

The Relative Effectiveness of Using the Jigsaw II

And the Traditional Method in Teaching Systems of Linear Equations

This work entitled "The Relative Effectiveness of Using the Jigsaw II and the Traditional Method in Teaching Systems of Linear Equations" prepared and submitted by Rhea Religioso Mateo is hereby approved and accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching major in Mathematics

00382

TM
RTM

A Master's Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
University of the East, Manila

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Mathematics

Rhea Religioso - Mateo

November , 2001

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to compare the relative effectiveness of using the Jigsaw II and the traditional method in teaching systems of linear equations. Specifically this study has the following objectives:

1. To determine the difference between the pre test achievement mean scores of the students exposed to Jigsaw II method and Traditional method.
2. To determine the difference between the pre test and post test achievement mean scores of the students who were exposed to :
 - 2.1 Jigsaw II method
 - 2.2 Traditional method
3. To determine the difference between the attitudes toward mathematics of the students who were exposed to :
 - 3.1 Jigsaw II method before and after the experiment
 - 3.2 Traditional method before and after the experiment
4. To determine how Jigsaw II and traditional method , in the teaching of systems of linear equations compare in terms of :
 - 4.1 post test achievement mean scores
 - 4.2 attitudes toward mathematics after the experiment

This study was conducted at the De La Salle University – Dasmariñas , Cavite using two intact sections of freshman Marketing students who were enrolled in College Algebra during the first semester of the school year 2001-2002.

This study used the quasi-experimental design, known as the Pre test- Post test Non-Equivalent Control Groups Design. It made use of two instruments namely: the achievement test prepared by the researcher, and a validated instrument known as Mathematics Attitude Scale (MAS). The statistical methods used by the researcher are the t-test for independent samples and the t-test for dependent samples. Validation of the achievement test was done through content validation, item analysis and by the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20.

The findings of the study are as follows:

1. There is no significant difference between the pretest mean scores of students who were exposed to the Jigsaw II and the traditional method. The pre test mean scores of the experimental group was 68.03 and the pre test mean score of the control group was 69.3 which yielded a computed t-value of 1.24 which was found to be not significant at 0.05 level of significance.
2. There is a marked significant difference between the pre test and post test scores of students who were exposed to the Jigsaw II. The pre test and post test mean scores of the experimental group yielded a computed t-value of 10.69 which was found to be significant at 0.05 level. On the other hand, there is no significant difference between the pre test and the post test scores of the students who were exposed to the traditional method. The pre test and post test mean scores of the control group yielded a computed t-value of 1.72 which was found not to be significant at 0.05 level.

3. The mean attitude score of the experimental group increased by 5.07 after the experiment and the mean attitude score of the control group increased by 3.85 after the experiment, but both was not found to be significant at 0.05 level.
4. The difference between the post achievement test mean scores of both groups, after the experiment was found to be significant at 0.05 level while the difference between the mean attitude scores of both groups after the experiment was found not to be significant at 0.05 level.

The findings of the study led to the following conclusions on the relative effectiveness of the Jigsaw II model and the traditional method in teaching systems of linear equations:

1. The mean difference between the post tests achievement mean scores of both E and C groups is significant . This means that the Jigsaw II was more effective than the traditional method in teaching systems of linear equations.
2. The mean difference between the MAS mean scores after the experiment of both E and C groups is not significant. This shows that the attitude is not easily affected by any of the teaching methodology- Jigsaw II and traditional method.
3. Both the Jigsaw II and the traditional method improved the attitude towards mathematics of the students.
4. Students from both the E group and C group have favorable attitude towards mathematics.

Based on the findings and conclusions the following recommendations were formulated:

1. Since the Jigsaw II method was found to be more effective than the traditional method, a teacher can make use of the Jigsaw II method in teaching systems of linear equations.
2. Similar studies may be conducted to determine other factors that might affect the performance of the students who will be exposed to Jigsaw II model such as character traits, study habits, and communication skills and others.
3. The study may be replicated using larger sample and longer time frame to investigate the possible effects of time and heterogeneity of samples in students' achievements and behavior.
4. Further studies should be done to test the effectiveness of other cooperative learning techniques in other fields of mathematics and in other areas of science.
5. Seminars on Jigsaw II should be conducted for teachers and student teachers of DLSU-D as alternative method to improve the achievement of the students in class.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study	11
Significance of the Study	23
Definition of Terms	24
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	27
Conceptual Framework	27
Research Literature	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TITLE PAGE.....	1
ABSTRACT.....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	6
LIST OF TABLES.....	9
CHAPTER	
1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND	
Introduction	10
Conceptual Framework	18
Statement of the Problem	20
Hypotheses	21
Scope and Delimitation of the Study	21
Significance of the Study	23
Definition of Terms	24
2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	27
Conceptual Literature	27
Research Literature	30

F	Copy of Related Studies	30
G	Table of Local Studies	31
H	Letter of Foreign Studies on the Content Validity	32
	3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	36
F	Copy of Research Method	36
L	Letter of Subjects of the Study	41
J	Form of Research Instrument	42
X	Copy of Administration of the Instrument	46
L	Letter of Statistical Treatment of Data	45
	4 PRESENTATION , ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	51
M	5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	58
N	Summary	58
O	Copy of Findings of the Study	60
P	Copy of Conclusions	61
	Recommendations	61
	REFERENCES	63
	APPENDICES	
A	Letter of Request for the Dean of the College of Sciences	66
B	Letter of Request to Respondents	67
C	Questionnaires for Teachers	68
D	Questionnaires for Students	69
E	Summary of Responses to the Questionnaires	70

F	Copy of Course Syllabus	71
G	Table of Specifications	72
H	Letter to the Evaluator of the Content Validity Of the Proposed Achievement Test	73
I	Copy of Pre test and Post test for Systems of Linear Equations	74
J	Item Analysis of the Try-Out Test	75
K	Certification of Validation	76
L	Letter of Request for Permission to Use a Validated Instrument	77
M	Mathematical Attitude Scale	78
N	Statistical Computer Print-Outs	82
O	Computation of Kuder-Richardson Formula 20	83
P	Curriculum Vitae	84

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Item Classification of the Try-out Achievement Test According to the Index of Difficulty	43
2	Item Classification of the Try-Out Achievement Test According to the Index of Discrimination	43
3	Items of Positively and Negatively Stated Statement Of the MAS	45
4	Improvement Points Table	49
5	Means, Variances and the t-test Analyses of the Pre test Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups	51
6	Means, Variances and the t-test Analyses of the Pre test and Post test Score of the Experimental and Control Groups	52
7	Means, Variances and the t-test Analyses of the Mathematics Attitude Scores of the Experimental and Control Group Before And After the Experiment	53
8	Difference in the Academic Achievements of the Experimental And Control Groups	56
9	Difference in the Mean Attitude Scores of the Experimental And Control Groups	57