

ISSN 2229-6751

RUMINATIONS

*A Peer-Reviewed Bi-Annual International Journal
for Analysis and Research in Humanities
and Social Sciences*

Abstracted & Indexed at- Ulrich, U.S.A.

Approved by: UGC, New Delhi, Sr. No. 1339, Jr. No. 49164

Vol. 10

No. 1

JUNE 2019

Website: ruminationsociety.com

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.25

ICI WORLD
of
JOURNALS



Editor-in-Chief :
Dr. Ram Sharma

Members Editorial Board :
Dr. Elisabetta Marino,
(University dl Roma, Italy)
Dr. Carolyn Heising,
(Iowa State University, Iowa, USA)
Dr. Andre Kukla,
(University of Totanto, Canada)
Dr. Diane M. Rousseau, USA
Dr. Alberto Testa, Argentina
Frank Jousen, Germany
Dr. M. Rajaram,
*Government Arts College,
Karur, Tamil Nadu, India*

ISSN 2229-6751



13. To Compare the Explosive Power between Volleyball and Basketball Player's of Gautam Buddha University
- Surendra Singh 102
14. India and Kyrgyzstan
- Dr. Ashok K. Atri 110
15. "Yoga as a Popular Culture in Literature"
- Dr. Upendra Kumar Soni 122
16. Social Discrimination of Gender: A Blot Regarding Bravely Fought the Queen"
- Shalu Yadav 129
17. Inclusive Education: System-Wide Development
- Kiran Tripathi, Dr. Nidhi Shukla 140
18. Regional Rural Banks, A Strong Financial Help to Weaker Sections of Indian Society
- Dr. Rachna Vats 153
19. Status of Family Planning in India
- Pravin Kumar Gond 165
20. Bama's Femistic Approach in Sangati
- Manu 176
21. Spiritual Intelligence Scale for Teacher Educators
- Rima Dutta and Dr. Sonia Sthapak 182
22. State of Democracy in India - An In-depth Study of the Ancient India
- V.K. Shekhar 192
23. Dalit Literature and Social Emancipation in Contemporary India : Narratives from Arundhati Roy's Selected Writings
- Dr. Ram Sebak Thakur 199
24. Sound of Nature in Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things
- Dr. S. Jayalakshmi, Ms. M. Mercy 211
25. Philosophy of Sarvodaya
- Dr. Pawan Kumar Yadav 217
26. A Study of Academic Performance of Personality of Secondary School Teachers and their Teaching Competency
- Madhuban Sharma 224
27. An Analytical Study of Mathematics Achievement at Secondary School
- Dr. Prakriti James, Sushil Tigga 238

AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT AT SECONDARY SCHOOL

DR. PRAKRITI JAMES

Asst. Prof. (Education Dept.)

Pt. Sundarlal Sharma (Open) University Chhattisgarh, Bilaspur

SUSHIL TIGGA

Research Scholar (Education)

Pt. Sundarlal Sharma (Open) University Chhattisgarh, Bilaspur

Abstract

In this study an attempt is made to know whether the gender, school management and locality of the school have impact on the mathematics achievement of the students at Secondary school level. The sample consisted of 700 students of High school studying in government and private schools of Surguja district in Chhattisgarh. The main objective of the study was to find out the mathematics achievement of High School students. The statistical techniques used were t-test, Standard Deviation and Mean. The findings reveal that there is no significant difference between the achievement of male and female students in Mathematics Achievement. In the same way there is no significant difference between the Mathematics achievement of urban school students and rural school students. But there is significant difference between the Mathematics achievement of government school students and private school students.

INTRODUCTION

Mathematics takes an important place in school curriculum. The reason behind it is the usefulness of mathematics in daily life. All people i.e. young and old, educated and uneducated, literate and illiterate, farmers and business men, labourers and office holders, make use of mathematics in day-to-day life. As a result all the parents wish that their children must study Mathematics in schools. They have great expectation that their children will do better in Mathematics. Yet many students find this subject difficult and also some of them fail in this subject. This is matter of concern. To a great extend, those students who do better in Mathematics, are good in other subjects also. Therefore, mathematics achievement is the key point in school education. It is worthwhile to study about the mathematics achievement of the students with reference to gender, school management and medium of instruction. In the field of education, academic achievement is a vital point. In this world globalization and of industrialization academic excellence is considered as a necessity for qualification. Also the educational status of individual is highly depicted through the academic excellence.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Pandey, Bhairab Datt, (2017) conducted a study on the topic "A Study of Mathematical Achievement of Secondary Schools Students" and found that Male students of class X standard were found better in their mathematics achievement than female students of X class.

Reddy Mahender, and Maddini, Sarsani Ravi, (2010) studied on the topic, "Achievement in Mathematics of Secondary School Students in Selected Variables" and had the following findings - Girls performed better than boys in Mathematics Scholastic Achievement Test. Types of school has influenced on performance on Mathematics Scholastic Achievement. Medium of instruction has influence on the performance in Mathematics Scholastic Achievement.

Pallavi, (2006) found that urban boys and girls were better in educational achievement than rural boys and girls respectively.

Chitkara, M. (2005) did study on the topic "To study the Effectiveness of different Strategies of Teaching on Achievement in

Mathematics in Relation to intelligence, Sex and Personality" and found that boys and girls of superior ability did not show any significant difference between mean scores on achievement in Mathematics.

Norman, (2005) found that boys had more positive attitude towards Science and Mathematics than girls.

Roopalatha, (2003) in his study found that private school children are better than government school children with respect to their abilities of representation and interpretation of geometrical concepts.

Kelly, D.Bradley, (2002) in their study on "The Development of Mathematics Achievement in Secondary School Individual Differences and School Effects" found that Asian American and White students scored higher than their Hispanic and African American counterparts in secondary schools.

Das, R.C.,and Baura, A.P. (2001) did a study on the topic "Effect of Remedial Teaching in Arithmetic, A Study with Grade IV Pupils" and came to conclusion that remedial teaching had improved significantly the achievement of students in Mathematics.

Manika, G.K. (1998) studied on the topic "Acquisition of Concepts in Mathematics of Pupils at Primary School Level and its Relation to some Personal and Environmental Variables of the Pupils" and found that there did not exist sex differences in the acquisition of Mathematical concepts at Primary School level.

Obiedat, (1992) in his study found that there was no significant mean difference between male and female students in mathematics achievements.

Khatoon, Fareeda, (1988) studied on the topic 'A Study of mathematics aptitude among boys and girls and its relationship with interests and vocational preferences at the secondary school level' and found that (i) the boys are superior than girls in Mathematics also boys showed more interest in mathematics as compared to girls.

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS

The following objectives were formulated for the purpose of this paper :

To compare the Mathematics Achievement of male and female

students of High School

To compare the Achievement of Government and Private High School students

To compare the Mathematics Achievement of Urban and Rural High School students

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The following hypotheses were formulated for the purpose of this paper.

- H₀1. There will be no significant difference between the male and female students of High school in Mathematics Achievement.
- H₀2. There will be no significant difference between the Urban and Rural school students of High school in Mathematics achievement.
- H₀3. There will be no significant difference between the Government and Private school students of High school in Mathematics achievement.

METHODOLOGY

Sample : The sample size of the schools is 26 i.e. 13 private schools and 13 government schools and the sample size of the students is 700. 15 male and 15 female students were taken for study from each school. For collecting data, stratified random sampling was used.

Tool : For collecting data "Mathematics Achievement Test" constructed by Dr. Ali Imam and Dr. Tahira Khatoon was used. Or "Mathematics Achievement Test" by Dr. Ali Imam and Dr. Tahira Khatoon was used for measuring the achievement of the students in Mathematics at secondary level.

DATA ANALYSIS

H₀1: There is no significant difference in mathematics achievement between the males and females of secondary schools.

Table 1: Comparison of Mathematics achievement between males and females

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Remarks Significance
Male	319	21.8715	7.63	698	.341	Not Significant
Female	381	21.6824	7.00			

Table 1 reveals that in Mathematics Achievement test the Mean score of males which is 21.871, is higher than the Mean score of females which is 21.6824. It is clear from the table that the calculated t-value is .341. Here degree of freedom is 698. The tabulated t-value at .05 level is 1.94 and at .01 level 2.58 respectively. The calculated t-value is less than the tabulated t-value at both .05 and .01 level. As a result the null hypothesis is accepted.

Therefore it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between males and females performance in Mathematics achievement test.

H_02 . There is no significant difference between the mathematics achievement of urban school students and rural school students.

Table 2: Comparison between Mathematics Achievement and Locality

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Remarks Significance
Urban	326	22.2585	8.3493	698	1.648	Not Significant
Rural	374	21.3476	6.221			

Table 2 reveals that in Mathematics Achievement Test the Mean score of Urban school students which is 22.2585, is higher than Mean score of Rural school students which is 21.3476. It is clear from the table that the calculated t-value is 1.648. Here the degree of freedom is 698. The tabulated t-value at .05 level is 1.96 and at .01 level is 2.58 respectively. The calculated t-value is less than the tabulated t-value at both .05 and .01 level. As a result the null hypothesis is accepted.

Therefore it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between Urban school students' achievement and Rural school students' achievement.

H_03 . There is no significant different between the mathematics achievements of the students of government school students and private school students.

Table 3: Comparison of Mathematics Achievement between Government school and Private school students

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Remarks Significance
Govt.	340	19.367	4.947	698	8.929	Significant
Private	360	24.036	8.355			

Table 3 reveals that in Mathematics Achievement Test the Mean score of private school is 24.036, is higher than Mean score of government school students, which is 19.367. It is clear from the table that the calculated t-value is 8.929. Here degree of freedom is 698. The tabulated t-value at .05 level is 1.96 and at .01 level is 2.58 respectively. The calculated value t-value is more than the tabulated t-value at both .05 and .01 level. As a result null hypothesis is rejected.

Therefore it can be concluded that there is significant difference between achievement of Government school and private school students in Mathematics Achievement test.

CALCULATION

In the light of the above analysis, we come to the following conclusion : From the table 1., it is clear that there is no significant difference between the males' and females' performance in mathematics achievement test. In the same way, the Table 2 shows that there is no significant difference between urban school students' achievement and rural school students' achievement. Table 3 reveals that there is significant difference between achievement of government school and private school students in Mathematics Achievement test. This study though limited in scope, clarifies the mathematics achievement of secondary school students in Surguja. The government schools need to improve in the field of mathematics achievement.

REFERENCES

- Alkhateeb, Haithem M. (2010) Gender differences in Mathematics achievement among high school students in United Arab Emirates. Published doctoral dissertation, Miami University
- B. Karen, (2008), Scientific evidence elated to teaching and learning Mathematics Best, John W. (Tenth Edition) Research in Education,

- Published by Asoke K. Ghosh, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Bhatnagar A.B. (2010), Measurement and Evaluation, R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut.
- Buch, M.B., (1983-1988), Fourth Survey of Research I Education Vol. 1
1 Dissertation Abstract International, Vol. 65, No. 12. April 2005, UMI Publications
- Hapur, J.N. (1988-92), Fifth Survey of Educational Research, Vol. 1
- Hornby A.S. (1986), Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford
- Khatoon, Kareda (1988), A Study of mathematical aptitude among boys and girls and its relationship with its relationship with interest and vocational references at the Secondary school level.
- Kerlinger, Fre N. (1973) Foundations of Behavioural Research, Vikash Publications, New Delhi.
- Koul, Lokesh (2009) Methodology of Educational Research, Vikash publications, New Delhi.
- Mahender reddy Sarsani, Ravi Maddini (2010), Edutracks Vol. 9 No. 6, February 2010. *Achievement in Mathematics of Secondary Students in Selected Variables.*
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Research Committee (2006), the challenges of linking research and practice. Journal for research in Mathematics Education, 37(2). 76-86. Htt//findarticles
- Owens, D.T. (ed.) (1996). Research in mathematics education, 1995. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED402 159
- Pandhari A.S. (1988), A Study of language, memory and progress as Factors affecting students' learning of mathematics in standard XII., Indian Institute of Education, Pune.
- Puran Chand (1988-92), Fifth Survey of Educational Research Vol. II, Abstract International, Vol. 65, No. 12. April 2005, UMI Publications
- Rachna Verma Mohan, (2009), Indian Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 28, No. 1, Jan-June, 2009
- Rao Gauov & Singh Prabha (2009), Indian Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 28, No. 2, July-Dec 2009 Aptitude of Pupil - Teachers

Lakhnow University Towards English As a Medium of Instruction.
Saxena, N.R. (2008), Fundamentals of Educational Research, R. Lall Book
Depot, Meerut.

Sharma, R.A. (2008), Educational Research, R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut.

Singh, Amitabh, (2008) Indian Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 27,
No. 2. July-Dec. 2008

WEBSITES

[Http//findarticles.p.particles/mi-qa3667is-200101/ai-n8941584](http://findarticles.particles/mi-qa3667is-200101/ai-n8941584), Internet
website .ERIC.



ISSN 2250-0561

GLIMPSSES

(A Peer-Reviewed Bi-Annual Refreed International Journal
of Multi Disciplinary Research)

Abstracted & Indexed at- Ulrich, U.S.A.

Vol. 8

No. 1

DECEMBER, 2018 (Suppl.-III)

Website: ruminationsociety.com

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.05

**ICI WORLD
JOURNALS**



ISSN 2250-0561



9 772250 056007

Editor-in-Chief :
Dr. Ram Sharma

26. Learning Style of Students in Relation to their Demographic Variables 261
 – Dr. Prakriti James, Sushil Tigga
27. "Parenting the Naga Cultural Heritage" 270
 – Jessymol MV
28. उत्तराखण्ड में आर्थिक विकास द्वारा अनुसूचित जाति की महिलाओं का सशक्तिकरण 277
 – राधा आर्या, डा. पुष्पेश पाण्डे
29. विभिन्न प्रकार के उत्प्रेरक व प्राथमिक विद्यालय के शिक्षार्थी: एक अध्ययन 282
 – डा. विनोद कुमार
30. भारतीय गणित का इतिहास एवम् प्रसिद्ध शोडष सूत्र 291
 – डा. पूजा सैनी
31. वर्तमान संदर्भ में महात्मा गाँधी के विचारों की प्रासंगिकता 297
 – डा. अशोक कुमार मैन्दोला
32. विद्यार्थियों के अनुशासनिक स्तर का उनके अधिगम स्तर पर पड़ने वाले प्रभावों का अध्ययन 301
 – डा. सुजाया प्रदीप बिजवे, सोनिया रायजदा
33. महिलाओं में रक्तअल्पता – एक अध्ययन 309
 – डा. पूजा पालीवाल
34. मध्य एशिया में ऊर्जा की भू-राजनीति : चीन व भारत की प्रतिस्पर्धा एवं उसके पर्यावरणीय एवं सामाजिक परिणाम 316
 – महेन्द्र कुमार पुरोहित
35. उपाध्याय यशोविजय द्वारा पातंजल योग सूत्रों की समीक्षा 325
 – मनजीत कंवर
36. पिथौरागढ़ जनपद के प्राथमिक शिक्षकों की अध्यापन अभिक्षमता का अध्ययन 331
 – डा. टी.सी. पाण्डेय
37. तेजेंद्र शर्मा की कहानियों में प्रवासी जीवन के अंतर्विरोध 340
 – डा. रहमान मुसव्विर

LEARNING STYLE OF STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

DR. PRAKRITI JAMES

Asst. Prof. (Education Dept.)

Pt. Sundarlal Sharma (Open) University Chhattisgarh, Bilaspur

SUSHIL TIGGA

Research Scholar (Education)

Pt. Sundarlal Sharma (Open) University Chhattisgarh, Bilaspur

ABSTRACT

Individual characteristics of learners which include learning styles play an important role in the study of learners. Here an in-depth study is done about what constitutes learning styles of the students. From the study it has been found that there is no significant difference between the male and female students of High School in the Learning Styles like Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Figural, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive at 0.05 level of significance. But female students have a significantly higher Mean score on Enactive Learning Style compared to male students. There is no significant difference between the urban and rural students of High School in Learning Styles like Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Constructive and Figural. But the urban students have a significantly higher Mean score compared to rural students in Learning Styles such as Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Enactive, Verbal, Reproducing and

Constructive. There is no significant difference between the Government school students and Private school students of High School in the Learning Styles such as Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Constructive, Enactive and Figural. But, Private School students have a significantly higher Mean score compared to Government school students in Learning Styles such as Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive.

INTRODUCTION

Learning styles are kinds of learning or a ways of learning by which the learner easily assimilates his or her study. They are the learning strengths and preferences of students. It may possible that many students adopt the same learning styles or a student chooses one of the learning styles to study and achieve his goal. The student may adopt learning styles which make him easy in study and he may reach his destination by spending less time, power and money. He adopts the styles of learning as per his convenience. Every student has a learning style, but each student's is different – like our fingerprints which come from each person's five fingers and look similar in many ways. He may adopt Learning Styles such as Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Reproducing and Verbal Constructive learning style. Similarly learning styles may be categorized as Visual, Physical, Aural, Verbal, Logical, Social and Solitary Learning style. The learning styles influence the performances of the students. This research seeks to explore whether learning styles of the students differ on the basis of gender, locality of the school and school management.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Albert, Hanci (2016) conducted a study on "Determination of the Relationship between 8th Grade Students Learning Styles and Mathematics Achievement" and found that the most dominant learning style of the students is auditory and the second one is Kinesthetic

learning style.

Zeynel Kablan (2014) studies on "The Effect of Manipulative Achievement across different Learning Styles" and found that Abstract learners showed higher academic performance compared with concrete learners in the environment where only traditional methods were used. The study also showed that concrete learners demonstrated higher performance in Mathematics when manipulative were used than did their counterparts in the environment where only abstract activities were used.

Suntonrapot, Damrongpanit (2014) studies on the topic "An Interaction of learning and teaching styles influencing mathematic achievements of ninth-grade students: A multilevel approach" and gave the following findings : The main results revealed that most students were categorized in the reflector style. Two groups of learning styles had direct effects significantly.

Das, R.C. and Baura, A.P. (2001) did independent study on the topic "Effect of Remedial Teaching in Arithmetic, A Study with Grade IV Pupils" and came to conclusion that remedial teaching had definitely improved significantly the achievement in Mathematics.

Rastogi, S. (1997), did an independent study on the topic "Diagnosis of Weaknesses in Arithmetic as Related to the Arithmetic Skills and Their Remedial Measures" and found that one of the important causes of backwardness in Mathematics was the poor command over basic Arithmetic skills.

Rosley, A. (1992), has found that the attitude of high school students towards the learning of Mathematics and their achievement in Mathematics are highly correlated and that urban boys and girls have more positive attitude towards Mathematics than rural boys and girls. Doshi, P.C. (1989) studied on the topic 'A Study of Achievement and Cognitive Preference Style in Mathematics of Class X' and found that rural female students were more inclined to check the recall style as compared to rural/urban male students.

Khatoon, Fareeda (1988), studied on the topic 'A Study of mathematics aptitude among boys and girls and its relationship with

interests and vocational preferences at the secondary school level' and found that (i) the achievement of boys in mathematics was found to be somewhat superior than that of the girls (based on the marks obtained in mathematics of the class X annual examination) (ii) interest and job preferences tended to be influenced by environmental factors like the occupation of the father (iii) boys showed more interest in mathematics and subjects related to mathematics as compared to girls.

Pandhari, A.S. (1988), has studied the effect of language, memory and process on student's learning of Mathematics. He finds that all these influence learning but the type of the students' institution does not affect learning.

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS

The following objectives were formulated for the purpose of this paper :

- To find out the effect of Learning Styles on High School students
- To compare the Learning Styles of boys and girls of High School
- To compare the Learning Styles of Government and Private High school students

To compare the Learning Styles of Urban and Rural High school students

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The following hypotheses were formulated for the purpose of this paper.

- H₀1. There will be no significant difference between the male and female students of High School in Learning Styles.
- H₀2. There will be no significant difference between the Urban and Rural school students of High School in Learning Styles.
- H₀3. There will be no significant difference between the Government and Private school students of High School in Learning Styles.

METHODOLOGY

Sample : The sample size of the schools is 26 i.e. 13 private schools and 13 government schools and the sample size of the students is 700. For collecting data, stratified random sampling was used.

Tool : For collecting data “Learning Styles Inventory” constructed by Karuna Shankar Mishra was used for studying the effect of learning styles on Mathematics achievement at secondary level.

DATA ANALYSIS

Testing Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the male and female students of High School in Learning Styles

Table 1 : Comparison of Learning Styles of High School Students by Gender

Learning Style	Male (N=326)		Female (N=374)		df	t	Remark
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Enactive Reproducing (ER)	24.17	5.29	25.25	4.29	698	1.034	Not Significant
Enactive Constructive (FC)	25.34	4.38	25.81	4.53		1.400	Not Significant
Figural Reproducing (FR)	22.19	4.26	22.70	4.35		1.57	Not Significant
Figural Constructive (FC)	24.21	4.97	24.45	5.12		0.629	Not Significant
Verbal Reproducing (VR)	24.50	4.42	24.67	4.97		0.448	Not Significant
Verbal Construction (VC)	25.68	6.12	25.99	4.68		0.468	Not Significant
Enactive (ER+EC)	49.80	7.32	51.05	7.35		2.30	Significant
Figural (FR+FC)	47.64	23.93	47.07	8.10		.432	Not Significant
Verbal (VR+VC)	49.84	8.00	50.65	8.31		1.298	Not Significant
Reproducing (ER+FR+VR)	71.24	10.32	72.39	10.92		1.420	Not Significant
Constructive (EC+FC+VC)	74.40	11.77	76.01	12.26		1.761	Not Significant
Total	1.4613E2	20.06	1.4857E2	21.84		1.529	Not Significant

Tabulated t at 0.05 level is 1.96 and at 0.01 level is 2.58. From the Table 1, it can be seen that the obtained t values are less than the tabulated t values at 0.05 level of Significance for the learning styles Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Figural, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is no significant difference between the male and female students of High School in these Learning Styles. But the obtained value for Enactive Learning styles is 2.30 i.e. greater than tabulated t value at 0.05 level.

So, at this level of significant the null hypothesis is rejected. Female students have a significantly higher Mean score on Enactive Learning Style compared to males students.

Testing Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the urban and rural school students of High School in Learning Styles.

Table 2 : Comparison of Learning Styles of High School Students by Locality

Learning Style	Urban (N=356)		Rural (N=344)		df	t	Remark
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Enactive Reproducing (ER)	25.46	4.32	24.67	5.20	698	2.179	Significant
Enactive Constructive (EC)	26.21	4.48	24.95	4.36		3.780	Significant
Figural Reproducing (FR)	22.60	4.55	22.32	4.05		.872	Not Significant
Figural Constructive (FC)	24.65	5.44	24.01	4.59		1.694	Not Significant
Verbal Reproducing (VR)	25.32	4.99	23.83	4.30		4.224	Significant
Verbal Constructive (VC)	25.73	4.59	25.96	6.12		.561	Not Significant
Enactive (ER+EC)	51.62	7.74	49.28	6.74		4.267	Significant
Figural (FR+FC)	47.25	8.52	47.42	23.21		.131	Not Significant
Verbal (VR+VC)	51.03	8.32	49.49	7.95		2.515	Significant
Reproducing (ER+FR+VR)	73.47	11.01	70.18	10.03		4.133	Significant
Constructive (EC+FC+VC)	76.49	12.67	73.99	11.27		2.763	Significant
Total	1.5007E2	21.55	1.4470	20.20		3.399	Significant

Tabulated t at 0.05 level is 1.96 and at 0.01 level is 2.58. From the Table 1, it can be seen that the obtained t values are less than the tabulated t values, for the learning styles Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Constructive and Figural, at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is no significant difference between the urban and rural students of High School in these Learning Styles. But the obtained values are greater than the tabulated values for Learning styles such as Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Enactive, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive at 0.05 level. So, at this level of significant

the null hypothesis is rejected. Urban students have a significantly higher Mean score on these Learning Styles as compared to rural students.

Testing Hypothesis 3 : These is no significant difference between the Government and Private school students of High school in Learning Styles.

Table 3 : Comparison of Learning Styles of High School Students by Management

Learning Style	Government (N = 340)		Private (N = 360)		df	t	Remark
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Enactive Reproducing (ER)	27.27	4.17	25.83	5.19	698	4.358	Significant
Enactive Constructive (EC)	24.90	4.39	26.24	4.43		4.020	Significant
Figural Reproducing (FR)	22.23	4.27	22.68	4.34		1.385	Not Significant
Figural Constructive (FC)	23.96	4.93	24.69	5.14		1.900	Not Significant
Verbal Reproducing (VR)	23.99	4.91	25.14	4.46		3.246	Significant
Verbal Constructive (VC)	25.47	4.39	26.20	6.18		1.805	Not Significant
Enactive (ER+EC)	49.12	7.03	51.74	7.44		4.795	Not Significant
Figural (FR+FC)	46.07	7.80	48.53	22.94		1.871	Not Significant
Verbal (VR+VC)	49.40	7.91	51.10	8.34		2.759	Significant
Reproducing (ER+FR+VR)	70.24	10.49	73.38	10.60		3.933	Significant
Constructive (EC+FC+VC)	73.78	11.55	76.66	12.36		3.179	Significant
Total	1.4438E2	20.69	1.5032E2	21.02		3.762	Significant

Tabulated t at 0.05 level is 1.96 and at 0.01 level is 2.58. From the Table 1, it can be seen that the obtained t values are less than the tabulated t values, for the learning styles Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Constructive, Enactive and Figural, at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is no significant difference between the Government school students and Private school students of High School in these Learning Styles. But the obtained values are greater than the tabulated values for Learning styles such as Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Verbal

Reproducing, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive at 0.05 level. So, at this level of significant the null hypothesis is rejected. Private School students have a significantly higher Mean score on these Learning Styles as compared to Government school students.

CALCULATION

In the light of the above analysis, we come to the following conclusion : From the Table 1, it can be seen that the obtained t values are less than the tabulated t values at 0.05 level of Significance for the learning styles Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Figural, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is no significant difference between the male and female students of High School in these Learning Styles. But the obtained value for Enactive Learning is greater than tabulated t value. As a result female students have a significantly higher Mean score on Enactive Learning Style compared to male students. From the Table 2, it concluded that the obtained t values are less than the tabulated t value, for the learning styles i.e. Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Constructive and Figural learning Style. Hence there is no significant difference between the urban and rural students of High School in these Learning Styles. But the obtained values are greater than the tabulated value for Learning styles such as Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Enactive, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive Learning Style. Therefore, urban students have a significantly higher Mean score on these Learning Styles as compared to rural students. From the Table 3, it is concluded that the obtained t values are less than the tabulated t values, for the learning styles Figural Reproducing, Figural Constructive, Verbal Constructive, Enactive Learning Style. Hence there is no significant difference between the Government school students and Private school students of High School in these Learning Styles. But the obtained values are greater than the tabulated value for Learning styles such as Enactive Reproducing, Enactive Constructive, Verbal Reproducing, Verbal, Reproducing and Constructive Learning Style at 0.05 level. So, Private School students have a significantly higher Mean

score on these Learning Styles as compared to Government school students.

REFERENCES

- Arya, Mohan Lal (2017) *Learning and Teaching*, R, Lal Book Depot, Meerut.
- Best, John W. (Tenth Edition) *Research in Education*, Published by Asoke K. Ghosh, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Bhatnagar A.B. (2010), *Measurement and Evaluation*, R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut.
- Khatoon, Kareda (1988), *A Study of mathematical aptitude among boys and girls and its relationship with its relationship with interest and vocational references at the Secondary school level.*
- Kerlinger, Fre N. (1973) *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, Vikash Publications, New Delhi.
- Koul, Lokesh (2009) *Methodology of Educational Research*, Vikash Publications, New Delhi.
- Pandhari A.S. (1988), *A Study of language, memory and progress as Factors affecting students' learning of mathematics in standard XII.*, Indian Institute of Education, Pune.
- Pandya, Shefali R. (2010) *Learning and Teaching Styles* S.B. Nangia A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, New Delhi
- Puran Chand (1988-92), *Fifth Survey of Educational Research* Vol. II, Abstract International, Vol. 65, No. 12. April 2005, UMI Publications
- Rachna Verma Mohan, (2009), *Indian Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Jan-June, 2009
- Rao Gauov & Singh Prabha (2009), *Indian Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 28, No. 2, July-Dec 2009 Aptitude of Pupil – Teachers Lakhnow University Towards English As a Medium of Instruction
- Saxena, N.R. (2008), *Fundamentals of Educational Research*, R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut.
- Sharma, R.A. (2008), *Educational Research*, R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut.
- Singh, Amitabh, (2008) *Indian Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 27, No. 2. July-Dec. 2008.