6. One-way ANOVA

*Table 1*

*ANOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics for Mathematics Scores by Type of Instruction*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Type | | Mean | | SD | | n | |
| Write to Learn | | 75.00 | | 2.94 | | 4 | |
| Jigsaw | | 85.00 | | 2.58 | | 4 | |
| Peer Tutor | | 95.00 | | 0.82 | | 4 | |
| Source | SS | | df | | MS | | F |
| Instruction | 800.00 | | 2 | | 400.00 | | 75.00\* |
| Error | 48.00 | | 9 | | 5.33 | |  |

*Note*. R2 = .94, adj. R2 = .93.

\* p < .05

*Table 2*

*Multiple Comparisons and Mean Differences in Mathematics Scores by Type of Instruction*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comparison | Mean Difference | s.e. | Bonferroni Adjusted 95% CI |
| Write vs. Jigsaw | -10.00\* | 1.63 | -14.79, -5.21 |
| Write vs. Peer Tutor | -20.00\* | 1.63 | -24.79, -15.21 |
| Peer Tutor vs. Jigsaw | 10.00\* | 1.63 | 5.21, 14.79 |

\* p < .05, where p-values are adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Statistical analysis of mathematics scores show statistically significant mean differences, at the .05 level, among the three groups examined. Multiple comparisons results show that those in peer tutoring demonstrated the highest performance, those in jigsaw the second highest, and those in write to learn the lowest. Each pairwise comparison was statistically significant.