



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK FOR
PRE-SERVICE MATHEMATICS TEACHERS**

GAN SOH FUEY



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION (MATHEMATICS)
(MASTER BY RESEARCH)**

**FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS
SULTAN IDRIS EDUCATION UNIVERSITY**

2018



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi



ABSTRACT

This quantitative survey design study aims to develop a curriculum framework for pre-service Mathematics teachers in Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum (MTEC). The sample of the study consisted of 491 pre-service Mathematics teachers selected using a stratified random sampling technique. The five-point Likert scale survey questionnaire which composed of six constructs and 46 items was used in this study. The instrument was validated by six education experts and its reliability was inspected using the value of Cronbach's alpha. Initially, the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to investigate the actual constructs and items that represents the curriculum framework for pre-service Mathematics teachers. The Covariance-Based Structural Equation Modelling (CB-SEM) method was conducted to validate the curriculum framework using the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The findings showed that the content validity index of the instrument was 0.946 and the Cronbach's alpha reliability index was 0.932, indicating that the instrument was acceptable to be used in the study. The EFA findings showed that there are six constructs and 39 items remain with weighting factors exceeding 0.400. The six constructs were adapted for MTEC framework, namely Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev), Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi), Mathematical Psychological (MPsy), Mathematical Technology (MTech), Mathematical Historic (MHis) and Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC). All the constructs achieved the acceptable fit values in Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) for Index Category and Level of Acceptance for Every Fitness Index, and resulted with 32 items with factor loading above 0.400. The MTEC Framework also achieved the GOF for the sample of the data (RMSEA=0.039; GFI=0.907; CFI=0.954; ChiSq/df=1.654). Finally, the CB-SEM method has shown that all constructs are significantly related to the MTEC framework. In conclusion, MTEC framework is valid, reliable and well fitted. The implication of the study is that the MTEC framework provides a good guidance to all pre-service Mathematics teachers in the curriculum planning.



PEMBANGUNAN KERANGKA KURIKULUM UNTUK GURU PRA-PERKHIDMATAN MATEMATIK

ABSTRAK

Kajian kuantitatif dengan menggunakan reka bentuk tinjauan ini bertujuan membangunkan kerangka kurikulum untuk guru pra-perkhidmatan Matematik dalam Kurikulum Pendidikan Guru Matematik (*MTEC*). Sampel bagi kajian ini terdiri daripada 491 guru pra-perkhidmatan Matematik dalam bidang pendidikan guru yang dipilih secara teknik persampelan rawak berstrata. Soal selidik tinjauan skala Likert lima mata yang mengandungi enam konstruk dan 49 item digunakan dalam kajian ini. Pada awalnya, instrumen ini disahkan oleh enam pakar pendidikan dan kebolehpercayaannya diperiksa menggunakan nilai alfa Cronbach. Seterusnya, Analisis Faktor Penerokaan (*EFA*) dilaksanakan menggunakan Analisis Komponen Prinsipal (*PCA*) untuk menyiasat konstruk dan item sebenar yang mewakili kerangka kurikulum bagi guru pra-perkhidmatan Matematik. Akhirnya, kaedah Permodelan Persamaan Berstruktur berasaskan kovarian (*CB-SEM*) dilaksanakan untuk mengesahkan kerangka kurikulum tersebut dengan menggunakan Analisis Faktor Pengesahan (*CFA*). Dapatan menunjukkan indeks kesahan kandungan ialah 0.946 dan indeks kebolehpercayaan alfa Cronbach ialah 0.932, memberi indikasi bahawa instrumen tersebut boleh diterima untuk digunakan dalam kajian ini. Dapatan *EFA* menunjukkan terdapat enam konstruk dan 39 item kekal dengan pemberat faktor melebihi 0.400. Enam konstruk tersebut diadaptasi untuk kerangka *MTEC* iaitu Pembangunan Profesional Matematik (*MPDev*), Falsafah Matematik (*MPhi*), Psikologi Matematik (*MPsy*), Teknologi Matematik (*MTech*), Kesejarahan Matematik (*MHis*), dan Penstrukturan Semula Sosial Matematik (*MSRC*). Semua konstruk ini mencapai nilai padanan yang boleh diterima dalam *CFA* bagi Kategori Indeks dan Tahap Penerimaan bagi Setiap Indeks Padanan dan menghasilkan 32 item dengan faktor pemberat melebihi 0.400. Kerangka *MTEC* juga mencapai kesesuaian padanan bagi sampel data ($RMSEA=0.039$; $GFI=0.907$; $CFI=0.954$; $ChiSq/df=1.654$). Akhirnya, kaedah *CB-SEM* menunjukkan bahawa semua konstruk mempunyai kaitan signifikan dengan kerangka *MTEC*. Kesimpulannya, kerangka *MTEC* adalah sah, boleh dipercayai dan mempunyai kesesuaian padanan. Implikasi bagi kajian ini ialah kerangka *MTEC* memberikan panduan terbaik bagi guru Matematik pra-perkhidmatan dalam merancang kurikulum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK	ii
DECLARATION OF THESIS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
<i>ABSTRAK</i>	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
<i>LIST OF FIGURES</i>	<i>xiii</i>
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xix
APPENDIX LIST	xx

INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background of The Study	1
1.2	Statement of Problem	6
1.3	Objectives of The Study	13
1.4	Research Questions	14
1.5	Hypotheses	15
1.6	Conceptual Framework	16
1.7	Significance of The Study	21
1.8	Scope and Limitations of The Study	22
1.9	Summary	26

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	27
2.2	Concept of Curriculum & Mathematics Curriculum Framework	
2.2.1	Curriculum	30
2.2.2	Mathematics Curriculum Framework	33
2.3	Development of Mathematics Teacher Education in Malaysia	36
2.4	Framework/Model in Reforming Curriculum	
2.4.1	The Oliva Model	40
2.4.2	The AIM Model	41
2.4.3	The Taba's Model	42
2.4.4	The Tyler's Model	45
2.4.5	The Saylor and Alexander & Lewis (SAL) Curriculum Model	47
2.4.6	Other Models	49
2.4.7	The Tyler's Model VS The Taba's Model	50
2.5	Target of Professional Development & Quality Pre-Service Mathematics Teachers	51
2.6	The Concept of Curriculum Framework for Pre-Service Mathematics Teachers	5
2.6.1	Professional Development	60
2.6.2	Psychology	63

CHAPTER 1

1.10 Operational Definitions

2.6.3	Technology	67
2.6.4	Historic	71
2.6.5	Philosophy	76
2.6.6	Social Re-Constructivist	79
2.7	Summary	81

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	83
3.2	Research Design	84
3.3	Research Population	85
3.4	Research Respondents & Samples	87
3.5	Research Instruments	90

3.5.1	Instruments	90
3.5.1.1	Validity of the Instruments	91
3.5.1.2	Reliability of the Instruments	95
3.5.2	Survey Instrument	98
3.6	Procedure for Data Collection	99
3.7	Pilot Study	
3.7.1	Data Screening	104
3.7.2	Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)	108
3.7.2.1	Endogenous Construct: Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum (MTEC)	112
3.7.2.2	Exogenous Construct: Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev)	114

3.7.2.3 Exogenous Construct: Mathematical Psychology (MPsy)	116
3.7.2.4 Exogenous Construct: Mathematical Technology (MTech)	119
3.7.2.5 Exogenous Construct: Mathematical Historic (MHis)	121
3.7.2.6 Exogenous Construct: Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi)	124
3.7.2.7 Exogenous Construct: Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC)	127
3.8 Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)	130
3.8.1 The Validation of Developed Instrument, Measurement Models and Structural Model Through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)	135
3.8.2 Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) Approach & Model Developing Strategy	136
3.9 Summary	138

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction	140
4.2 Data Preparation Prior to Analysis	141
4.2.1 Preliminary Data Analysis	142
4.2.2 Demographic Characteristic	142
4.2.3 The Assessment of Normality Distribution for the Data	144
4.3 RQ1: Have the constructs of MTEC achieved the acceptable fit values in Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)?	152

4.3.1 Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

4.3.1.1 Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum (MTEC) 152

4.3.1.2 Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev) 155

4.3.1.3 Mathematical Psychology (MPsy) 158

4.3.1.4 Mathematical Technology (MTech) 161

4.3.1.5 Mathematical Historic (MHis) 163

4.3.1.6 Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi) 168

4.3.1.7 Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC) 170

4.4 RQ2: Have the constructs of MTEC achieved the acceptable fit values in Pooled Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Pooled-CFA)? 174

4.5 RQ3: Have the constructs of MTEC achieved the acceptable value Convergent Validity and reliability in Pooled Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Pooled-CFA)? 184

4.6 RQ4: Are the Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev), Mathematical Psychology (MPsy), Mathematical Technology (MTech), Mathematical Historic (MHis), Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi), and Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC) positively related to the Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum (MTEC)? 187

4.7 RQ5: What is the Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum framework for pre-service Mathematics teachers? 189

4.8 Summary 191

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction 192

5.2	Summary of The Study	194
5.3	Discussions	196
5.3.1	Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev)	199
5.3.2	Mathematical Psychology (MPsy)	204
5.3.3	Mathematical Technology (MTech)	207
5.3.4	Mathematical Historic (MHis)	211
5.3.5	Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi)	216
5.3.6	Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC)	219
5.4	Implications of The Study	225
5.5	Recommendations For Future Research	231
5.6	Conclusions	234

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

LIST OF FIGURES

No. Figures	Page
2.1 The AIM Model	41
2.2 The Taba's Curriculum Development Model	44
2.3 The Tyler's Model (1949)	45
2.4 The Tyler's Ends-Means Model	46
2.5 The Tyler's Curriculum Framework	47
2.6 The Saylor, Alexander & Lewis Curriculum Model Steps	48
2.7 The Target Of Developing Curriculum Framework For Pre-Service Mathematics Teacher	53
2.8 Six Principles of Teacher Education in Indiana University, Bloomington	57
2.9 An Open-Ended Task That Develop Learners' Critical Thinking	62
2.10 Screenshots from a Graphic Calculator	70
2.11 Geometer's Sketchpad in Mathematics	71
2.12 Theorem Pythagoras	73
3.1 Stratified Random Sampling	88
3.2 Simple Random Sampling for Public Universities	89
3.3 Simple Random Sampling for Institutes of Teacher Education	89
3.4 Procedure of Data Collection	102
4.1 CFA Model for Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum (MTEC)	153
4.2 CFA Model for Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev)	155

4.3	Re-specified CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev)	156
4.4	CFA Model for Mathematical Psychology (MPsy)	159
4.5	CFA Model for Mathematical Technology (MTech)	161
4.6	CFA Model for Mathematical Historic (MHis)	164
4.7	Re-specified CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Historic(MHis)	165
4.8	CFA Model for Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi)	169
4.9	CFA Model for Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC)	172
4.10	Pooled-CFA Measurement Model 1	175
4.11	Re-specified Pooled- CFA Measurement Model 2	178
4.12	Re-specified Pooled-CFA Measurement Model 3	182
4.13	The Structural Equation Modelling of Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum Framework	190
4.14	The Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum Framework	191
5.1	Level of Inquiry Outlines	201

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
2.1	The Provisional Guiding Principle	55
2.2	The Five Minds of the Future	58
2.3	The Conception of New Zealand Curriculum	59
2.4	The Orientations of Philosophy	78
3.1	Enrolment of Pre-service Mathematics Teachers in Public Universities according to Zones	86
3.2	Enrolment of Pre-service Mathematics Teachers in Institutes of Teacher Education according to Zones	86
3.3	Likert Scale for Questionnaire	91
3.4	Five-Point Relevance Scale for Expert Validation	92
3.5	Ratings on a 46-Item Scale by 6 Experts: Items Rated 4 or 5 on a Five-Point Relevance Scale	93
3.6	Cronbach's Alpha and Strength of Data & Internal Consistency	96
3.7	Cronbach's Alpha for Pilot Study	97
3.8	Cronbach's Alpha for Pilot Study (According to Constructs)	97
3.9	Technique of Data Analysis	100
3.10	Enrolment for Pilot Study	103
3.11	Enrolment of Actual Study	103
3.12	Normality Test – Skewness (± 3) & Kurtosis Test (± 5)	106
3.13	Descriptive Data for Pilot Study	107

3.14	Reliability Statistics	108
3.15	KMO and Bartlett's Test for MTEC	113
3.16	The Total Variance Explained of MTEC	113
3.17	The Rotation of Varimax and Communalities for MTEC (n=372)	114
3.18	KMO and Bartlett's Test for MPDev	115
3.19	The Total Variance Explained of MPDev	115
3.20	The Rotation of Varimax and Communalities for MPDev (n=372)	116
3.21	KMO and Bartlett's Test for MPsy	117
3.22	The Total Variance Explained of MPsy	118
3.23	The Rotation of Varimax and Communalities for MPsy (n=372)	118
3.24	KMO and Bartlett's Test for MTech	120
3.25	The Total Variance Explained of MTech	120
3.26	The Rotation of Varimax and Communalities for MTech (n=372)	121
3.27	KMO and Bartlett's Test for MHis	122
3.28	The Total Variance Explained of MHis	123
3.29	The Rotation of Varimax and Communalities for MHis (n=372)	124
3.30	KMO and Bartlett's Test for MPhi	125
3.31	The Total Variance Explained of MPhi	126
3.32	The Rotation of Varimax and Communalities for MPhi (n=372)	126
3.33	KMO and Bartlett's Test for MSRC	128
3.34	The Total Variance Explained of MSRC	129
3.35	The Rotation of Varimax and Communalities for MSRC (n=372)	129

3.36	Index Category and Level of Acceptance for Every Fitness Index (Zainuddin, 2014)	133
4.1	Profile of Respondents according to Demographic Variable (N=462)	144
4.2	The Assessment of Normality Distribution for Items in the Respective Constructs	146
4.3	Skewness and Kurtosis for Each of the Constructs	147
4.4	Inter-Construct Correlation Indexes	149
4.5	Factor Loading (Standardized Regression Weights) of the Items	150
4.6	Index Category and Level of Acceptance for Every Fitness Index (Zainuddin, 2014)	151
4.7	The Fitness Indexes for CFA Measurement Model for Mathematics Teacher Education Curriculum MTEC	154
4.8	CFA Result of The CFA Measurement Model for MTEC	154
4.9	The Fitness Indexes for Re-Specified CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Professional Development (MPDev)	157
4.10	CFA Result of The Re-Specified CFA Measurement Model for MPDev	158
4.11	The Fitness Indexes for CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Psychology (MPsy)	160
4.12	CFA Result of The CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Psychology (MPsy)	160
4.13	The Fitness Indexes for CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Technology (MTech)	162
4.14	CFA Result of The CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Technology (MTech)	163
4.15	The Modification Indices Presents the Covariance Between Each Pair of Items	164
4.16	The Fitness Indexes for Re-Specified CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Historic (MHis)	167

4.17	CFA Result of The Re-Specified Model for Mathematical Historic (MHis)	167
4.18	The Fitness Indexes for Re-Specified CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi)	169
4.19	CFA Result of The Re-Specified Model for Mathematical Philosophy (MPhi)	170
4.20	The Fitness Indexes for CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC)	172
4.21	CFA Result of The CFA Measurement Model for Mathematical Social Re-Constructivist (MSRC)	173
4.22	The Goodness of Fit (GOF) Indexes for Pooled-CFA Measurement Model 1	176
4.23	The GOF Statistic VS Modification Indices Presents the Covariance Between Each Pair of Items	177
4.24	The Goodness of Fit (GOF) Indexes for Pooled-CFA Measurement Model 2	179
4.25	The GOF Statistic VS Modification Indices Presents the Covariance Between Each Pair of Items	179
4.26	The GOF Statistic VS Factor Loading (Standardized Regression Weights) for Deleted Items	180
4.27	The Goodness of Fit (GOF) Indexes for Re-Specified Pooled-CFA Measurement for Model 3	181
4.28	Pooled-CFA Result of The Re-Specified Measurement Model 3	183
4.29	The Validation and Reliability of The Pooled-CFA Measurement Model	185
4.30	Inter-Construct Correlations Indexes	186
4.31	The Regression Path Coefficients And Significance Based On p-Values < .05	187
4.32	The Hypotheses Statement for Every Path And Conclusion	188

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AMOS	Analysis of Moment Structures
CB-SEM	Covariance-based SEM
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
EFA	Exploratory factor analysis
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
METP	Malaysia Economic Transformation Programme
MOE	Ministry of Education Malaysia
MOHE	Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia
MTS	Malaysia Teacher Standard
PISA	Program for International Student Assessment
SEARS-MT	The Southeast Asia Regional Standards for Mathematics
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Studies
UiTM	MARA University of Technology
UPM	University Putra Malaysia
UPSI	Sultan Idris Education of University
UTM	University of Technology, Malaysia

APPENDIX LIST

- A1 Approval Letter To Conduct Research From Ministry Of Education Malaysia (MOE)
- A2 Approval Letter To Conduct Research From The Ministry Of Higher Education Malaysia (MOHE)
- A3 Application Letter To Get The Enrolment From Ministry Of Education Malaysia (MOE)
- A4 Application Letter To Get The Enrolment From Ministry Of Higher Education Malaysia (MOHE)
- A5 Student Verification For Conducting Research In Campus UPSI
- A6 Student Verification For Conducting Research Out of Campus UPSI
- A7 Instruments Before & After Modification
- A8 Concern Letter As A Respondent
- A9 Survey for Curriculum Framework for Pre-service Mathematics Teacher
- A10 Communalities (Removed B12, B16, B22, B32, B35, B44, B45)
- A11 Missing Data Summary

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of The Study

The Malaysian education system is based on the National Education philosophy and emphasises on the development of student emotions. It aims to produce physically, emotionally, spiritually and intellectually balanced individuals, which would result in Malaysians who are skilled and responsible in various fields (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2008). The curriculum is an educational plan to achieve educational goals. It comes from Latin “currere” which means “the course to be run” (Sun, 2017; Johnson-Mardones, 2018). The curriculum intentions affect the conceptualised curriculum. The main components of the curriculum, goals and objectives, curriculum

content, methods and assessment structures are set up to produce instructions.

Malaysians are aware that only through quality education will this help the future generation in implementing and renewing Malaysia's education and economy system. This has led to two important policy documents: the Malaysia Economic Transformation Program (METP), which was enacted in 2010 and the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025 (Ministry of Education, 2012) which was introduced in 2013. The priority of these policy documents is to improve the quality of teachers in the education system (Jala, 2010). Australia, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore have made extensive progress in education, and have made sustained progress in teaching and promoted their economic goals (Mok, 2007). The question raised therefore is whether the curriculum of Malaysia Teacher Education is capable on improving the quality of teachers as an indicator, and provides students with employability and be able to meet the needs and challenges of the changing global landscape (Zachariah, 2013).

Human resource education and development is the key to improving the competitiveness of the country (Ali et al., 2017). Teacher quality affects the achievement of human resource education and human capital development. Mathematics is not just a subject, but it plays an important role in other fields such as science, technology, and engineering. And it is from the prescribed traditional curriculum that has been enriched to a more innovative technology-based curriculum.

In this endeavour, the school will be the source of resource suppliers to target students in the development of good students skills in Mathematics, science, and technology (Tan & Leong, 2014). Malaysia Education Blueprint clearly states that teacher quality needs more effort in improving and upgrading, but the failure of teacher education appears exaggerated and the public is disappointed with the significant decline in education in Malaysia. The teacher educator needs to relook, rethink and reform a suitable and effective curriculum for pre-service Mathematics teacher that is grounded in the Malaysian context.

In order to improve the quality of education and educational outcomes in

Malaysia, the education reform culminated in the development of a teacher standard in 2009, namely the New Malaysian Teacher Standards (MTS), which set the “high capacity” standard for the training of pre-service teachers. In the face of these institutional standards, pre-service teachers’ educators may encounter the challenge in transforming pre-service teachers in deeply rooted beliefs, values, and prejudices in education. In light of this challenge, teacher educators need to have solutions to understand and redesign teacher education programmes in a more standardized way (Goh, 2012). The Malaysian Teacher Standard (MTS) 2009 consists of three main standards: (1) Professional values within the teaching profession, (2) Knowledge and understanding of education, subject matter, curriculum and co-curriculum, and (3) Skills of teaching and learning. MTS is just a common standard form for all subjects but not specifically for Mathematics. The Southeast Asia Regional Standards for

Mathematics Teachers (SEARS-MT) in the year 2015 proposed a basic development in conceptualizing the Malaysian Mathematics teacher quality based on the characteristics and attributes of Mathematics teachers in the Southeast Asian region. SEARS-MT has formally outlined four dimensions of Mathematics teacher quality: (1) Professional knowledge, (2) Professional teaching and learning process, (3) Personal and professional attributes, and (4) Professional communities. The outlines are given as guidance to provide benchmarks for relevant Malaysian educational divisions in formulating policies and in structuring Mathematics Teacher Education's Curriculum to improve and enhance the quality of Mathematics teachers. Furthermore, it also guides Mathematics teachers' professional development at a personal level and acts as performance evaluation.

To achieve the underline outcomes for “Learned Values-Driven Talent” in Malaysia Education Blueprint (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2015), the first four shifts focused on higher education system, including the academic and vocational pathway and students, academics, and all Malaysians are involved in lifelong learning. The Ministry and Higher Learning Institutions will focus on developing more holistic and integrated curricula and enhance the ecosystem for student development. In order to create a good moral foundation, but also has the tenacity and enterprising spirit, for oneself and others to create new opportunities. Higher education needs to be excellent with diverse career paths and different institutions. Therefore, Malaysia needs to educate Malaysians to continually seek learning opportunities to enrich their world.



The importance of teaching is increasing in contemporary societies. Standards for learning are now higher than ever because people need more knowledge and skills to succeed. Mathematics education is becoming increasingly important for the success of both individuals and countries, and it proves those educational resources and professional teachers' abilities are important contributors to the deprivation of students and future energy sources. In the past decades, teachers are expected to only provide a small minority for ambitious intellectual work. However, they are now expected to provide almost all students for higher order thinking skills and skills that are only available for just a few. At present, the demand for teacher professions is high. Teachers are not only a source of knowledge and information to students but also to elicit students' abilities in more complex contexts.



Teachers have a role to guide and motivate all students, which is crucial in boosting the interest of students to learn something new (Mahamod, Yusoff & Ibrahim, 2009). The main purpose of Mathematics learning is to acquire basic mathematical skills, the understanding of basic mathematical concepts, the meaning of significant meaning, the development of desired attitudes, the achievement of good mathematical application, and the ability to make intelligent and independent interpretations. Effective mathematical learning depends on the teacher's teaching to ensure students understand the concept and mastery the skills in mathematics. Additionally, teachers need to identify the factors that prevent students from learning mathematics and look for approaches to overcoming barriers or negative effects in

