International Journal of Mathematical Theory and Applications
Vol 1, Issue 2 2025

The Impact of the Model Drawing Approach (MDA) on Improving Students' Problem-Solving Abilities in Ninth Grade

Shiela Marie B. Copia
Department of Mathematics

Article Info
Received: 08-02-2025 Revised:08-03-2025 Accepted:19-03-2025 Published:03-04-2025

Abstract

In order to foretell the study's future results, the researchers used an intervention-based quasi-experimental research design. In quasi-experimental studies, researchers use computational methods to compile questionnaire data and then analyze it statistically, mathematically, or numerically in an effort to determine a cause-and-effect relationship between variables (Chiang, 2015). The study used a non-equivalent control group design with pre- and post-tests. The pre-test, post-test non-equivalent groups design includes a treatment group that undergoes a pre-test, treatment, and subsequent post-test. On the other hand, a non-equivalent control group is available, which consists of individuals who take a pre-test, skip the therapy, and then get a post-test.

INTRODUCTION

There is no denying the fundamental significance of mathematics in our daily lives. It bears mentioning that it would be hard for science to advance and develop in any domain. Students in particular should not undervalue its abilities and ideals.
As to Kitta (2014), mathematics is a scientific discipline that focuses on computation and reasoning. It enables us to see the interconnectedness of the universe, provide descriptions of occurrences, and reveal the invisible. Put simply, mathematics is not only a topic that should be taught in schools for purely academic reasons. On the contrary, its scope and purpose go well beyond the confines of a traditional classroom, assisting us in solving a difficult problem and expanding the boundaries of human understanding (Michael, 2015).
The importance of understanding and mastering its principles cannot be overstated, given its relevance. The majority of students have a hard time learning and understanding mathematical concepts and theories that are applicable to real-world situations, despite the fact that math is essential in many aspects of life. Math is seen by many Filipino students as both a challenging and one of their weakest subjects (Ganal & Guiab, 2014).
One of these inquiry-based learning techniques is the Model Drawing Approach (MDA). Other progressive countries highly value the Bar Model for converting mathematical ideas into a simple and visual explanation that learners can easily follow. As a result, the effectiveness of said approach to facilitating students' problem-solving skills was investigated in this paper.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Accordingly, although students excel in knowledge-based instructions, nevertheless, they fail considerably in higher and critical analysis skills required for Mathematical operations. In; the study conducted by Aguinaldo (2001), Ayap (2007), Balbosa (2010), and Valdez (2016), wherein the performance of students in Math for the previous years has been disturbingly consistently low, whether in national, international or even in local achievements level. This; confirmed by a study by Alcantara and Bacsa (2017), which illustrates that mastering problem-solving abilities is

difficult because it entails a variety of skills and competencies that consider for higher-order reasoning.

At the start of the pandemic, teachers' instructional strategies were also redefined to meet the needs of the students. Teaching math in the new normal requires a variety of strategies to keep students motivated and interested in the subject. Since; the havoc caused by the pandemic affected all aspects of the learner, the pedagogical styles of the teachers must still essentially enhance the learner's weaknesses in problem-solving, primarily if manifested dilemma exists previously in the traditional face-to-face approach. Hence, distance or remote learning posed a challenge yet a promising avenue for learning to revisit its applicability and effectivity, particularly in learner's engagement and participation in given tasks. According; to Kalogeropoulos et al. (2021), teachers in the new normal faced several challenges such as the struggle to maintain the students' motivation, loss of identity, and stress-related concerns resulting in burnout, and limited resources from the various social and economic backgrounds. Hence; with the correct approach will eventually eradicate challenges in the teaching-learning process.

Some of the pedagogical styles employed by teachers in the new normal utilized include educational games, manipulation tools, and an inquiry-based approaches. According to Ekonesi and Ekwueme (2011), educational games are a very effective way to remove any negative attitude among students by introducing math concepts in a fun and interactive way. Meantime; for manipulative tools involve the use of objects that can be discovered in any household, such as a chairs, fruit, balls, and like, which learners can directly manage to express basic operational skills including addition and subtraction.

Finally, inquiry-based learning entails contextualizing math abstract concepts into practical reasoning through authentic real-life situations in which learners gain significant learning experiences through exploration, observation, and manipulation with the goal of resolving any uncomfortable situations (Kalogeropoulos, et al., 2021).

RESEARCH METHOD

In the current study, two groups were the participants of the study. One group has experimental with MDA intervention, while the other has a traditional teaching style of discussion. A; total of 25 pairs of students from the practical and comparison group were selected based on the result of the pre-test from the population of 88 students in the two sections of Grade 9 level of Palo Alto Integrated School, namely Carnation and Hyacinth. Participants; were randomly assigned to either the experimental group, section Carnation, which utilizes the MDA, or the control group, section Hyacinth, which uses the modular approach.

The researcher used five instruments to guide data processing, including a pre-test, post-test, formative test, portfolio, classroom observation checklist, and lesson exemplar. By doing a pre-test; the need was determined to establish the foundation of the study and serve as guiding principles on the areas to be measured and improved.

This formative assessment is integrated in a particular part of the Lesson Plan and serves to determine whether or not the students have acquired problem-solving skills. A portfolio, according to Hyland (2003), these are a compilation of a student's written work over time and is carefully selected from various genres of topics and lessons that serve as the best representation of students' progress, improvements, and areas that need immediate attention from the teacher. It;is the collection of students' written work for two (2) weeks to obtain an accurate picture of students' progress and performance in writing in a natural and non-threatening environment.

The researcher adopted an observation Checklist standard from the Department of Education to constantly check and monitor the lesson's progress for the entire duration of the study. To ensure the smooth delivery of instructions, Math teachers have followed the Lesson Exemplar, especially on the study duration, which covered two weeks.

All instruments were affirmed by subject-matter experts with the skills and competencies to teach mathematics at the Junior High School level. The; researcher's thesis adviser checked the construct of the question items to ensure that it was free from grammatical flaws, which could lead the respondents to interpretations different from what was originally intended. The Master Teacher, Head Teacher, or Principal validated the question items to ensure that these would generate responses that are relevant, essential, and useful in developing conclusions and recommendations. They; were tapped not only for their knowledge and competencies in teaching, but also for their recognition of the level of students enrolled in Palo Alto Integrated School based on data reflected on the LESF (Learner's Enrolment Survey Form). Suggestions and feedback were carefully considered and incorporated into the instruments.

Mean and standard deviation were used to calculate the mean scores of student participants in formative, pre-test, and post-test assessments. An independent t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups' formative tests. Similarly; dependent t-tests were utilized to determine the important difference between the pre-test and post-test; of each group. In case the test of difference showed significance, Cohen's d was employed to measure the effect size.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This table shows the mean scores of the experimental and comparison groups on their formative tests.

As gleaned on Table 4, reveals how each group performed in the formative test. For the experimental group achieved a (M = 3.32, SD=3.41), which is interpreted as proficient. In contrast, the comparison group, it attained a developing result of a (M = 31.08, SD=4.30). These findings indicate that drawing model approach, when integrated into all lessons, significantly improved the formative scores of the experimental group that received this treatment.

Table 5 presents the mean scores of experimental and comparison groups on their post-test.

Table 5. Posttest Mean Scores of Experimental and Comparison Groups

Group (n=25)	Mean	SD	DI
Experimental	21.88	6.14	P
Comparison	16.12	4.20	B

Legend: 22.38- 25.00 or 90-100% Advanced (A); 21.00-22.37 or 85-89% Proficient (P); 19.87 -20.99 or 80-84% Approaching Proficiency (AP) 18.62-19.86 or 75-79% Developing (D); and 18.61 or 74% & below Beginning (B)

Table 1 reflects the result of post-test; mean scores in which the experimental group attained a (M = 21.88, SD = 6.14) which is interpreted as Proficient, while the comparison group only indicates a (M = 16.12, SD = 4.20), which is classified only as a beginning. It can be inferred that the drawing model approach is not only effective in student comprehension in identifying the concept of basic problem techniques, but also allows the teacher to directly connect to the learners' mental and affective domains, gaining more advantages on their academic performance in terms of their Math subject scores. According to Liu and Soo (2014), the model drawing approach teaches and reinforces principles of multiplicative thought and proportional reasoning that many struggling mathematics students do not understand.

The result further strengthens other related studies of Osman, et al. (2018), Thiyagu (2013), & Himawan & Wilujeng (2020), which indicated that Model Drawing approach guides the students to attain the explicit knowledge, understanding, and application of the stated learning competencies, thus eventually improved their mathematical skills in the areas of problem comprehension, devising a plan, carrying out the plan, and looking for alternative choices.

Table 6 presents the test of significant difference between the formative test mean scores of the two groups.

Table 6. Test of Significant Difference between the formative test mean scores of the two groups

Test	Group	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	Cohen's d
Formative	Experimental Comparison	33.32 31.08	2.24	2.115*	.657 (Medium)

*df = 48; *Significant at .05 level; Cohen's d: 0.20 (Small); 0.50 (Medium); 0.80 (Large)*

The results in Table 6 show that there is a highly significant difference between the formative mean scores of the participants in this study, with the Experimental group achieving a mean rating of 33.32 and its Comparison group counterpart achieving a mean rating of 31.08, resulting in a [t (48) = 2.115, Mean Difference = 2.24, p-value < 0.05]. The outcome simply indicated that the null hypotheses were rejected and the alternative hypotheses were accepted.

This implies that drawing model approach not only helped the experimental group improve their academic scores across the board, but it also significantly improved students' visualization, creativity, and analytical thinking skills. As a result, it assists students in transitioning from concrete manipulative work with word problems to the theoretical phase of creating an equation to solve conceptual problems (Jackson, 2010). Because the students are given enough visual examples of how to solve a problem, all of the lessons allow teachers and students to explore the benefits of drawing model approach through scaffolding.

Table 7 presents the test of significant difference between the post-test mean scores of experimental and comparison groups.

Table 7. Test of Significant Difference between the Posttest Mean Scores of Experimental and Comparison Groups

Group	Mean	Mean Difference	Df	t-value	Cohen's D	Effect size
Experimental	21.88					
Comparison	16.12	5.76	48	5.175**	1.10	Large

Legend: df = Degrees of Freedom
***Highly Significant at .01 level*

Table 7 shows a highly significant difference between the performance of the experimental group and the comparison group with a [t (48) = 5.175, p-value < 0.01], indicating that the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the two groups was rejected.

The research results support the findings of Osman et al. (2018), who found that using the Drawing Model Approach or Visualization in the experimental group helps students grasp the coverage of the topic better than using no intervention in the comparison group. In the four-lesson scope of the paper, the study found evidence that drawing model can significantly improve students' mathematical skills. After determining the highly significant difference between the computed mean differences of the control and experimental groups, it became clear that the latter, which was exposed to the model drawing, scored higher in Direct and Inverse Constant Variations.

Table 8 presents the test of significant difference between the pre-test and post-test mean scores of each group.

Table 8. Test of significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of each group

Group	Test	Mean	Mean Difference	df	t-value	Cohen's d	Effect size
Experimental	Pretest Posttest	11.88 21.88	10.00	24	14.586**	1.75	Large
Comparison	Pretest Posttest	11.88 16.12	4.24	24	4.997**	0.89	Large

Cohen's d: 0.20 (Small); 0.50 (Medium); 0.80 (Large)
***Significant at .01 level*

According to the results in Table 8, there are highly significant differences between the post-test and pre-test mean scores of each group of participants. For the experimental group with [t (24) = 14.586, Mean Difference = 10, p-value < 0.01, Cohen's d = 1.75, large effect size] while comparison group with [t (24) = 4.997, Mean Difference = 4.24, Cohen's d = 0.89, large effect size], indicating that both groups improved their performance after the experimental process. The improvement of the comparison group could be attributed to several factors, including the students' condition, particularly their level of intelligence, given that their match pairing was done randomly, giving a chance that some superior students could be in the comparison group, or such parental support and assistance, which can be a basis for future research given the limitations of this study. The researcher carefully examined variables that might have a direct impact on the class during the conduct of the study, so this improvement cannot be directly attributed to the use of drawing model.

This also supported the research by Himawan & Wilujeng (2020) and Arcavi (2003), which found that MDA aids students in visualizing abstract mathematical concepts by allowing them to connect those concepts to their own senses of manipulation. Similar results revealed a highly significant difference between the performance of the experimental group and the comparison group with a t-value of 5.175 and a p-value less than 0.01 level of significance, indicating that the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the two groups was rejected.

Finally, the results revealed that there are highly significant differences in each group of participants' post-test and pre-test mean scores. The experimental group had a computed t-value of

14.586 with a Cohen's d of 1.75 and a large effect size, while the comparison group had a t-value of 4.997 and a Cohen's d of 0.89, both with p-values less than 0.01 level of significance, indicating that both groups improved their performance after the experimental process. However, the experimental group has a greater mean difference of 10.00 than the comparison group, which has a mean difference of 4.24

CONCLUSIONS

The overall mean rating for the formative test for the experimental group was 33.32 (SD=3.41), which is interpreted as Advanced, while the comparison group received a starting result of 31.08 (SD=4.30), indicating that the experimental group performed better than the comparison group. The; results also revealed that the experimental group that used the Model Drawing Approach received a mean rating of 21.88 (SD=6.14), which is classified as proficient, whereas the comparison group only received a mean rating of 16.12 (SD=4.20), which is classified as beginning. It; can be inferred that the drawing model is not only effective in student comprehension in identifying the concept of basic problem techniques, but also allows the teacher to directly connect to the learners' mental and affective domains, gaining more advantages on their academic performance in terms of their Math subject scores. Another intriguing finding was that there is a highly significant difference between the formative mean scores of the respondents in this study, with the Experimental group achieving a mean rating of 33.32 and the Comparison group achieving a mean rating of 31.08, resulting in a mean difference of 2.24 and a t-value of 2.115. The outcome simply indicated that the null hypotheses were rejected and the alternative hypotheses were accepted. This meant that MDA not only helped the experimental group improve their academic scores in the subject, but it also helped students improve their visualization, creativity, and analytical thinking skills Since there is a highly significant difference between the mean scores that were tested, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the formative test mean scores performance of the learners was rejected. The null hypothesis, which stated that there is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the learners, was also rejected because the results revealed a highly significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups of participants. The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test mean scores performance of each group of learners was also rejected because the results indicate a highly significant difference between the mean scores of each group before and after the implementation of this study. The results showed that both groups of participants used K-12 materials to help improve their mean score performance; however, the group of participants who used the Drawing Model Approach achieved significantly higher score performance

than its counterpart group.

REFERENCES

Abu, M.S., Osman, S., & Yang, C.A. (2018). Enhancing Students' Mathematical Problem-Solving Skills through Bar Model Visualization Technique. International; Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education e-ISSN: 1306-3030. 2018, Vol. 13, No. 3, 273-279 https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/3919 Angay, M. E. (1998). Difficulties; in solving fractions encountered by the grade six pupils in Tubod East District, Malinga, Tubod Lanao del Norte, SY 1997-1998. Unpublished; master's thesis, MSU-IIT, School of Graduate Studies. Albalawi, A. (2018). The; Effect of Using Flipped Classroom in Teaching Calculus on Students' Achievements at the University of Tabuk. International; Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 4(1), 198-207. Bacsa, J. M. & Alcantara E. C. (2017). Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills in Mathematics of Grade-7 Public Secondary Students. Asia; Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 5, No. 4, November 2017 Hester, P., Morin, L., Raver, S., & Watson, S. (2017). The; Use of a Bar Model Drawing to Teach Word Problem Solving to Students. Hammill; Institute of Disabilities. Retrieved; from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0731948717690116. Himawan, N. A. & Wilujeng, I. (2020). Improving students' problem-solving skills through a quick on-the-draw model assisted by the optical learning book integrated with the Pancasila. IOP; Publishing. Journal; of Physics: Conference Series. doi:10.1088;/1742-6596/1440/1/012031 Incebacak, B.B. & Ersoy, E. (2016). Problem Solving Skills of Secondary School Students. China-USA; Business Review, June 2016, Vol. 15, No. 6, 275-285;. Retrieved; from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308327519_Problem_Solving_Skills_of_Secondary_School_Students Jackson, B. (2010). The; Singapore math model-drawing approach (part 3). Retrieved from September 24, 2015, from http://www.thedailyriff.com/2010/11/singapore-math-demystified-part-3-the famous-bar-models.php Kalogeropoulos P, Roche A., Russo J., Vats S., & Russo T. (2021). Learning; mathematics from home during covid-19: insights from two inquiry-focused primary schools. EURASIA; Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 2021, 17(5). Kamariah, A. B., Jennifer, W., & Janette, B. (2016). Young; Children's Drawings in Problem Solving. Mathematics; Education Research Group of Australasia, 86–93. Adelaide; MERGA. Kitta, S. (2004). Enhancing; Mathematics Teachers' Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills in Tanzania. Print Partners- Ipskamp: Enschede. Kumari, V. S. N. (2014). Constructivist; Approach to Teacher Education: An Integrative Model for Reflective Teaching. Journa;l on Educational Psychology, v7 n4 p31-40