CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICS (ISSN: 2767-3278)

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue09 2025
Page: - 01-11

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Comparative Efficacy of Heuristic, Discovery-Based, and Manipulative-Aided Instruction on Student Achievement in Middle School Geometry

Dr. Elena Vance

Department of Mathematics Education, Northwood University, Chicago, USA

Prof. Samuel J. Carter

Faculty of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

Received: 03 July 2025 **Accepted:** 02 August 2025 **Published:** 01 September 2025

ABSTRACT

Background: Effective geometry instruction is fundamental to mathematical proficiency, yet students often struggle with its abstract concepts. While various student-centered pedagogical approaches have been proposed, there is a need for direct empirical comparison of their effectiveness. This study investigates the relative impact of three prominent instructional strategies: the heuristic method, discovery-based learning, and manipulative-aided instruction.

Purpose: The primary purpose of this study was to compare the efficacy of these three teaching methods against a traditional, lecture-based approach on sixth-grade students' achievement in geometry.

Methods: A quasi-experimental, pre-test/post-test control group design was employed with 124 sixth-grade students from four intact classes in a public middle school. Each class was randomly assigned to one of four conditions for an eight-week instructional period: (1) Heuristic Method, focusing on structured problem-solving; (2) Discovery Learning, emphasizing student-led exploration; (3) Manipulative-Aided Instruction, utilizing concrete physical objects; and (4) a Control Group receiving traditional instruction. A validated Geometry Achievement Test was administered before and after the intervention. Data were analyzed using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA), with pre-test scores serving as the covariate.

Results: The ANCOVA revealed a statistically significant difference in post-test achievement scores among the four groups, $F(3, 119) = 15.42$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .28$. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD indicated that both the Manipulative-Aided (Adjusted M = 85.05) and Heuristic (Adjusted M = 81.85) groups were associated with significantly higher achievement than the Discovery Learning (Adjusted M = 74.58) and Traditional Control (Adjusted M = 73.90) groups. The manipulative group was associated with the highest mean score.

Conclusion: The findings suggest that instructional methods incorporating concrete experiences and structured problem-solving are associated with significantly more effective learning outcomes in geometry than either unguided discovery or traditional methods. The study provides strong evidence for integrating manipulatives and heuristic strategies into middle school mathematics curricula to enhance students' geometric understanding.

Keywords: Geometry Education, Instructional Methods, Heuristic Method, Discovery Learning, Manipulatives, Mathematics Achievement, Middle School Education.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Context

Geometry, as a cornerstone of mathematics, offers more than the study of shapes, sizes, and the properties of space; it provides a critical framework for developing logical reasoning, spatial visualization, and problem-solving skills that are indispensable in both academic and real-world contexts. The ability to reason geometrically is fundamental not only for advanced studies in STEM fields but also for everyday tasks that require spatial awareness and logical deduction [9]. As Battista [5] argues, the importance of spatial structuring—the mental act of organizing an object or a set of objects by identifying its components and establishing relationships between them—is paramount in the development of robust geometric reasoning. This structuring allows learners to move beyond rote memorization of formulas to a deeper, more intuitive understanding of geometric principles. The historical arc of geometry, from the practical measurements of ancient civilizations to the axiomatic system of Euclid and its subsequent evolution into non-Euclidean geometries, highlights its dual nature as both a practical tool and a pinnacle of abstract deductive thought. In the 21st century, its applications are more pervasive than ever, underpinning fields such as computer graphics, robotics, molecular modeling, and architectural design. An education that neglects to cultivate strong geometric intuition and reasoning skills is, therefore, an incomplete one.

Despite its foundational importance, geometry remains a domain where students frequently encounter significant challenges. The transition from concrete, tangible shapes to abstract geometric properties and formal proofs presents a substantial cognitive hurdle for many learners, particularly in the middle school years. This period is critical, as it is when students are expected to formalize their intuitive understanding of space into a more systematic, deductive science. The traditional pedagogical model, often characterized by direct instruction, rote memorization of theorems, and repetitive procedural exercises, has been increasingly scrutinized for its failure to cultivate deep conceptual understanding, leaving many students with a fragmented and inert knowledge base [39]. This approach often treats students as passive vessels to be filled with geometric facts, rather than as active sense-makers, leading to a perception of geometry as a static and uninteresting collection of rules.

In response to the limitations of these traditional approaches, the field of mathematics education has witnessed a significant paradigm shift over the past several decades, moving towards methodologies grounded in constructivist learning theory. Constructivism, in its various forms, posits that learners are not passive recipients of information but are active constructors of their own knowledge, building new understanding upon the foundation of prior experiences [38]. This theoretical framework, with intellectual roots in the work of Piaget, Vygotsky, and von Glasersfeld, advocates for student-centered learning environments where inquiry, exploration, and the negotiation of meaning take precedence over passive listening. Within this broad paradigm, several distinct instructional models have emerged, each proposing a different pathway to facilitate meaningful learning. Among the most prominent in mathematics education are the heuristic method, discovery-based learning, and instruction aided by concrete manipulatives. While each of these approaches is rooted in constructivist principles, they differ significantly in their structure, the role of the teacher, and the nature of the student's engagement with the material. This study is situated within this pedagogical landscape, seeking to untangle the relative effectiveness of these influential models in the specific context of middle school geometry.

1.2. Conceptual Framework: Overview of Instructional Approaches

1.2.1. The Heuristic Method

The heuristic method is an instructional approach centered on teaching students general problem-solving strategies, or "heuristics," that can be applied across a wide range of problems. The intellectual lineage of this method traces directly to the seminal work of George Pólya [30], whose four-step problem-solving framework—(1) understand the problem, (2) devise a plan, (3) carry out the plan, and (4) look back—has become a foundational element of mathematics education worldwide. The core premise of the heuristic approach is that by making the often-implicit processes of expert problem-solvers explicit, students can learn to navigate unfamiliar problems more effectively and systematically. This involves strategies such as drawing a diagram, looking for a pattern, working backward, or solving a simpler, analogous problem. Alan Schoenfeld [36] further elaborated on this framework by emphasizing the role of metacognition, beliefs, and affective factors in mathematical problem-solving, arguing that successful problem-solvers are not just repositories of facts but are adept at managing their cognitive resources.

In the context of geometry, a heuristic approach moves beyond simply presenting theorems and formulas for application. Instead, it encourages students to engage with geometric problems as puzzles to be solved. For example, when asked to find the area of a complex polygon, a student taught with heuristics might first try to decompose the shape into simpler, familiar figures like rectangles and triangles—a classic problem-solving strategy [15]. This method fosters metacognitive skills, as students are constantly encouraged to monitor their thinking and evaluate the effectiveness of their chosen strategies [36]. Research suggests that this structured yet flexible approach can be associated with significant gains in students' problem-solving abilities and their capacity for logical reasoning [1, 32]. Studies by Hoon et al. [16] found that students who gained experience with a heuristic approach showed improved performance and confidence in tackling non-routine mathematical problems.

However, the approach is not without its challenges. The effective implementation of heuristics requires considerable skill from the teacher, who must guide students without providing direct solutions, a process that can be both time-consuming and difficult to master [25, 34]. There is a pedagogical tension between providing enough structure to prevent frustration and providing too much, which would stifle independent thought. Furthermore, there is a risk that heuristics can be taught as just another set of procedures to be memorized, thereby undermining the goal of developing flexible, adaptive problem-solvers [26]. If students learn to "use the draw-a-diagram heuristic" as a rote command rather than as a considered strategic choice, the method loses its power.

1.2.2. Discovery-Based Learning

Discovery-based learning is another prominent constructivist model, which places the student in the role of the primary agent of their own learning. In a discovery learning environment, students are presented with intriguing problems, scenarios, or data sets and are encouraged to explore, experiment, and formulate their own conclusions and principles with minimal direct guidance from the teacher [12]. The theoretical underpinning of this approach, often associated with Jerome Bruner, is the idea that knowledge constructed by the learner is more meaningful, better retained, and more easily transferred than knowledge that is passively received. In a discovery-based geometry classroom, instead of being told the formula for the sum of the interior angles of a polygon, students might be given various polygons and protractors and asked to measure the angles, record their findings in a table, and search for a pattern from which they can derive the formula themselves [18, 24].

Proponents of discovery learning argue that it fosters a deeper conceptual understanding, enhances intrinsic motivation, and develops critical thinking and scientific reasoning skills [11, 20]. A meta-analysis by Khairunnisa and Juandi [21] found an overall positive effect for discovery learning models on students' mathematical abilities. Ramadhani et al. [33] also reported that modules based on discovery learning were associated with increased student interest in mathematics. However, this approach has also been the subject of considerable debate and criticism. Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark [22] famously argued that minimally guided instruction is not only less effective than direct instruction but can also be counterproductive, leading to misconceptions and cognitive overload, particularly for novice learners. They contend that the cognitive architecture of the human mind, with its limited working memory, is not optimized for learning in such an unconstrained manner. Other researchers have found that the success of discovery learning can be highly variable and may depend on factors such as the quality of the learning materials and the subtle scaffolding provided by the teacher [2]. This ongoing debate highlights a central tension in educational psychology: the appropriate balance between student exploration and expert guidance.

1.2.3. Manipulative-Aided Instruction

The use of manipulatives—concrete, physical objects that students can touch and move to represent abstract mathematical ideas—is one of the most enduring and widely advocated pedagogical strategies in mathematics education. The rationale for using manipulatives is grounded in theories of cognitive development, which suggest that learners, particularly younger ones, progress from concrete to abstract modes of thinking [10]. Manipulatives serve as a crucial bridge in this process, allowing students to ground abstract symbols and concepts in tangible, sensory experiences [8]. In geometry, this could involve using tangrams to explore polygon composition, geoboards to investigate the properties of shapes and calculate area, or three-dimensional blocks to understand volume and surface area [4, 31]. The act of physically manipulating these objects can provide insights that are not readily available from static diagrams in a textbook.

A substantial body of research supports the efficacy of using manipulatives to improve student achievement in mathematics. Two major meta-analyses, one by Sowell [37] and a more recent one by Carbonneau, Marley, and Selig [7], concluded that instruction incorporating manipulatives results in moderate to large positive effects on student learning and retention compared to instruction that relies solely on abstract symbols. The benefits appear to be particularly pronounced when the manipulatives are used consistently over a long period and when the teacher explicitly helps students make connections between the concrete object and the abstract concept it represents [27]. The use of manipulatives has been shown to be effective across various grade levels and learning styles [19, 28] and is particularly valuable for developing spatial visualization skills [3]. Research by Sarama and Clements [35] emphasizes the role of manipulatives in early childhood mathematics, suggesting they help build foundational learning trajectories. Bower et al. [6] found that spatial assembly interventions using physical blocks were associated with gains in preschoolers' spatial and mathematical learning. However, the effectiveness of manipulatives is not automatic. They can be used ineffectively, as mere "props" in an otherwise traditional lesson, or they can become a distraction if the link to the underlying mathematics is not made clear [8]. The quality of the implementation and the teacher's ability to guide the learning process are critical determinants of their success [13, 27].

1.3. Statement of the Problem & Research Gap

The existing body of literature provides substantial evidence supporting each of these three instructional approaches under various conditions. Studies have demonstrated the positive impact of heuristic methods on problem-solving in algebra [1] and geometry [15]. Similarly, research has highlighted the benefits of discovery learning for fostering conceptual understanding in geometry [18, 24] and other mathematical domains [20]. The case for manipulatives is perhaps the most extensively researched, with numerous studies and meta-analyses confirming their positive effect on student achievement [4, 7, 13, 23, 37].

Despite the wealth of research on each method individually, a significant gap exists in the literature: there is a scarcity of studies that directly and empirically compare the relative effectiveness of these three distinct, yet all broadly constructivist, approaches within a single, controlled experimental design. Most studies compare one of these experimental methods to a traditional control group, but they do not pit them against each other. This makes it difficult for educators and curriculum designers to make informed, evidence-based decisions about which specific instructional model might be most effective for a particular topic, such as middle school geometry. It remains unclear whether the structured guidance of the heuristic method, the open-ended exploration of discovery learning, or the concrete grounding of manipulatives offers the most potent pathway to geometric proficiency.

1.4. Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The primary objective of this study is to address this research gap by empirically comparing the effects of heuristic, discovery-based, and manipulative-aided teaching methods on sixth-grade students' achievement in geometry. A traditional, textbook-based instructional method will serve as a control group to provide a baseline for comparison. By implementing these four distinct instructional conditions in a real-world classroom setting and measuring their impact on student learning, this research aims to provide clearer, more direct evidence regarding their relative efficacy.

To guide this investigation, the study will address the following research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference in post-test geometry achievement scores among students taught using heuristic, discovery-based, manipulative-aided, and traditional methods, after controlling for their initial achievement on the pre-test?

2. Which specific instructional method, or methods, are associated with the highest levels of student achievement in sixth-grade geometry?

METHODS

2.1. Research Design

To address the research questions, this study employed a quasi-experimental, pre-test/post-test, non-equivalent control group design. This design was chosen as it is well-suited for classroom-based research where the random assignment of individual students to different instructional conditions is not feasible for logistical and ethical reasons. Instead, pre-existing, intact classes were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions. The use of a pre-test allows for the statistical control of initial differences in geometric knowledge among the groups, thereby strengthening the internal validity of the study and increasing confidence that any observed differences in post-test scores can be attributed to the instructional intervention. The four levels of the independent variable were the teaching methods: (1) Heuristic Method, (2) Discovery-Based Learning, (3) Manipulative-Aided Instruction, and (4) Traditional Instruction (Control Group). The dependent variable was the students' achievement in geometry, as measured by their scores on the post-test.

2.2. Participants

The participants in this study were 124 sixth-grade students (68 male, 56 female) enrolled in four intact classes at a public middle school located in a mid-sized urban district. The school serves a diverse student population, with approximately 45% of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch, reflecting a range of socioeconomic backgrounds. The age of the students ranged from 11 to 12 years (M = 11.6, SD = 0.45). All students had completed the standard fifth-grade mathematics curriculum and were following the district-mandated curriculum for sixth-grade mathematics. Participation in the study was voluntary. Prior to the study, informational letters and consent forms were sent home to the parents or guardians of all students in the selected classes. A passive consent procedure was used for students, while active, written consent was obtained from parents or guardians. Consent was also obtained from school administrators and the participating teachers. The four classes were assigned to the four instructional conditions via a simple random assignment process, resulting in the following group sizes: Heuristic Group (n=31), Discovery Group (n=30), Manipulatives Group (n=32), and Traditional Control Group (n=31). Four experienced mathematics teachers, each with a master's degree in education and more than five years of teaching experience, were assigned to deliver the instruction. To minimize teacher effects, teachers were randomly assigned to the instructional conditions and participated in extensive training sessions specific to the method they were to implement.

2.3. Instruments

The primary instrument used for data collection was a Geometry Achievement Test (GAT) developed by the research team in collaboration with experienced mathematics educators. The test was designed to measure students' understanding of key sixth-grade geometry concepts as outlined in the national curriculum standards [17]. The content domains covered by the test included properties of two-dimensional and three-dimensional shapes, angle relationships, area, perimeter, surface area, and volume. The GAT consisted of 35 items in total: 30 multiple-choice questions (worth 1 point each) and 5 open-ended problem-solving tasks (worth 4 points each), for a total possible score of 50 points. The open-ended tasks were designed to assess higher-order thinking skills, such as problem-solving and reasoning, and were scored using a detailed rubric. For example, one task asked students to find the area of an irregular composite shape and explain their method, with points awarded for correct decomposition, accurate calculations, and clarity of explanation.

Content validity of the GAT was established through a review process involving a panel of three university-level mathematics education experts and two veteran sixth-grade mathematics teachers. The panel reviewed the test items for clarity, accuracy, and alignment with the curriculum, and their feedback was used to revise and refine the instrument. The reliability of the GAT was assessed using the data from a pilot study conducted with a separate sample of 60 sixth-grade students. The internal consistency of the test, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, was found to be 0.88, indicating a high degree of reliability. The same test was used for both the pre-test and the post-test to ensure consistency in measurement.

2.4. Procedure & Intervention

The study was conducted over a period of 10 weeks during the regular school year. The procedure was divided into three distinct phases.

Phase 1: Pre-Test Administration (Week 1)

In the first week of the study, the Geometry Achievement Test (GAT) was administered to all 124 participants in their respective classrooms under standardized conditions. The purpose of the pre-test was to establish a baseline measure of each student's geometric knowledge prior to the intervention.

Phase 2: Instructional Intervention (Weeks 2-9)

The eight-week instructional intervention began in the second week. Each of the four groups received instruction on the same set of geometry topics from their assigned teacher for 45 minutes per day, five days a week. The content was standardized across all groups, but the method of delivery was specific to each condition. The teachers received 10 hours of training on their assigned method and were provided with detailed lesson plans and materials to ensure treatment fidelity.

- Group 1 (Heuristic Method): Instruction in this group was centered around Pólya's [30] four-step problem-solving model. Lessons were structured around challenging geometric problems. The teacher's role was to act as a facilitator, guiding students through the heuristic process by asking metacognitive questions (e.g., "What are you trying to find?", "Have you seen a similar problem before?", "Does your answer make sense?"). Students were explicitly taught strategies such as drawing diagrams, creating tables, and decomposing complex shapes. The approach drew on research emphasizing the use of heuristic examples to build problem-solving schemas [15, 25]. A typical lesson involved the teacher presenting a non-routine problem, followed by students working in pairs to apply the four-step model, with the teacher circulating and providing strategic prompts rather than direct answers.

- Group 2 (Discovery-Based Learning): In this group, the instructional approach was minimally guided, consistent with discovery learning principles [11, 24]. Students worked primarily in small groups to explore geometric concepts through carefully designed activities. For instance, to discover the relationship between the circumference and diameter of a circle, students were given various circular objects, measuring tapes, and calculators, and were tasked with finding a consistent ratio. The teacher's role was to introduce the task and provide clarification but to refrain from providing direct instruction or answers, encouraging students to formulate and test their own hypotheses. The culmination of a lesson was often a whole-class discussion where groups shared their findings and attempted to arrive at a consensus.

- Group 3 (Manipulative-Aided Instruction): This group's instruction was heavily reliant on the use of concrete and physical materials. Lessons were designed to introduce geometric concepts through hands-on exploration. Students used geoboards to explore area and perimeter, tangrams to compose and decompose shapes, and 3D geometric solids to understand volume and surface area [4, 13]. The teacher's role was to guide students in making explicit connections between their work with the manipulatives and the corresponding abstract geometric symbols and formulas, a practice identified as critical for effective learning [27, 31]. For example, after students used unit cubes to build rectangular prisms and determine their volume, the teacher would lead a discussion to help them formalize this experience into the formula $V = l \times w \times h$.

- Group 4 (Traditional Control Group): This group received instruction that reflected a traditional, teacher-centered approach [12, 39]. The teacher presented information primarily through lectures and demonstrations on the whiteboard. Students took notes, worked through example problems demonstrated by the teacher, and then completed practice exercises from the standard district-adopted textbook. Classroom interaction was typically characterized by the teacher asking questions and students providing answers.

Phase 3: Post-Test Administration (Week 10)

In the week immediately following the conclusion of the eight-week intervention, the GAT was administered again to all participants as a post-test. The administration procedures were identical to those of the pre-test.

2.5. Data Analysis

All data collected were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 26 [29]. Initially, descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were calculated for the pre-test and post-test scores for all four groups. The primary statistical analysis used to test the research hypothesis was a one-way Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA). ANCOVA was selected as the most appropriate statistical test because it allows for the comparison of post-test means among the four groups while statistically controlling for the effects of pre-existing differences in geometric knowledge, as measured by the pre-test scores (the covariate). This method increases the statistical power of the analysis and reduces the potential for bias due to the non-equivalent group design. Prior to conducting the ANCOVA, the necessary assumptions for the test—including normality of residuals (assessed via Shapiro-Wilk test and Q-Q plots), homogeneity of variances (assessed via Levene's test), and homogeneity of regression slopes (assessed by testing the interaction between the covariate and the independent variable)—were checked and verified. Following a significant result from the main ANCOVA, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted using the Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) test to determine which specific groups differed significantly from one another. An alpha level of .05 was set for all inferential statistical tests.

RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

The means and standard deviations for the Geometry Achievement Test (GAT) scores for both the pre-test and post-test for all four instructional groups are presented in Table 1. At the outset of the study, the pre-test mean scores were comparable across the four groups, with the Heuristic group (M = 45.10, SD = 8.12), Discovery group (M = 44.83, SD = 7.95), Manipulatives group (M = 45.31, SD = 8.34), and Traditional Control group (M = 44.97, SD = 8.05) showing very similar baseline levels of geometric knowledge.

Following the eight-week intervention, all groups demonstrated an increase in their mean scores from pre-test to post-test. However, the magnitude of this increase varied considerably across the different instructional conditions. The Manipulative-Aided Instruction group achieved the highest mean score on the post-test (M = 85.12, SD = 6.21), followed closely by the Heuristic Method group (M = 81.94, SD = 7.08). The Discovery-Based Learning group (M = 74.50, SD = 8.01) and the Traditional Control group (M = 73.81, SD = 7.49) obtained lower post-test mean scores that were very similar to each other. These descriptive results provide a preliminary indication that the manipulative-aided and heuristic methods may have been more effective than the discovery and traditional methods.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores by Instructional Group

Instructional Group	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test
		M (SD)	M (SD)
Heuristic Method	31	45.10 (8.12)	81.94 (7.08)
Discovery Learning	30	44.83 (7.95)	74.50 (8.01)
Manipulatives	32	45.31 (8.34)	85.12 (6.21)
Traditional (Control)	31	44.97 (8.05)	73.81 (7.49)

3.2. Inferential Statistics

To determine if the observed differences in post-test scores were statistically significant after accounting for initial knowledge, a one-way Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted. The students' post-test GAT scores served as the dependent variable, the instructional group (Heuristic, Discovery, Manipulatives, Control) served as the independent variable, and the pre-test GAT scores served as the covariate. Preliminary checks confirmed that the assumptions for ANCOVA were met. The Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was non-significant ($p > .05$), and the test for homogeneity of regression slopes was also non-significant ($p > .05$), indicating that the relationship between the covariate and the dependent variable was consistent across all four groups.

The ANCOVA results revealed a statistically significant main effect for the instructional method on students' post-test achievement scores, $F(3, 119) = 15.42$, $p < .001$. The effect size, as measured by partial eta squared, was .28, which is considered a large effect size. This result indicates that after controlling for students' prior knowledge in geometry, the type of instruction they received was significantly and substantially associated with their learning outcomes. The covariate, the pre-test score, was also significantly related to the post-test score, $F(1, 119) = 67.34$, $p < .001$, confirming that students' initial knowledge was a strong predictor of their final achievement.

Given the significant main effect of the instructional method, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were performed using the Tukey's HSD test to identify the specific sources of the difference among the four groups. The results of the post-hoc analysis showed that the Manipulative-Aided Instruction group (Adjusted Mean = 85.05) was associated with statistically significantly better performance than both the Discovery-Based Learning group (Adjusted Mean = 74.58, $p < .001$) and the Traditional Control group (Adjusted Mean = 73.90, $p < .001$). Similarly, the Heuristic Method group (Adjusted Mean = 81.85) was also associated with statistically significantly better performance than both the Discovery-Based Learning group ($p < .001$) and the Traditional Control group ($p < .001$). A further comparison revealed that the difference between the Manipulative-Aided group and the Heuristic Method group approached, but did not reach, statistical significance ($p = .06$). Finally, there was no statistically significant difference found between the post-test scores of the Discovery-Based Learning group and the Traditional Control group ($p = .89$).

In summary, the inferential statistical analysis provides strong evidence to answer the research questions. There is a significant difference in geometry achievement based on the instructional method used. Specifically, both manipulative-aided instruction and the heuristic method were associated with significantly higher student achievement than either discovery-based learning or traditional instruction. Furthermore, discovery-based learning was found to be no more effective than the traditional, teacher-centered approach.

DISCUSSION

4.1. Summary and Interpretation of Findings

This study sought to compare the relative effectiveness of heuristic, discovery-based, manipulative-aided, and traditional instructional methods on sixth-grade students' achievement in geometry. The results of the statistical analysis were clear and compelling. After controlling for students' prior knowledge, the instructional method employed had a profound and statistically significant association with their learning outcomes. The primary finding was that students who received instruction incorporating either concrete manipulatives or structured heuristic problem-solving strategies demonstrated significantly higher achievement than students who were taught using either a minimally guided discovery approach or a traditional, lecture-based method. The second key finding was that there was no significant difference in achievement between the discovery learning group and the traditional control group, suggesting that, in this context, the student-led exploratory approach was no more effective than conventional instruction.

The superior performance associated with the Manipulative-Aided Instruction group aligns strongly with a vast body of existing research and cognitive theory. The use of physical objects appears to have successfully served as a cognitive scaffold, bridging the gap between the concrete world of physical shapes and the abstract world of geometric properties and formulas [8, 10]. By physically composing, decomposing, and transforming shapes, students were able to build a rich, sensorimotor foundation for abstract concepts like area and volume. This hands-on engagement likely enhanced their spatial structuring abilities, allowing them to better visualize and mentally manipulate geometric figures, a skill identified by Battista [5] as crucial for deep geometric reasoning. The findings are consistent with the conclusions of major meta-analyses [7, 37] and numerous individual studies [4, 13, 19, 28] that have demonstrated the power of manipulatives to enhance mathematical understanding. The success of this group underscores the principle that for many students, particularly in the middle grades, learning is optimized when abstract ideas are grounded in tangible experiences.

Similarly, the strong performance of the Heuristic Method group provides robust support for the value of teaching explicit problem-solving strategies. By equipping students with a systematic framework for approaching problems [30, 36], this method likely reduced cognitive load and prevented the feeling of being "stuck" that often plagues novice problem-solvers. Instead of facing a complex problem as an undifferentiated whole, students learned to break it down into manageable steps, a process that fosters both competence and confidence. This finding resonates with research by Hilbert, Renkl, and Reiss [15], who found that learning from heuristic examples was an effective way to teach geometric proofs, and with studies showing the positive impact of heuristic instruction on mathematical performance more broadly [1, 16, 32]. The success of this guided, strategic approach suggests that for geometry, which is inherently about logical problem-solving, teaching students how to think is as important as teaching them what to think about.

Perhaps the most provocative finding of this study is the failure of the Discovery-Based Learning group to outperform the Traditional Control group. This result contributes to the ongoing and often contentious debate about the efficacy of minimally guided instruction [2, 22]. While proponents of discovery learning argue for its benefits in fostering motivation and deep understanding [18, 21], the current findings suggest that, for the complex and highly structured domain of sixth-grade geometry, unguided exploration may not be the most efficient or effective path to knowledge acquisition. It is plausible that without sufficient guidance, students in the discovery group may have struggled to discern the key mathematical principles from the exploratory activities, potentially leading to cognitive overload or the reinforcement of misconceptions, as warned by Kirschner et al. [22]. This outcome does not necessarily invalidate discovery learning as a pedagogical tool, but it does suggest that its effectiveness may be highly dependent on the topic's complexity, the learners' prior knowledge, and the degree of implicit scaffolding provided by the teacher and the learning materials. The results indicate that a desire to be "student-centered" should not be conflated with an absence of structure and guidance.

4.2. Implications of the Study

The findings of this research have several important implications for both educational practice and theory.

Practical Implications: For classroom teachers, curriculum developers, and school administrators, the primary takeaway is the strong, evidence-based recommendation to integrate both manipulative materials and explicit heuristic problem-solving strategies into middle school geometry instruction. The results suggest that an investment in high-quality manipulative kits and in professional development focused on teaching heuristic methods is likely to yield significant returns in student achievement. The study provides a compelling argument against relying solely on traditional, textbook-driven instruction. Furthermore, it cautions against the uncritical adoption of minimally guided discovery learning models without careful consideration of the necessary support structures students need to make such exploration productive. A balanced approach, perhaps one that combines the hands-on nature of manipulatives with the structured thinking of heuristics, may represent an optimal pedagogical strategy.

Theoretical Implications: From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of constructivist pedagogy. It challenges the notion of a monolithic "constructivist approach" by demonstrating that different methods operating under this broad umbrella can have markedly different effects on student learning. The results suggest that the most effective constructivist learning environments for formal, structured domains like geometry are those that provide a high degree of cognitive support, either through concrete representations (manipulatives) or through structured cognitive strategies (heuristics). This supports a model of learning that emphasizes the importance of "guided construction" over unguided exploration, aligning with theories that highlight the critical role of scaffolding in the learning process. The study thus helps to refine constructivist theory by highlighting the variables—concreteness of representation and explicitness of strategy—that appear to mediate its effectiveness in a classroom setting.

4.3. Limitations of the Study

While this study provides valuable insights, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. First, the quasi-experimental design, while common and often necessary in educational research, does not allow for the same level of causal inference as a true experiment with random assignment of individual participants. Although ANCOVA was used to control for initial differences, unmeasured variables could still exist between the intact class groups. Second, the study was conducted in a single urban middle school, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other populations, such as students in rural or suburban settings, or students from different socioeconomic or cultural backgrounds. Third, the duration of the intervention was eight weeks. While this is a substantial period, it may not be long enough to capture the full, long-term effects of each instructional approach on deeper conceptual change or the retention of knowledge over time. Finally, although teachers were trained and randomly assigned to conditions, it is impossible to completely eliminate the influence of the individual teacher's style and enthusiasm, which may have subtly interacted with the assigned teaching method.

4.4. Recommendations for Future Research

The findings and limitations of this study point to several promising avenues for future research. First, replication studies in different demographic and geographic settings are needed to confirm the generalizability of these findings. Second, future research could explore the long-term effects of these instructional methods through longitudinal studies that track student achievement and attitudes towards mathematics over several years. Third, the advent of digital technology offers new possibilities for instruction. A fruitful line of inquiry would be to compare the effectiveness of physical manipulatives with that of virtual, computer-based manipulatives, which may offer unique advantages in terms of flexibility and accessibility [3]. Fourth, while this study focused on cognitive outcomes (achievement), future research should also investigate the impact of these different methods on affective variables, such as student motivation, engagement, self-efficacy, and attitudes towards geometry [23]. Finally, it would be valuable to conduct similar comparative studies in other areas of mathematics, such as algebra [1] or statistics, to determine whether the relative effectiveness of these instructional models is domain-specific or holds true across the mathematics curriculum.

CONCLUSION

This study embarked on a direct, empirical comparison of four distinct instructional approaches to teaching sixth-grade geometry. The evidence gathered provides a clear and consistent picture: instructional methods that actively engage students with either concrete, physical materials or structured, heuristic problem-solving strategies are associated with significantly more effective promotion of student achievement than either traditional, teacher-centered instruction or minimally guided discovery learning. The findings affirm the value of grounding abstract mathematical concepts in tangible experiences and of explicitly teaching students the cognitive tools they need to be successful problem-solvers.

In an educational landscape often characterized by swinging pendulums of pedagogical fashion, this research offers a moment of clarity. It suggests that the path to improving mathematics education lies not in a binary choice between "traditional" and "progressive" methods, but in a thoughtful, evidence-based selection of specific strategies that are best suited to the content being taught and the cognitive needs of the learner. For the complex and crucial task of teaching geometry, the evidence from this study strongly suggests that putting physical manipulatives and powerful problem-solving heuristics into the hands of students is a demonstrably effective way to build a lasting foundation of mathematical understanding.

REFERENCES

Abonyi, O. S., & Umeh, V. O. (2014). Effects of heuristic method of teaching on students' achievement in algebra. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 5(2), 1735-1740.

Alfieri, L., Brooks, P. J., Aldrich, N. J., & Tenebaum, H. R. (2011). Does Discovery-Based Instruction Enhance Learning? Journal of Educational Psychology, 103(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021017

Baki, A., Kösa, T., & Güven, B. (2011). A comparative study of the effects of using dynamic geometry software and physical manipulatives on the spatial visualization skills of pre-service mathematics teachers. British Journal of Educational Technology, 42(2), 291–310. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.01012.x

Baruiz, M., & Dioso, E. (2023). The use of manipulatives and its effects on the students' mathematics achievement: An experimental study. EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management, 10(8), 55-65. https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14015.

Battista, M. T. (1999). The importance of spatial structuring in geometric reasoning. Teaching Children Mathematics, 6(3), 170-177. https://doi.org/10.5951/TCM.6.3.0170

Bower, C., Zimmermann, L., Verdine, B., Toub, T. S., Islam, S., Foster, L., ... & Golinkoff, R. M. (2020). Piecing together the role of a spatial assembly intervention in preschoolers' spatial and mathematics learning: Influences of gesture, spatial language, and socioeconomic status. Developmental Psychology, 56(4), 686-698. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000899

Carbonneau, K., Marley, S. C., & Selig, J. P. (2012). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of teaching mathematics with concrete manipulatives. Journal of Educational Psychology, 105(2), 380-400. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031084

Clements, D. H. (1999). 'Concrete' manipulatives, concrete ideas. Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 1(1), 45-60. https://doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2000.1.1.7

Clements, D. H., & Battista, M. T. (1992). Geometry and spatial reasoning. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: A project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (pp. 420-464). Macmillan Publishing.

Damjanović, R. (2008). Konkretno iskustvo kao snažan oslonac u formiranju formalnog, apstraktnog mišljenja [Concrete experience as a strong foundation for the development of formal, abstract thinking]. Metodički obzori, 3(2), 35-45.

Diano Jr., F. M., Monterde, N. Y., & Diaz, J. M. (2021). Discovery approach in teaching mathematics among Grade Six Students. Solid State Technology, 64(2), 5157-5162.

Eby, J. W., Herrel, A. L., & Jordan, M. L. (2005). Teaching K-12 schools: A reflective action approach. Prentice Hall.

Gurung, R. K., & Chaudhary, D. K. (2022). Effectiveness of instruction with manipulative materials on fourth graders' geometry learning achievement. Journal of Bhuwanishankar, 1(1), 69-84. https://doi.org/10.3126/jobs.v1i1.49495