



**HAL**  
open science

## Comparison of two small group learning methods in 12th grade physics classes focusing on intrinsic motivation and academic performance

Roland Berger, Martin Hänze

► **To cite this version:**

Roland Berger, Martin Hänze. Comparison of two small group learning methods in 12th grade physics classes focusing on intrinsic motivation and academic performance. *International Journal of Science Education*, 2009, 31 (11), pp.1511-1527. 10.1080/09500690802116289 . hal-00516233

**HAL Id: hal-00516233**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00516233>**

Submitted on 9 Sep 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**Comparison of two small group learning methods in 12th grade physics classes focusing on intrinsic motivation and academic performance**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2007-0070.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	cooperative learning, experimental study, quantitative research, physics education, classroom
Keywords (user):	jigsaw classroom, intrinsic motivation, basic needs



**Abstract**

Twelfth grade physics classes with 344 students participated in a quasi-experimental study comparing two small-group learning settings. In the jigsaw classroom, in contrast to the cyclical rotation method, teaching expectancy as well as resource interdependence is established. The study is based on the self-determination theory of motivation which states that the satisfaction of the 'basic needs' for experiencing autonomy, competence, and social relatedness is essential to promote intrinsic motivation. Regarding the experience of competence, a small effect in favour of the jigsaw classroom was found, whereas students in the cyclical rotation setting showed medium-sized benefits in experiencing autonomy. A path analysis revealed that these opposing effects balanced each other, that is, no effect from small-group method to intrinsic motivation was found.

In contrary to the motivational variables, achievement effects depended on the underlying study topic: based on scanning electron microscopy, the cyclical rotation setting outperformed jigsaw classroom, whereas an opposed trend is observed with regard to the microwave oven learning unit. The higher interestingness of the latter learning unit was revealed as a weak mediator from study topic to academic achievement.

## Introduction

Research on the effects of cooperative learning indicates that the learning process and the subsequent outcomes are strongly fostered by cooperative learning methods (Slavin , Hurley & Chamberlain, 2003). As shown in the meta-analysis conducted by Springer, Stanne & Donovan (1999) cooperative methods can be established with success in science, mathematics, and technology. Almost all of the studies included in this meta-analysis compared various forms of cooperative learning to more traditional methods. Relative little research has investigated in comparing two (ore more) small-group learning procedures. Research in this field should gain insight into various strengths as well as weaknesses of the different forms of small-group learning settings. In this paper we focus on the comparison of two forms of small-group learning: the jigsaw classroom and the cyclical rotation method. The jigsaw learning technique was first developed and implemented by Elliot Aronson (1978 & 2002) in the 1970's. In the jigsaw classroom, the lesson is divided into segments. Students meet first with other students who have been assigned the same segment in an 'expert group'. Together, they research their segment, discuss, and clear up questions. The students then leave their groups to join 'jigsaw groups'. Each student in each group teaches the whole group about his or her expert subtopic, **thus covering the whole topic**. By contrast, in the cyclical rotation method the groups' composition is not varied while 'rotating' from subtopic to subtopic. Both methods differ mainly with respect to two aspects. First, in contrast to the cyclical rotation groups, the learners in the expert groups are aware of the demand

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 to teach their peers in the jigsaw group ('teaching expectancy', Renkl, 1995) and  
7  
8 they subsequently teach each other. Second, due to the task-specialisation in the  
9  
10 jigsaw setting, each group member is accountable for a unique part of the activity  
11  
12 and the students in the jigsaw groups are dependent on their experts' knowledge.  
13  
14 In contrast, the cyclical rotation groups have access to the whole material and  
15  
16 work together without separate responsibilities. Thus, 'resource interdependence'  
17  
18 is established in the jigsaw condition (Slavin, Hurley & Chamberlain, 2003).  
19  
20 Most researchers in cooperative learning agree that individual accountability as  
21  
22 well as positive interdependence are essential for fruitful cooperative working  
23  
24 (Antil, Jenkins & Wayne, 1998). The most striking differences between both  
25  
26 methods are resumed in Table 1.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 [Insert Table 1 about here]  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 We focus on the question if these characteristic differences lead to different  
40  
41 outcomes with respect to academic performance and intrinsic motivation. It is  
42  
43 widely believed that the jigsaw method supports intrinsic motivation (Hidi, Weiss,  
44  
45 Berndorff, & Nolan, 1998). But it is not clear why, and the question arises, if  
46  
47 other forms of small-group learning like the cyclical rotation method lead to the  
48  
49 same motivational benefits. In order to shed some light on this issue we refer to  
50  
51 the self-determination theory by Deci and Ryan (2000).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Framework

### *Self-determination theory*

The self-determination theory postulates that innate basic psychological needs play an essential role for the development and maintenance of intrinsic motivation. The authors identified three needs for competence, autonomy, and social relatedness. They emphasize that intrinsic motivation requires satisfaction of perceived competence as well as autonomy. Following Deci and Ryan all three needs are necessary for intrinsic motivation, albeit the relatedness plays a role primarily in the maintenance of intrinsic motivation. The asserted impact of the relatedness for intrinsic motivation is controverted by Vallerand (2000). He points out that the perception of relatedness has a low relationship with self-determined motivation due to the individualistic type of classroom activities.

A frequently espoused position is that autonomy and social relatedness are incompatible or competing aspects of experience. In contrast, Deci and Ryan strongly emphasize that the need for autonomy refers to the desire to self-organize experience and behaviour and should not be interpreted as detachment or independence. That is, there is no incompatibility with relatedness.

Furthermore in the self-determination theory extrinsic motivation is no static concept, but supports for relatedness, autonomy, and competence allow the person to transform extrinsic motivation into a more self-determined motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The authors identified factors which foster an increasing identification with an object, e.g. its meaningfulness. With respect to the genesis

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 of interest, the basic needs are important because they provide emotional feedback  
7  
8 and thus contribute to the development of preferences (Krapp, 2002).  
9

### 10 11 12 13 *Cooperative Learning and Jigsaw*

14  
15 From a theoretical point of view there is no unifying approach that could  
16  
17 explain all the outcomes of cooperative learning consistently (Slavin et al., 2003).  
18  
19 Nevertheless all theoretical perspectives expect benefits of cooperative learning  
20  
21 with respect to academic achievement compared to more traditional whole-class  
22  
23 teaching methods, e.g. frontal teaching. An impressive research effort across a  
24  
25 range of curriculum areas (in mathematics, science, and technology documented  
26  
27 by a meta-analysis conducted by Springer et al. (1999)) supports this assertion,  
28  
29 albeit not all studies agree.  
30  
31

32  
33 Placing students in small groups and telling them to work together will not  
34  
35 necessarily promote cooperation. The potential of learning together is maximized  
36  
37 when students realize that they can not succeed unless they facilitate each other's  
38  
39 learning (Gillies, 2003). Thus, unwanted side effects as 'free-riding' (a group  
40  
41 member leaves it to the others to complete the task) and 'sucking' (a more active  
42  
43 student lowers his effort because of the feeling that others are free-riding) should  
44  
45 be suppressed. The question arises which conditions are crucial for positive  
46  
47 outcomes of learning in small groups. Although this matter is still under active  
48  
49 debate (Huber, 2003), there is consensus among most of the researchers, that two  
50  
51 conditions are indispensable: positive interdependence and individual  
52  
53 accountability (Antil et al., 1998).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 In the jigsaw classroom, positive interdependence is established through task  
7  
8 specialization: the peers depend on the experts knowledge to be successful  
9  
10 (resource interdependence). In contrast, all members of a cyclical rotation learning  
11  
12 group work together without separate tasks. The positive impact of resource  
13  
14 interdependence on achievement is not evident from the research literature (Slavin  
15  
16 et al., 2003; Buchs, Butera & Mugny, (2004)). In their study Buchs et al. found  
17  
18 that resource interdependence outperformed working on identical material only if  
19  
20 the difficulty of the information matches well to the students' level of  
21  
22 competence. Otherwise peer teaching might be detrimental for the learning  
23  
24 process due to reduced quality of explanations, which does not allow the listener  
25  
26 to understand and master the information.  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 One of the main purposes of cooperative learning is individual mastery of the  
33  
34 learning material. This is fostered by an individual accountability which exists  
35  
36 when the individual performance of students is assessed. This prevents the group  
37  
38 from doing the whole work by one or two students.  
39

40  
41 In the jigsaw classroom the students realize that they have to teach their peers,  
42  
43 that is, they are responsible for their groups success. From a motivational point of  
44  
45 view this teaching expectancy might facilitate intrinsic motivation, based on the  
46  
47 need to have a meaningful impact on one's own environment (Benware & Deci,  
48  
49 1984). On the other hand, teaching expectancy might lead to anxiety, thus  
50  
51 deteriorating motivation and performance.  
52  
53

54  
55 Regarding the impact of teaching expectancy on the experts cognitive structure,  
56  
57 he or she is probably less likely to skip impasses in understanding and thus  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 assigning more time to elaborate the material in the expert group. Additionally,  
7  
8 explaining to someone else is expected to be one of the most effective means of  
9  
10 elaboration (Slavin et al., 2003). Hence, from teaching expectancy and later  
11  
12 teaching one would assume positive impact on achievement. According to this,  
13  
14 Benware & Deci found a stronger cognitive involvement under teaching  
15  
16 expectancy. Nevertheless, Renkl (1995) reports no positive effect of the teaching  
17  
18 expectancy on performance.  
19  
20

21  
22 Simons (1997) highlights that autonomy for decision making is crucial for active  
23  
24 learning. In comparison to frontal teaching the jigsaw classroom as well as  
25  
26 cyclical rotation learning are characterized by more room to control the own  
27  
28 learning process, that is, e.g. to adapt the learning speed to the task and to take  
29  
30 task-related support. Nevertheless there are differences with respect to autonomy:  
31  
32 the cyclical rotation method allows the scope to access the whole learning  
33  
34 material whereas the students in a jigsaw group depend on the other experts.  
35  
36 Regarding the structure of the two methods, in the jigsaw classroom there are  
37  
38 certain inherent demands, e.g. the composition of new groups and the clearly  
39  
40 defined division into two separate phases (expert and jigsaw groups). This might  
41  
42 lead to a detrimental experience of autonomy.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **The lessons**

51  
52 The study is based on two learning units, which were selected by the  
53  
54 following criteria: the topics had to be meaningful, that is, important for the 12th  
55  
56 grade level, as well as interesting. Furthermore it had to be possible to divide the  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 material into independent segments, and the degree of difficulty had to be adapted  
7  
8 to the students capabilities.

9  
10 Following Häussler (1987), boys as well as girls of all ages from 11 to 16 have a  
11  
12 higher than average interest in the context 'Physics as a vehicle to understand  
13  
14 technical objects in everyday life' and the topic 'Structure of matter'. Thus,  
15  
16 gaining insight into the microworld by suitable apparatuses seems to be a  
17  
18 favourable topic for a multitude of students. From these interests it was suggested  
19  
20 to take the topics 'Physics of the microwave oven' and 'Principles of the scanning  
21  
22 electron microscope' as learning units. These topics are particular favourable for  
23  
24 teaching physics in the 12th grade level, since the underlying physical principles  
25  
26 cover two main areas of the curriculum: the generation and propagation of  
27  
28 electromagnetic waves as well as the motion of charged particles in electric and  
29  
30 magnetic fields. For gaining a useful insight into these topics, we give a concise  
31  
32 survey of both.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 *Principles of the Scanning Electron Microscope*

42  
43 Free electrons are accelerated by a high voltage towards the sample. When  
44  
45 the electron beam hits the sample further electrons are released from its surface.  
46  
47 The so called Everhart-Thornley detector collects these secondary electrons. The  
48  
49 brightness of the corresponding pixel on the computer screen is controlled by the  
50  
51 number of electrons collected by the detector per second. To capture the whole  
52  
53 sample the electron beam is scanned by the magnetic field of current-carrying  
54  
55 coils. The learning unit consists of these basic information about the components  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 of the microscope and its scanning principle. Further the release of secondary  
7  
8 electrons due to the interaction of the electron beam with the sample is discussed.  
9

10 In the group work the following four subtopics are discussed:  
11

- 12 • The generation of the electron beam by acceleration of free electrons in the  
13 electron gun.  
14
- 15 • The force on the electron beam due to the magnetic field of the coils, that is  
16 the Lorentz-force.  
17
- 18 • The question, how the penetration depth into the sample depends on the  
19 energy of the electron beam and the atomic number of the sample material.  
20
- 21 • The working principle of the Everhart-Thornley detector.  
22

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 Additionally, in higher performing classes the physics of the electron lense might  
31 be incorporated as a further subtopic. The electron microscope can be used to  
32 teach some important advanced physics: the electron beam generates x-rays when  
33 penetrating the sample. In order to highlight specific elements in the picture the  
34 characteristic lines from the spectrum are captured by an x-ray detector. With  
35 respect to quantum physics, the resolution of the electron microscope is ultimately  
36 limited by the de Broglie wavelength of the incident electrons. Since these topics  
37 are not covered by the current 12th class curriculum in Germany they were not  
38 included into the learning unit.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 We recommend the excellent book of Goldstein et al. (1992) providing further  
51 information on physics and technology of the scanning electron microscope.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Physics of the microwave oven*

Microwaves can heat matter only if its molecules have a permanent electric dipole moment. Due to the interaction of the electric field of the electromagnetic wave with the dipole moment of the water molecule, rotational motion is excited. The increase in motional energy is macroscopically linked to an increase of the liquids temperature. As most food has an appreciable water content, microwaves can heat most of the common food, e.g. meat and vegetables. On this basis, the following four questions are discussed in the groups:

- Why does the metallic grid in the ovens front door transmit visible light, but reflects microwaves? As a rule of thumb, the ratio of the wavelength to the diameter of the holes is the key factor.
- For what reason the turntable rotates inside the microwave oven? Due to the reflection of electromagnetic waves at the metallic walls inside the cooking chamber, a standing wave is generated. Without rotation, the food thus is not heated by the microwaves in the nodes of the standing microwave, what leads to a non-uniform temperature pattern.
- How is the high frequency microwave generated? In the so called magnetron, suitable resonant circuits are excited which emit microwave radiation.
- Is a microwave oven an energy saving device? This question is investigated by comparing the input electric power and the deposited thermal energy when heating water.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 *Cooperation script*  
9

10 To foster the interaction with the learning material we adapted a  
11 cooperation script, first proposed by Dansereau (1988) for dyadic cooperation.  
12  
13 MURDER is an acronym for the sequence of various phases in cooperation: after  
14 the Mood-Phase to establish a positive mind-set for learning, the students studied  
15 their expert topic to understand the main ideas and facts. Subsequently, the  
16 experts recalled their segment while teaching their jigsaw groups. Afterwards they  
17 asked their peers to answer questions for repetition and comprehension, in order  
18 to detect problems and elaborate the topic's content and structure. In the  
19 concluding Review-Phase the peer students were requested to determine the most  
20 relevant keywords relating to the segment they were taught about. In order to  
21 match both conditions, the students in the cyclical rotation setting were demanded  
22 to answer repetition and comprehension questions and to formulate keywords as  
23 well as in the jigsaw classroom.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **The learning material provided to the students in order to perform their tasks and**  
42 **to prepare for the test can be downloaded from our homepage<sup>1</sup>.**  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58  
59 <sup>1</sup> Microwave oven: <http://www.physik.uni-osnabrueck.de/didaktik/mikrowelle.htm>; Scanning  
60 electron microscope: <http://www.physik.uni-osnabrueck.de/didaktik/rem.htm> (in German)

## The study

### Hypothesis

#### *Basic needs and intrinsic motivation*

The students in the expert groups are aware that they have to teach the material to their peers in the jigsaw groups. This teaching expectancy thus should foster an active, deep level interaction with the learning material. Moreover, the student's experience of responsibility for a segment of the material, and of acting as an expert source for other students, is posited to give the student a feeling of competence. In preceding studies, we found that the degree of difficulty of our learning units is well adapted to the students capabilities. Furthermore, there is no anxiety which degrades the learning process, since the students know each other well. In summary, in the jigsaw condition we expect a higher experience of competence as compared to the cyclical rotation setting (Hypothesis 1 a).

Students in the cyclical rotation condition have more leeway in structuring the learning process, since there is no defined time span to interact with a single subtopic. The learning speed can be adjusted by the students in a more appropriate way than in the jigsaw condition. Thus, the students should feel themselves more free, that is, we expect a higher autonomy as compared to the jigsaw condition (Hypothesis 1 b).

In our study, the composition of experts groups as well as cyclical rotation groups was determined by students' self-selection. Thus, in the expert groups as well as

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 in the station to station groups, the students should feel good with their peers. Due  
7  
8 to the inherently similar social structure of both methods we expect no difference  
9  
10 between both conditions regarding the experience of social relatedness  
11  
12 (Hypothesis 1 c).  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 If these hypotheses are confirmed, we expect no difference in intrinsic motivation  
18  
19 (Hypothesis 2), since, following the self-determination theory, the feeling of  
20  
21 competence as well as the feeling of autonomy must both be enhanced  
22  
23 simultaneously by one of the methods to foster intrinsic motivation.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 *Academic Performance*

30  
31 Regarding the academic performance, two opposite effects might come into play:  
32  
33

- 34 • We expect advantages on the students' assigned 'expert' segments of  
35  
36 knowledge in comparison with the cyclical rotation learning. The teaching  
37  
38 expectancy in the experts group, associated with an intensive interaction with  
39  
40 the learning material, as well as the subsequent giving of explanations in the  
41  
42 jigsaw groups, should improve the cognitive structure of the instructing  
43  
44 student (Springer et al., 1999).  
45  
46
- 47 • Concerning the segments that the students learned about from fellow group  
48  
49 members, losses due to reduced information transmission might appear. When  
50  
51 comparing the jigsaw method to frontal teaching this detrimental effect was  
52  
53 apparent (Hänze & Berger, 2007).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Thus, regarding the overall performance it is not clear which of these both factors  
7  
8 dominates. For that reason we do not formulate a hypothesis concerning the  
9  
10 academic performance.  
11

### 12 13 14 15 **Participants, experimental design and procedure**

16  
17 20 physics classes (12th grade level), with a total of 286 students,  
18  
19 participated in the study in the 2003-2004 school year. Originally, the study was  
20  
21 to be conducted as a cross-over design that investigated the method of instruction  
22  
23 as both between-subject factor and within-subject factor, although with different  
24  
25 study topics (Figure 1). Nine classes (Group A) studied the topic ‘scanning  
26  
27 electron microscope’ in the jigsaw classroom and then were taught the second  
28  
29 study topic, ‘microwave oven’ in the cyclical rotation method. 11 classes (Group  
30  
31 B) learned about the first study topic through cyclical rotation teaching and then  
32  
33 studied the physics of the microwave oven through the jigsaw classroom.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 [Insert Figure 1 about here]  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 However, for the second study topic (microwave oven) about a half year later,  
47  
48 seven classes as well as some students from the remaining classes dropped out  
49  
50 from our study (a total of 121 students). In order to compensate for this, four new  
51  
52 classes of 12th graders (58 students) were included. That is, 223 students were  
53  
54 available for the second study topic. The design was evaluated as a between-  
55  
56 subjects design for the method of instruction with the study topic as a control  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 factor. Classes were assigned randomly to the jigsaw classroom or the cyclical  
7  
8 rotation learning condition.  
9

10  
11  
12 First, students were given a test of academic performance (pretest). The actual  
13  
14 learning unit was made up of four school hours (scanning electron microscope)  
15  
16 and three school hours (microwave oven), respectively (see Figure 1). Basic  
17  
18 information on the topics was introduced in two (scanning electron microscope)  
19  
20 and one (microwave oven) physics hours through direct instruction (same for both  
21  
22 **methods of instruction**). At the end of these lessons, the learning experience  
23  
24 questionnaire was given as a pretest measurement. In the following double period  
25  
26 students in the experimental groups worked in the jigsaw classroom, while the  
27  
28 other groups studied the same learning material through the cyclical rotation  
29  
30 method. In the jigsaw classroom, the learning experience questionnaire was  
31  
32 administered after the work in the expert groups and again when students had  
33  
34 finished with the jigsaw groups. In the cyclical rotation condition, the learning  
35  
36 experience questionnaire was given once at the end of the lesson.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **For comparison with the cyclical rotation condition, the chosen point in time of**  
44 **measurement of the learning experience variables is after working in the expert**  
45 **groups. We did not contrast the cyclical rotation groups with jigsaw groups, since**  
46 **the main focus of the latter lies on the peer teaching process.**  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 The posttest on academic performance was given in an extra lesson some days  
54  
55 after the learning unit.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Instruments and measures

### *Learning experience questionnaire*

On the basis of known scales (Prenzel et al., 1993, 2001) we developed a new questionnaire for the following reasons:

- The questionnaire was administered at several points in time. In order not to overstrain the students, the questionnaire needed to be short.
- The items had to be applicable for different learning situations (direct instruction as well as group work).

In the present study, the following scales were used in the German version (cf. Berger & Hänze, 2004). The Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability for each of the subscales, measured after working in the expert groups and cyclical rotation condition, respectively, is shown in brackets:

Social relatedness ( $\alpha=.69$ )

SR 1: The atmosphere was pleasant.

SR 2: I felt comfortable with my group.

Experience of competence ( $\alpha=.84$ )

C 1: I noticed that I really understood things.

C 2: I felt able to master the work.

Experience of autonomy ( $\alpha=.54$ )

A 1: I had the opportunity to learn about new things on my own.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 A 2: I had a feeling of freedom to make some of my own decisions.  
7  
8  
9

10 Intrinsic motivation ( $\alpha=.69$ )

11  
12 IM 1: I was eager to learn about the material.

13  
14 IM 2: The work was really fun.

15  
16 IM 3: I didn't notice how the time flew by.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Students respond to the items by using a 5-point, Likert-type scale in which only  
23 the first and fifth points are anchored ('strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree').  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 Additionally, the factor loadings of the basic need items are shown in Table 2. We  
30 obtained a clear and interpretable structure of the basic needs items. The  
31 extraction is based on a principal component analysis with varimax rotation and  
32 three factors, explaining 77.1 % of the variance.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 [Insert Table 2 about here]  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 *Academic performance tests*

46  
47 The pre- and post performance tests differ from each other, since topic specific  
48 questions were included in the posttest. The classification of the test questions  
49 (reproduction, reorganisation, and transfer) for each of the topics are up to german  
50 school standards set by ministry of education (Leisen, 2004). The tests correlate to  
51 the last grade earned in physics to .42 and .45, respectively. The reliabilities of the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 tests are  $\alpha=.45$  and  $.60$ , respectively. In consideration of the fact that the four test  
7  
8 items refer to four different subtopics, these values seem to be satisfactory.  
9

## 10 11 12 **Results**

13  
14 We conducted 2 X 2 analyses of variance with the basic needs, intrinsic  
15 motivation and academic performance as dependent variables and two  
16 independent variables: method of instruction (jigsaw classroom / cyclical rotation  
17 learning) and study topic (scanning electron microscope / microwave oven). The  
18 results are shown in Table 3. Depicted are the adjusted means and standard  
19 deviations (in brackets). For all variables, corresponding pretest measures were  
20 used as covariates.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 [Insert Table 3 about here]  
35  
36  
37

### 38 *Basic needs and intrinsic motivation*

39  
40 With regard to the basic needs and the intrinsic motivation no significant  
41 interaction between method of instruction and topic appeared (see Table 3, right  
42 column). From that reason we aggregate across both study topics. The results are  
43 depicted in Figure 2.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 [Insert Figure 2 about here]  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 As expected from the theoretical reasoning, with respect to the basic needs both  
7  
8 methods have different strengths and weaknesses: While the jigsaw classroom is  
9  
10 favourable concerning the feeling of competence, the students feel more  
11  
12 autonomous working in the cyclical rotation condition. Following the proposal of  
13  
14 Cohen (1988), the range of the effect sizes run from small (competence,  $d=.24$ ) to  
15  
16 medium (autonomy,  $d=.39$ ). We found no difference with regard to the social  
17  
18 relatedness. Thus, the hypotheses 1 a - c are supported. Additionally, according to  
19  
20 hypothesis 2 the intrinsic motivation was nearly equal in both settings. In the light  
21  
22 of the self-determination theory this finding might be interpreted as a  
23  
24 counteracting effect: the higher experience of competence in the jigsaw classroom  
25  
26 is balanced by a higher feeling of autonomy in the cyclical rotation setting,  
27  
28 leading to equal intrinsic motivation. This view is supported by a path analysis  
29  
30 shown in Figure 3. The experience of competence as well as autonomy mediate  
31  
32 from method of instruction (jigsaw and cyclical rotation learning, respectively) to  
33  
34 intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, the path analysis shows that social relatedness  
35  
36 did not play a crucial rule for motivation.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 [Insert Figure 3 about here]  
47  
48  
49

### 50 *Academic Performance*

51  
52 Concerning the question, which method of instruction is more favourable  
53  
54 with regard to performance, we found that it depends on whether the electron  
55  
56 microscope or the microwave oven was used as the study topic: students working  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 in cyclical rotation groups outperformed the jigsaw groups when learning the  
7  
8 electron microscope. But when the microwave oven was taught, the jigsaw groups  
9  
10 performed slightly better (Table 3). Thus the interaction between method of  
11  
12 instruction and study-topic was significant. The question arises, what causes this  
13  
14 interaction. A first hint is given by Figure 4: For the jigsaw classroom condition,  
15  
16 academic performance is divided into expert performance (students' score on that  
17  
18 part of the test that covered the segment of the learning material assigned to the  
19  
20 student) and tutored performance (the students' score on that part of the test that  
21  
22 tested segments a student had learned about from fellow group members).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 [Insert Figure 4 about here]  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The better performance of the jigsaw groups in the microwave oven learning unit  
35  
36 is due to the fact, that the tutored performance is equal to the performance in the  
37  
38 cyclical rotation setting. This is not the case in the electron microscopy learning  
39  
40 unit. We examine two possible assumptions that might play a crucial role for the  
41  
42 latter result:  
43  
44

- 45 1. If the microwave oven learning unit is more easy to comprehend than the  
46  
47 electron microscope, this should lead to an enhanced feeling of competence  
48  
49 compared to that experienced in the electron microscope unit. But the  
50  
51 difference in experiencing competence between both topics is not significant  
52  
53 (see Table 3).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 2. The students are substantially more interested in the microwave oven learning  
7  
8 unit ( $t(207)=3.42$ ;  $p=.00$ ). This was assessed with a 19 item scale  
9  
10 ('Interestingness') provided by Hoffmann et al. (1997). The reliability of the  
11  
12 scale is  $\alpha=.91$ . The effect size is estimated to be  $d=.48$ , that is, a medium  
13  
14 effect.  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20 In order to test whether the interestingness can be regarded as a mediator between  
21  
22 topic (that is the scanning electron microscope and the microwave oven,  
23  
24 respectively) and achievement in the tutored segments (cf. Figure 5), we follow  
25  
26 the proposal by Baron & Kenny (1986).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 [Insert Figure 5 about here]  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 They recommend to accomplish a series of three regression equations  
38  
39 (unstandardized regression coefficients, standard errors in brackets):  
40

- 41 1. Tutored performance is used as the criterion and topic as the predictor<sup>2</sup>:  
42  
43  $c=.082$  (.030);  $p=.008$   
44  
45  
46 2. Interestingness is used as the criterion variable and topic as the predictor:  
47  
48  $a=.315$  (.091);  $p=.001$   
49  
50  
51 3. The tutored performance is used as the criterion variable and interestingness  
52  
53 as well as topic as predictors:  $b=.057$  (.023);  $p=.016$  and  $c'=.064$  (.031);  
54  
55  $p=.039$ .  
56  
57  
58

59  
60 

---

<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the pretest measure for performance was included as predictor in all analyses.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 That is, when controlling for the mediator, the beta-weight from topic to  
7  
8 performance is decreased from .082\*\* to .064\*. Running the SOBEL-Test as  
9  
10 proposed by Preacher & Hayes (2004) it is shown that this decrease is statistically  
11  
12 significant on a .05 level<sup>3</sup>. Following Baron & Kenny, the link from topic over  
13  
14 interestingness to tutored performance thus is a partial mediator.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 Discussion

21  
22 On the basis of Deci and Ryans self-determination theory we assessed two  
23  
24 small-group settings, the jigsaw classroom and cyclical rotation learning. Both  
25  
26 methods show characteristic advantages particularly with regard to its capabilities  
27  
28 in fostering the experience of autonomy and competence. On the one hand, the  
29  
30 students feel less autonomous when working in the jigsaw classroom. The benefits  
31  
32 of the cyclical rotation method with regard to the experience of autonomy might  
33  
34 result from the more open structure. For example, in the jigsaw classroom a  
35  
36 deadline for working in the expert groups is defined. This might derogate the  
37  
38 experience of autonomy. On the other hand, the teaching expectancy in the expert  
39  
40 groups might stimulate an intensive interaction with one segment of the topic,  
41  
42 what should favour the experience of competence. This is particularly interesting  
43  
44 in light of the frequently espoused position that teaching expectancy might lead to  
45  
46 anxiety and thus a degradation of intrinsic motivation: most of the students  
47  
48 participating in the study seem to be familiar with giving explanations to their  
49  
50 peers. Furthermore, this is accompanied by a pronounced feeling of relatedness.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58  
59 <sup>3</sup> Calculated online from <http://www.psych.ku.edu/preacher/sobel/sobel.htm> (Retrieved February  
60 15th, 2007).



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Due to the similar structure of both learning methods no noticeable difference can  
7  
8 be observed regarding social relatedness. Concerning the intrinsic motivation no  
9  
10 appreciable difference is observed. As suggested by a path analysis this comes  
11  
12 about because two opposing factors, autonomy and competence, balance each  
13  
14 other. This is in accordance with the self-determination theory which states, that  
15  
16 the experience of competence as well as autonomy have to be fostered to enhance  
17  
18 motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Furthermore the path analysis shows that the  
19  
20 social relatedness plays no significant role for the intrinsic motivation. This point  
21  
22 is discussed controversially in the literature.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Regarding academic performance no main effect of method of instruction was  
30  
31 found when aggregating across both study topics electron microscope and  
32  
33 microwave oven. This is in accordance with the results from a study conducted by  
34  
35 Hidi et al. (1998): **after initial classroom instruction the students worked in a  
36  
37 science center in small group settings. The authors did not find differences in  
38  
39 posttest academic performance between jigsaw and the cyclical rotation method.**  
40  
41  
42

43 In our study a significant interaction indicates that performance depends on the  
44  
45 study topic (cf. Table 3). With respect to the unit 'scanning electron microscope',  
46  
47 the cyclical rotation method outperformed the jigsaw classroom, whereas an  
48  
49 opposed trend is observed with regard to the microwave oven learning unit. This  
50  
51 is due to the better results in the part of the test covering areas of the material that  
52  
53 jigsaw participants had been taught by fellow group members. We elucidated the  
54  
55 interestingness of the study topics as a partial mediator between method of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 instruction and performance: a higher interestingness might lead to an enhanced  
7  
8 arousal during instruction in the jigsaw groups. Furthermore, an appealing study  
9  
10 topic should foster a more intensive study of the learning material at home.  
11

12  
13 Nevertheless, it seems clear that the observed discrepancy cannot be ascribed to a  
14  
15 single factor. This question needs further research.  
16

17  
18 Due to the design of the study, the observed effects can not clearly be traced back  
19  
20 to one of the factors teaching expectancy, giving explanations or resource  
21  
22 interdependence. In a subsequent study these factors are investigated separately,  
23  
24 what should explain their relative meaningfulness.  
25  
26

27  
28 With regard to the jigsaw method further research is needed on how to improve  
29  
30 the knowledge transmission from the experts to novices. It probably might be  
31  
32 helpful if future research would focus stronger on investigating mediating links  
33  
34 between the method of instruction and learning outcomes. This will give further  
35  
36 insight into specific benefits and drawbacks of teaching methods and helps to  
37  
38 abandon the fruitless discussion about “the best method”.  
39  
40

41  
42 The results of the present study might give teachers valuable hints for the choice  
43  
44 of the appropriate method, best suited to the teaching objectives. If the difficulty  
45  
46 of the group task is well adapted to the students' cognitive level the jigsaw  
47  
48 classroom is a powerful method in promoting the experience of competence,  
49  
50 especially for students with below average physics related self-concept (cf. also  
51  
52 Hänze & Berger, 2007).  
53  
54

55  
56  
57  
58 Acknowledgements  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 The current research was supported by a grant from the Deutsche  
7  
8 Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) allocated to both authors (HA 3509/1-1).  
9

## 10 11 12 13 **References**

- 14  
15 Antil, L. R., Jenkins, J. R., Wayne, S. K., & Vadasy, P. F. (1998). Cooperative  
16  
17 learning: Prevalence, conceptualizations, and the relation between research and  
18  
19 practice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(3), 419-454.  
20  
21  
22 Aronson, E. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.  
23  
24  
25 Aronson, E. (2002). Building empathy, compassion, and achievement in the  
26  
27 jigsaw classroom. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement*.  
28  
29 *Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 209-225). San Diego, CA:  
30  
31 Academic Press.  
32  
33  
34 Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable  
35  
36 distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and  
37  
38 statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6),  
39  
40 1173-1182.  
41  
42  
43 Benware, C. A., & Deci, E. L. (1984). Quality of learning with an active versus  
44  
45 passive motivational set. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21 (4), 755-  
46  
47 765.  
48  
49  
50 Berger, R., & Hänze, M. (2004). Das Gruppenpuzzle im Physikunterricht der  
51  
52 Sekundarstufe II – Einfluss auf Motivation, Lernen und Leistung. *Zeitschrift*  
53  
54 *für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften*, 10, 205-219  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Buchs, C., Butera, F., & Mugny, G. (2004). Resource interdependence, student  
7  
8 interactions and performance in cooperative learning. *Educational Psychology*,  
9  
10 24 (3), 291-314.  
11
- 12 Cohen, E. G. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive  
13  
14 small groups. *Review of Educational Research*, 64 (1), 1-35.  
15
- 16 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.).  
17  
18 Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.  
19
- 20 Dansereau, D. F. (1988). Cooperative Learning Strategies. In C. E. Weinstein, E.  
21  
22 T. Goetz, & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Learning and Study Strategies* (pp. 103-  
23  
24 120). San Diego: Academic Press.  
25  
26
- 27 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The ‘what’ and ‘why’ of goal pursuits: Human  
28  
29 needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-  
30  
31 268.  
32  
33
- 34 Gillies, R. M. (2003). Structuring cooperative group work in classrooms.  
35  
36  
37  
38 *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39, 35-49.  
39
- 40 Goldstein, J. I., Newbury, D.E., Echlin, P., Joy, D. C., Romig, A. D., Lyman, C.  
41  
42 E., Fiori, C., & Lifshin, E. (1992). *Scanning electron microscopy and x-ray*  
43  
44 *microanalysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum Press.  
45  
46
- 47 Hänze, M., & Berger, R. (2007). Cooperative learning, motivational effects and  
48  
49 student characteristics: An experimental study comparing cooperative learning  
50  
51 and direct instruction in 12th grade physics classes. *Learning and Instruction*,  
52  
53 17, 29-41.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Häußler, P. (1987). Measuring students' interest in physics – design and results  
7  
8 of a cross-sectional study in the Federal Republic of Germany. *International*  
9  
10 *Journal of Science Education*, 9 (1), 79-92.  
11  
12  
13 Hidi, S., Weiss, J., Berndorff, D., & Nolan, J. (1998). The role of gender,  
14  
15 instruction and a cooperative learning technique in science education across  
16  
17 formal and informal settings. In L. Hoffmann, A. Krapp, K.A. Renninger, & J.  
18  
19 Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and Learning* (pp. 215-227). Kiel, Germany: IPN.  
20  
21  
22 Hoffmann, L., Häußler, P., & Peters-Haft, (1997). *An den Interessen von*  
23  
24 *Mädchen und Jungen orientierter Physikunterricht*. [Physics education  
25  
26 oriented to the interests of girls and boys]. Kiel, Germany: IPN.  
27  
28  
29 Huber, G. L. (2003). Processes of decision-making in small learning groups.  
30  
31 *Learning and Instruction*, 13, 255-269.  
32  
33  
34 Krapp, A. (2002). Structural and dynamic aspects of interest development:  
35  
36 theoretical considerations from an ontogenetic perspective. *Learning and*  
37  
38 *Instruction*, 12, 383-409.  
39  
40  
41 Leisen, J. (2004). Einheitliche Prüfungsanforderungen Physik. *Der mathematische*  
42  
43 *und naturwissenschaftliche Unterricht* 57 (3), 155-159.  
44  
45  
46 Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating  
47  
48 indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods,*  
49  
50 *Instruments, & Computers*, 36 (4), 717-731.  
51  
52  
53 Prenzel, M., Duit, R., Euler, M., Lehrke, M., & Seidel, T. (2001). *Erhebungs- und*  
54  
55 *Auswertungsverfahren des DFG-Projekts 'Lehr-Lern-Prozesse im*  
56  
57 *Physikunterricht – eine Videostudie'*. Kiel, Germany: IPN.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Prenzel, M., Eitel, F., Holzbach, R., Schoenheinz, R.-J., & Schweiberer, L.  
7  
8 (1993). Lernmotivation im studentischen Unterricht in der Chirurgie.  
9  
10 [Motivation to learn in surgery courses]. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische*  
11  
12 *Psychologie*, 7 (2/3), 125-137.  
13  
14  
15 Renkl, A. (1995). Learning for later teaching: an exploration of mediational links  
16  
17 between teaching expectancy and learning results. *Learning and Instruction*, 5,  
18  
19 21-36.  
20  
21  
22 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic  
23  
24 definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-  
25  
26 67.  
27  
28  
29 Simons, P. R. J. (1997). Definitions and theories of active learning. In D. Stern &  
30  
31 G. L. Huber (Eds.), *Active learning for students and teachers*. (pp. 19-39).  
32  
33 Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.  
34  
35  
36 Slavin, R. E., Hurley, E. A., & Chamberlain, A. (2003). Cooperative learning and  
37  
38 achievement: Theory and research. In W. M. Reynolds, & G. E. Miller (Eds.),  
39  
40 *Handbook of Psychology: Educational Psychology*, Vol. 7 (pp. 177 –197). New  
41  
42 York: Wiley.  
43  
44  
45  
46 Springer, L., Stanne, M. E., & Donovan, S. S. (1999). Effects of small-group  
47  
48 learning on undergraduates in science, mathematics, engineering, and  
49  
50 technology: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 69 (1), 21-51.  
51  
52  
53 Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Deci and Ryan's self-determination theory: A view from  
54  
55 the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Psychological*  
56  
57 *Inquiry*, 11, 312-318.  
58  
59  
60

Table 1

Characteristic differences between jigsaw classroom and the cyclical rotation method.

	Jigsaw Classroom	Cyclical rotation learning
Instructional features	Teaching expectancy / Learning by teaching	No presetting
Assigned roles	Experts / Novices	No formal roles
Learning material	Resource interdependence	Complete access

Table 2

Results of the basic needs factor analysis

	Factor 'Social Relatedness'	Factor 'Competence'	Factor 'Autonomy'
SR 1	.89	.15	-.01
SR 2	.81	.26	.14
C 1	.18	.91	.11
C 2	.24	.89	.09
A 1	.06	.08	.82
A 2	.05	.09	.82

Table 3

Basic needs, intrinsic motivation and academic performance as a function of method of instruction and study topic.

	Electron microscope		Microwave oven		Statistics (p-values and F-values)		
	Jigsaw (n=128)	Cyclical rotation (n=156)	Jigsaw (n=116)	Cyclical rotation (n=100)	Method	Topic	Method X Topic
Autonomy	3.47 (0.93)	3.79 (0.74)	3.28 (0.94)	3.64 (0.73)	<b>p=.00</b> F=17.8	<b>p=.03</b> F=4.51	p=.80 F<1
Competence	4.11 (0.81)	4.00 (0.84)	4.10 (0.83)	3.78 (0.76)	<b>p=.00</b> F=8.60	p=.13 F=2.34	p=.16 F=2.03
Social Relatedness	4.19 (0.84)	4.22 (0.78)	4.24 (0.77)	4.16 (0.84)	p=.71 F<1	p=.97 F<1	p=.46 F<1
Intrinsic Motivation	3.43 (0.79)	3.45 (0.86)	3.34 (0.79)	3.54 (0.86)	p=.13 F=2.28	p=.96 F<1	p=.19 F=1.73
Academic Performance <sup>a</sup>	49% (23%)	56% (26%)	54% (21%)	51% (22%)	p=.31 F=1.05	—	<b>p=.01</b> F=6.46

Note. <sup>a</sup>in percent of maximum score. The degree of freedom for all variables is df=(1; 443).






Figure 1. Design of the study.




Figure 2. Adjusted means of the Basic Needs and intrinsic motivation aggregated across both topics. For all variables, corresponding pretest measures were used as covariates. The effect size (Cohen's d) is depicted in brackets. (\*\*: <.01; \*: <.05).




Figure 3. Path-analytic model: Influence of method of instruction on intrinsic motivation mediated by the basic needs. Jigsaw classroom and cyclical rotation are coded as 1 and 2, respectively. Only the significant paths are depicted. The results from the pretest measurement are included to control for preexperimental differences. ( $N=375$ ,  $\chi^2(1)=0.97$ ,  $p=.32$ ,  $RMSEA=0.0$ ,  $R^2=.26$ ).




Figure 4. Performance in Percent of maximum score. The depicted means are adjusted by the pretest covariate.




Figure 5. Model for testing the question if the interestingness is a mediator between topic and tutored performance.