THE EFFECTS OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING ON THE ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL AND ATTITUDE OF STUDENTS TOWARDS ALGEBRA

A Master's Thesis Presented to Faculty of the College of Education Graduate Studies De La Salle University – Dasmariñas Dasmariñas, Cavite

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Arts in Education Major in Educational Management

ELIZABETH B. DIZON

March 2010

ABSTRACT

| Title of the Research: | THE EFFECTS OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING ON |
|------------------------|--|
| | THE ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL AND ATTITUDE OF |
| | STUDENTS TOWARDS ALGEBRA |
| Author: | ELIZABETH B. DIZON |
| Degree: | Master of Arts in Education |
| Major: | Educational Management |
| Date of Completion: | March, 2010 |

This study aimed to determine the effects of cooperative learning on the achievement level and attitude of students towards Algebra. The conceptual framework evolved from two major theories associated with cooperative learning: motivational and cognitive (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 2004); and principles of development of Mathematics Framework for Basic Education: Mathematics is best learned when students are actively engaged; and Students' attitudes and beliefs about mathematics affect learning.

Two classes of second year students enrolled in the school year 2009-2010 in San Jose Community High School were the samples of this study. The researcher employed a quasi-experimental design known as the Pretest-Posttest Nonequivalent Control Groups Design. The samples were grouped as experimental and control. The experimental group was confined to cooperative learning strategy and the control group was exposed to traditional method of learning. Each group consisted of 30 students. Both groups were given pretests and posttests to infer if there was a significant difference in their achievement. Similarly, a validated Mathematics Attitude Scale was given before and after the intervention to determine if there was any significant change in their attitude. To determine the significant difference between the achievement and the attitude of students towards Algebra, the researcher used t-test for dependent samples and t-test for independent samples at 0.05 level of significance.

The study found out that respondents of experimental group obtained a pretest mean score of 10.37 and got a posttest mean score of 22.03 while the control group was able to get a mean score of 9.43 and a posttest mean of 14.10. The difference between the mean score of posttest of the two groups had a computed value of 9.11 which is higher than the critical value of 2.002. The two groups' mean scores in the achievement significantly differed in favor of the experimental group. The experimental group gained more than the control group. Before the intervention both group had no significant difference on the attitude towards Algebra. However in the posttest, the mean attitude score of the experimental group was significantly higher than the control group. This means that cooperative learning developed a more positive, favorable attitude of students towards learning Algebra.

The study concludes that using cooperative learning strategy specifically the Jigsaw II had a significant effect on the students' achievement based on the achievement scores. It also had a significant effect on the students' attitudes towards Algebra.

Cooperative learning strategy would be the most recommended teaching strategy designed for Mathematics classes to combat the negative attitudes of students towards learning the subject. Seminars and workshops, in-service trainings may be provided to teachers so that they would be properly guided on the principles of cooperative learning technique. Future research may be done in order to draw more conclusive findings on the effects of cooperative learning strategy on the achievement and attitude of students towards Algebra.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| TITLE PAGE | 1 |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| ABSTRACT | 2 |
| APPROVALSHEET | 4 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 5 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 7 |
| LISTS OF TABLES | 10 |
| LIST OF FIGURES | 12 |
| Chapter | |
| 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND | |
| Introduction | 13 |
| Conceptual Framework | 19 |
| Statement of the Problem | 22 |
| Hypotheses | 23 |
| Scope and Delimitation of the Study | 24 |
| Significance of the Study | 25 |
| Definition of Terms | 25 |
| 2 REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE | |
| Conceptual Literature | 29 |
| Research Literature | 37 |
| Synthesis | 46 |

3 METHODOLOGY

| Research Design | 50 |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Population of the Study | 51 |
| Respondents of the Study | 52 |
| Research Instrument | 53 |
| Validation of the Instrument | 54 |
| Data Gathering Procedure | 57 |
| Statistical Treatment of the Data | 59 |

4 PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

| | Problem 1 | 62 |
|---|---|----|
| | Problem 2 | 63 |
| | Problem 3 | 65 |
| | Problem 4 | 66 |
| | Problem 5 | 67 |
| | Problem 6 | 68 |
| | Problem 7 | 70 |
| | Problem 8 | 71 |
| | Problem 9 | 72 |
| | Problem 10 | 74 |
| 5 | SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | |
| | Summary | 76 |
| | Findings | 78 |

| Conclusions | | 82 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendations | | 84 |
| REFERENCES | | 86 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| A Letter of Request for | the Principal | 94 |
| B Letter of Request for | the Use of the Instrument (MAS) | 95 |
| B-1 Letter of Apology | | 96 |
| B-2 Certification of Appea | arance at Vice Chancellor | |
| for Academics ar | nd Research Office | 97 |
| B-3 Letter through E-ma | | 98 |
| B-4 Response Letter from | m VCAR | 99 |
| B-5 Confirmation Letter f | rom VCAR | 100 |
| D Letter of Request for | r the Validators | 101 |
| E Mathematics Attitude | e Scale | 102 |
| C Letter of Request for | r the Validators | 106 |
| F Table of Specificatio | n | 107 |
| G Achievement Test | | 112 |
| H Schedule of Activities | 5 | 113 |
| I Curriculum Vitae | | 115 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABL | TABLE | |
|------|---|----|
| 1 | Population and Sample of the Study | 52 |
| 2 | Schedule of Respondents | 56 |
| 3 | Pretest Achievement Level of Students in the Knowledge, | |
| | Comprehension and Computational Skills | 63 |
| 4 | Posttest Achievement Level O Students in Knowledge, | |
| | Comprehension and Computational Skills | 65 |
| 5 | Comparison of the Pretest-Posttest Achievemen Level | |
| | of the Control Group | 66 |
| 6 | Comparison of the Pretest-Posttest Achievement Level | |
| | of theExperimental Group | 67 |
| 7 | Comparison of the Pretest Achievement Mean Score | |
| | of Experimental and Control Group | 68 |
| 8 | Comparison of the Posttest Achievement Mean Score | |
| | of the Experimental and Control Group | 68 |
| 9 | Attitude of Experimental and Control Group Before | |
| | and After the Intervention | 70 |
| 10 | Comparison of the Pretest-Posttest MAS Exposed to | |
| | Traditional Method of Teaching | 71 |
| 11 | Comparison of the Pretest-Posttest MAS Exposed to | |
| | Cooperative Learning Strategy | 72 |

| 12 | Comparison of the Pretest MAS of Experimental | |
|----|--|----|
| | and Control Group | 73 |
| 13 | Comparison of the Posttest MAS of Experimental | |
| | and Control Group | 74 |
| 14 | Effects of Cooperative Learning on the Achievement | |
| | Level and Attitude of Students Towards Algebra | 75 |



LIST OF FIGURE

| FIGURE | PAGE |
|------------------------------------|------|
| 1 Conceptual Paradigm of the Study | 21 |

