productive: students may divide tasks without discussing the mathematics, allow one learner to dominate, or agree on an answer without examining its validity.

Esmonde (2009) examines equity in cooperative mathematics learning, while Alakoski et al. (2025) address interaction and collective emotional climate in mathematics lessons. The supplied chapter also notes that the quality of interaction may matter more than the sheer amount of on-task activity. Practical structures include assigning rotating roles, asking every student to prepare an explanation, requiring groups to compare two methods, and using individual exit questions to check each learner's understanding.

5. Flipped classroom and blended learning

In a flipped classroom, learners encounter introductory material before the lesson through a short video, reading, worked example, or digital module. Classroom time is then used for guided problem-solving, feedback, collaborative discussion, and targeted support. This approach can increase opportunities for teacher-student interaction during difficult tasks, provided that students can access and complete the preparatory work.

The approach also creates equity and implementation challenges. Learners may have unequal access to devices, internet connectivity, quiet study space, or support at home. Preparatory materials should therefore be brief, accessible, and accompanied by alternatives where necessary. Teachers should not assume that watching a video guarantees understanding; a short opening diagnostic activity can reveal misconceptions and help determine the next instructional step.

6. Technology-integrated mathematics instruction

Digital tools can provide dynamic visualizations, interactive graphs, simulations, automated feedback, and adaptive practice. For example, graphing software can allow students to change coefficients and observe how a function responds, while geometry

software can help learners investigate invariants by dragging points. Such environments can make relationships visible that are difficult to observe in static examples.

Technology should be chosen because it supports a defined mathematical purpose, not simply because it is available. Teachers need to check the accuracy of digital outputs, ensure that learners understand the representations being displayed, and connect screen-based exploration to written explanations. The supplied literature includes work on technology-based teaching skills and recent reviews of mathematical processes and digital approaches (Siswono et al., 2026; Zain et al., 2026).

7. Gamification, motivation, and emotional climate

Gamification introduces selected game features—such as challenge levels, progress indicators, feedback, or collaborative goals—into learning activities. These features may help sustain attention when they are linked to meaningful mathematical work. However, points and competition can also distract from conceptual learning if students focus on speed or rewards rather than reasoning. A balanced design values explanation, persistence, revision, and improvement, not only rapid correct answers.

The source manuscript connects mathematics learning with motivation, self-efficacy, and classroom emotional climate. Schukajlow et al. (2023) discuss emotions and motivation in mathematics education, while Alakoski et al. (2025) consider collective emotional climate. These perspectives suggest that learners' willingness to attempt difficult problems and disclose uncertainty is part of the learning environment that teachers need to cultivate.

Objectives of the Study

1. To review innovative teaching strategies discussed in the supplied mathematics-education literature.
2. To explain how inquiry, problem-solving, collaboration, flipped instruction, and technology can support mathematical learning.
3. To summarize the quantitative claims available in the source manuscript without inventing missing study results.
4. To provide descriptive statistics on the publication years represented in the supplied reference list.
5. To identify practical recommendations for teachers and directions for further research.

Research Methodology

1. Research design

This paper uses a narrative literature-review design based on the supplied manuscript and its listed references. The source chapter discusses comparative, quasi-experimental, and mixed-methods studies that may combine student achievement measures, attitude surveys, classroom observations, and teacher interviews. In a rigorous evaluation of an instructional strategy, these different forms of evidence can help distinguish learning outcomes from implementation processes.

The supplied manuscript does not include a complete database search log, search strings, screening-flow diagram, duplicate-removal procedure, or study-level extraction table. Accordingly, the present paper should be understood as an expanded narrative review of the provided source, not as a fully reproducible systematic review or a new meta-analysis. Claims are limited to the information available in the supplied chapter and references.

2. Descriptive bibliographic analysis

A descriptive analysis was conducted by counting publication years in the reference entries preserved in the supplied manuscript. This analysis is intended to characterize the bibliography, not to evaluate teaching effectiveness. The year distribution can indicate the temporal spread of the cited material, but it cannot show whether newer strategies are more effective or whether learning outcomes have improved.

Publication year	Reference entries (n)	Share (%)
2026	8	28.6
2025	6	21.4
2024	1	3.6
2023	3	10.7
2022	2	7.1
2021	1	3.6
2019	2	7.1
2015	1	3.6
2009	2	7.1
2008	1	3.6
1996	1	3.6
Total	**28**	**100.0**

Source: *Author's compilation by counting publication years stated in the references of the supplied manuscript. Percentage = (entries for a year ÷ 28) × 100. These are bibliography-entry counts, not verified unique studies or measures of teaching effectiveness.*

3. Interpretation of reported effect-size information

The supplied manuscript states that achievement effect sizes discussed through a secondary source fall between 0.05 and 0.59. This range is retained as a claim reported in the source. The manuscript does not provide the underlying study-level estimates, sample sizes, standard errors, confidence intervals, weighting procedure, or heterogeneity statistics. It is therefore not possible to recalculate the range, pool the effects, or determine which strategy has the largest effect from the supplied information alone.

Results

1. Bibliographic profile

The reference-year count identifies 28 entries with extractable publication years. Of these, 14 (50.0%) are dated 2025 or 2026. The list also includes foundational and earlier studies, including work from 1996, 2008, 2009, 2015, and 2019. This pattern indicates that the supplied chapter combines recent discussion with older research on mathematical tasks, cooperative learning, and instructional effectiveness. It does not establish a trend in the effectiveness of teaching strategies.

2. Comparative summary of teaching strategies

Strategy	Main learning process	Potential contribution	Implementation requirement
Inquiry-based learning	Investigate patterns, ask questions, test conjectures	Supports reasoning, curiosity, and justification	Use scaffolded questions and require evidence
Problem-based learning	Solve a meaningful problem using mathematical tools	Connects concepts to applications and strategy choice	Choose a problem aligned with learning objectives
Collaborative learning	Explain, question, and compare methods with peers	Makes reasoning visible and supports mathematical communication	Structure roles and assess individual understanding
Flipped classroom	Study introductory material before guided class work	Creates more class time for feedback and complex problems	Provide accessible preparation and check readiness
Technology-integrated learning	Use dynamic representations, simulations, and feedback	Helps visualize relationships and test examples	Verify tool accuracy and connect output to formal reasoning
Gamified activities	Use challenges, progress feedback, and goals	May support participation and persistence	Reward explanation and learning, not speed alone

Source: *Author's synthesis of the approaches discussed in the supplied manuscript, including Maaß et al. (2019), Koskinen and Pitkäniemi (2022), Santos-Trigo (2024), Madi and Gusni (2025), and other references listed in the source chapter.*

3. Conditions associated with stronger implementation

The reviewed material points to several implementation conditions that recur across strategies. First, tasks need to be mathematically purposeful: they should require the concept or reasoning process that the lesson intends to develop. Second, students need opportunities to explain and compare strategies, not merely produce answers. Third, teachers need to monitor misconceptions and make connections between informal approaches and formal mathematics. Fourth, assessment should capture conceptual understanding and transfer in addition to routine accuracy. Finally, implementation should be sustained long enough for learners to become familiar with classroom norms and for teachers to refine their practice.

Discussion

1. Innovation as a combination of task, teacher, and learner activity

The literature reviewed in the supplied manuscript suggests that innovation is best understood as a change in the structure of mathematical participation. Inquiry, problem-based learning, and collaborative work are most useful when they make student reasoning visible. Technology can support this process by providing representations and feedback, but the teacher still needs to help students interpret what they see and connect it to mathematical ideas. A digital graph, for example, becomes educationally meaningful when students explain how a parameter changes the graph and justify the relationship algebraically.

These approaches should not be treated as mutually exclusive. A teacher may introduce a real-world problem, ask groups to investigate alternative methods, use dynamic software to test a conjecture, and finish with a whole-class discussion that formalizes the result. The instructional design should be determined by the learning objective and the needs of the learners rather than by loyalty to a single method.

2. The role of mathematical discourse

Mathematical discourse is a central mechanism through which active learning can lead to deeper understanding. When students explain a solution, they must make assumptions and relationships explicit. When they compare methods, they can identify common structures and differences in efficiency or generality. When they critique an argument respectfully, they learn that mathematical claims require evidence. Teachers can strengthen discourse by asking questions such as: Why does this method work? Could another method solve the problem? What would change if one condition were different? How can we check the answer?

Group activity should therefore be evaluated by the quality of reasoning it produces. A classroom may appear active while only a few students make substantive mathematical decisions. Teachers should use individual explanations, targeted questioning, and short independent tasks to check whether each learner understands the group's conclusions.

3. Assessment and evidence of learning

Innovative instruction requires assessment practices that align with its goals. If a lesson aims to develop reasoning and transfer, a test containing only routine exercises may not capture the intended learning. Teachers can combine short computational questions with tasks that require explanations, multiple representations, error analysis, and application in a new context. Formative assessment can be used during the lesson to identify misunderstandings and adjust instruction before they become persistent.

The source manuscript reports a broad effect-size range but does not supply the underlying data required for a new statistical synthesis. This limits the conclusions that can be drawn about comparative effectiveness. Future research should report sample characteristics, intervention duration, comparison conditions, outcome definitions, effect sizes, uncertainty intervals, and implementation fidelity. These details would allow later reviewers to compare findings more reliably.

4. Equity, access, and teacher support

Innovation should expand opportunities to learn rather than create new barriers. Digital approaches may be less accessible to learners with limited devices, connectivity, or assistive technology. Collaborative tasks may disadvantage students if participation norms are not managed equitably. Contextual problems may be unfamiliar to some learners if they rely on experiences not shared by the whole class. Teachers should therefore provide varied representations, accessible materials, structured participation, and examples that respect the backgrounds of learners.

Teacher professional development is essential because strategies depend on in-the-moment decisions: selecting a suitable task, deciding when to intervene, responding to an unexpected solution, and connecting different approaches. Collaborative planning, lesson study, peer observation, and reflection on student work can help teachers improve these practices over time.

Limitations of the Study

- The paper is based on the supplied manuscript and its reference list; no new database search was conducted.
- The source does not provide a complete search and screening record, so the review is not fully reproducible.
- The effect-size range is reported from the supplied source and cannot be independently recalculated without the underlying data.
- Bibliographic year counts describe listed entries and may be affected by duplicate or incomplete references.
- Teaching strategies are implemented in different contexts and cannot be compared directly without common outcomes and adequate study details.

Recommendations for Practice and Future Research

- Start with explicit learning objectives and select an instructional strategy that directly supports those objectives.
- Design tasks that require students to explain, justify, represent, compare, and reflect on mathematical ideas.
- Use teacher questioning to move students from informal patterns toward general statements and formal reasoning.
- Structure group work so every student has a role and individual understanding is checked.
- Use digital tools for a clear mathematical purpose, while verifying outputs and discussing the meaning of representations.
- Use formative assessment throughout the lesson and assess transfer to unfamiliar problems, not only routine accuracy.
- Provide professional development that focuses on task selection, classroom discourse, assessment, and responsive teaching.
- Conduct comparative studies across grade levels and contexts with transparent methods, adequate sample descriptions, and clear outcome measures.
- Report data sources, sample sizes, effect sizes, confidence intervals, intervention duration, and implementation fidelity.
- Investigate whether gains in conceptual understanding, engagement, and strategy flexibility persist over time.

Conclusion

Innovative teaching and learning strategies can help mathematics education move beyond routine procedure practice toward conceptual understanding, flexible reasoning, mathematical communication, and meaningful participation. Inquiry-based learning, problem-based learning, collaboration, flipped classrooms, technology integration, and gamified activities offer different ways to organize this work. Their value depends not on novelty alone, but on the quality of mathematical tasks, teacher facilitation, classroom discourse, feedback, and assessment.

The descriptive bibliographic analysis shows that the supplied reference list gives substantial attention to publications from 2025 and 2026 while also drawing on foundational research from earlier years. The effect-size range included in the source manuscript is retained with a clear caveat because the underlying data are not available for recalculation. As a result, the paper does not rank strategies or claim a new pooled estimate. Future progress will require more transparent and comparable empirical studies, alongside sustained teacher development and equitable implementation. In practice, the strongest guiding principle is to make student reasoning visible and to ensure that every innovative activity is connected to clear mathematical learning goals.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have directly or indirectly contributed to the completion of this research paper entitled **"Innovative Teaching and Learning Strategies in Mathematics Education."**

I am deeply thankful to the scholars, researchers, and academicians whose valuable research publications, scholarly contributions, and insights into mathematics education provided an important foundation for this study.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of thesis paper.

References

1. Alakoski, R., Laine, A., & Hannula, M. S. (2025). Interaction and collective emotional climate in innovative learning environments in mathematics lessons: a third- and fourth-grade students' perspective. Learning Environments Research, 28(1), 81–102. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-025-09530-7
2. Al-Karaawi, F. A. M. H. (2025). ENGAGING MINDS, SOLVING PROBLEMS: DYNAMIC TEACHING STRATEGIES FOR MODERN MATH EDUCATION. International Journal of Apllied Mathematics, 38, 167–177. https://doi.org/10.12732/ijam.v38i8s.554
3. Cai, J., Morris, A., Hohensee, C., Hwang, S., Robison, V., Cirillo, M., Kramer, S. L., Hiebert, J., & Bakker, A. (2019). Maximizing the Quality of Learning Opportunities for Every Student. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 51(1), 12–25. https://doi.org/10.5951/jresematheduc.2019.0005
4. Castillo, D., Carrión, J., Chamba, C., Jiménez-Gaona, Y., Rodríguez-Álvarez, M. J., & Lakshminarayanan, V. (2025). Didactic strategies for conceptual understanding and motivation in university mathematics: a systematic review. Frontiers in Education, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1536470
5. Das, G. (2026). INNOVATIVE APPROACHES IN TEACHING MATHEMATICS FOR ENHANCING CONCEPTUAL MASTERY OF SCHOOL STUDENTS. The Social Science Review a Multidisciplinary Journal., 4(1), 89–98. https://doi.org/10.70096/tssr.260401018
6. Dita, A., Yusra, Y., & Nurhasanah, N. (2025). Mapping and evaluating strategies for teaching mathematics in secondary education: A theoretical and reflective study. Educational Research Journal Eduversia, 1(1), 11–17. https://doi.org/10.30862/eduversia.v1i1.887
7. Dublin, J. R. (2026). Teaching Strategies in Mathematics: A Meta-Analysis. Psychology and Education A Multidisciplinary Journal, 51(5), 575–581. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.510505
8. Erath, K., Ingram, J., Moschkovich, J., & Prediger, S. (2021). Designing and enacting instruction that enhances language for mathematics learning: a review of the state of development and research. ZDM, 53(2), 245–262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-020-01213-2
9. Esmonde, I. (2009). Ideas and Identities: Supporting Equity in Cooperative Mathematics Learning. TSpace (University of Toronto), 79(2), 1008–1043. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654309332562
10. Happy, N., Zuhri, Z., & Saputra, H. (2026). Problem-Based Learning Enhances Mathematics Engagement: A Multivariate Examination of Motivation and Interest. Integrated Science Education Journal, 7(4), 620–628. https://doi.org/10.37251/isej.v7i4.3583
11. Knogler, M., Hetmanek, A., & Seidel, T. (2022). Determining an Evidence Base for Particular Fields of Educational Practice: A Systematic Review of Meta-Analyses on Effective Mathematics and Science Teaching. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 873995. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.873995
12. Koskinen, R., & Pitkäniemi, H. (2022). Meaningful Learning in Mathematics: A Research Synthesis of Teaching Approaches. International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 17(2). https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/11715
13. Lee, J., & Paul, N. (2023). A Review of Pedagogical Approaches for Improved Engagement and Learning Outcomes in Mathematics. Journal of Student Research, 12(3). https://doi.org/10.47611/jsrhs.v12i3.5021
14. Maaß, K., Cobb, P., Krainer, K., & Potari, D. (2019). Different ways to implement innovative teaching approaches at scale. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 102(3), 303–318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-019-09920-8
15. Madi, U., & Gusni, E. (2025). Innovative Pedagogical Models in Mathematics Education: A Systematic Review of Global Challenges, Trends, and Future Research Directions. International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research, 24(9), 167–191. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.9.9
16. Navarro-Ibarra, L. A., Salazar, O. C., Valenzuela-Ochoa, J. M., Michel, L. L. A., & Robles-Aguilar, A. (2026). Learning in mathematics education. Bibliometric and network analysis (1980-2024). International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 21(3). https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/19008
17. Rämö, J., Oinonen, L., & Vikberg, T. (2015). Extreme Apprenticeship – Emphasising conceptual understanding in undergraduate mathematics. In Työväentutkimus Vuosikirja. http://hdl.handle.net/10138/303099
18. Rüede, C., Küttel, M., Mok, S. Y., & Staub, F. C. (2026). Tasks as mediators for advancing strategy flexibility in equation solving. Mathematics Education Research Journal. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13394-026-00589-w
19. Santos-Trigo, M. (2024). Problem solving in mathematics education: tracing its foundations and current research-practice trends. ZDM, 56(2), 211–222. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-024-01578-8
20. Schukajlow, S., Rakoczy, K., & Pekrun, R. (2023). Emotions and motivation in mathematics education: Where we are today and where we need to go. ZDM, 55(2), 249–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-022-01463-2
21. Siswono, T. Y. E., Lukito, A., Zulnaidi, H., Hidayat, D., Hartono, S., & Fatmanissa, N. (2026). Exploring Prospective Mathematics Teachers' Skills in Designing Innovative Technology-Based Mathematics Teaching. Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika, 20(1), 165–180. https://doi.org/10.22342/mej.v20i1.pp165-180
22. Slavin, R. E., & Lake, C. (2008). Effective Programs in Elementary Mathematics: A Best-Evidence Synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 78(3), 427–515. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308317473
23. Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., & Groff, C. (2009). Effective Programs in Middle and High School Mathematics: A Best-Evidence Synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 79(2), 839–911. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308330968
24. Stein, M. K., Grover, B. W., & Henningsen, M. A. (1996). Building Student Capacity for Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning: An Analysis of Mathematical Tasks Used in Reform Classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 33(2), 455–488. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312033002455

25. Tang, W.-C. (2025). Innovative Mathematics Pedagogy: Evidence-Based Strategies for Enhancing Student Learning. Journal of Integrative Education Studies, 1(1), 30–35. https://doi.org/10.64229/2q2ck886
26. Verschaffel, L. (2023). Strategy flexibility in mathematics. ZDM, 56(1), 115–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-023-01491-6
27. Wekullo, B. J. (2026). Professional Development for K–12 Mathematics Teachers: A Systematic Literature Review of Technology, Pedagogy, and Equity. International Educational Review, 4(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.58693/ier.412
28. Zain, M. F. M., Maat, S. M., & Karim, A. A. (2026). Strategies in mathematical proceses: A bibliometric and systematic review of the past decade. Multidisciplinary Reviews, 9(8), 2026352. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2026352