

A STUDY ON LEARNING STYLES OF BCom PA STUDENTS IN COIMBATORE

Dr. K.Vidyakala¹

Dr. Nithyakala²

Dr. J.Deepa³

K.Geerthana⁴

P.Nandhini⁵

Abstract:

“Learning Styles” has been regarded as one of the most important factors that controls the way of people learning. There is also a propensity to match students learning styles to the teaching styles of concerned teachers. There is a strong tendency for teachers and course designers to pay closer attention to students learning styles.

Key words: Learning styles

¹ HoD, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

² Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

⁴ BBA Student, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

⁵ Research Scholar (FT), Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Introduction:

Every student prefers different learning styles and techniques. Learning styles group common ways that the people learn. Everybody has a mix of learning styles. Some people identify that they use dominant style of learning, whereas others find that they use different learning styles in different circumstances. One can develop ability in less dominant styles, as well as further develop styles that were already used. Using multiple learning styles and “multiple intelligences” for learning is a relatively new approach. Educators only have started to recognize this kind of approach. Traditional schooling used (and continues to use) mainly linguistic and logical teaching methods. It also uses a limited range of learning and teaching techniques. Many schools still rely on classroom and book-based teaching, much repetition, and pressured exams for reinforcement and review. A result is that it is often labeled that those who use these learning styles and techniques find themselves as “bright.” Those who use less favored learning styles often find themselves in lower classes. This can create positive and negative spirals that reinforce the belief that one is “smart” or “dumb.” By recognizing and understanding one’s own learning styles, and can use techniques better suited. This improves the speed and quality of the learning

Objectives of the Study:

- To analyze learning styles of among professional accounting students

Research Methodology

The analysis of this paper is based on primary data collected from students and secondary data collected from the related websites, books and articles from different journals.

Review of Literature:

Rahmani (2012) analyzed the relationship between learning style of high school girl students and their academic achievement. The target population was 350 high school girls, selected by multi-stage sampling method. Chi square analysis and correlation was used and results showed that sensing intuitive learning style had significant correlation with academic achievement.

Mohr et.al. (2012) investigated as to how far individual’s preferences for a particular learning style are associated with the perceived usefulness of e-learning among 953 students. The findings revealed the effect of individual’s learning styles as well as their

gender and professional experience on the perceived usefulness of different forms of e-learning. The study contributes to the empirical basis on the relevance of learning styles in the design of virtual learning environments.

Albina (2013) analyzed the Learning Styles and Academic Achievement of High School Students. The study investigated whether there is any significant relationship between academic achievement and linguistic, logical, spatial, musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal and intrapersonal learning styles of the students. Random sampling technique was adopted. The sample size was found to be 250 students. Mean, Standard Deviation, 't' test and Product Moment Correlation were the statistical techniques used. The results indicates that there is no significant difference between boys and girls in their linguistic, logical, spatial, musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal and intrapersonal learning styles.

Zaini (2014) analyzed the transfer of education system from the traditional approach to Outcome Based Education. A total of 19 students participated in the study, 17 female and 2 male. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used for the study. The results concluded that, in general the students rated a high percentage of good rating in relation of their academic achievement to the program outcomes

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

Visual Learning Styles

Analysis of Visual Learning Styles of BCOM PA According to the Personal Profile of the Respondents

BCOM PA							
VISUAL		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	.218	3	.073	.224	.879	NS
	Within groups	54.730	169	.324			
	Total	54.948	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	3.266	7	.467	1.490	.174	NS
	Within groups	51.682	165	.313			

	Total	54.948	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	.002	1	.002	.007	.932	NS
	Within groups	54.946	171	.321			
	Total	54.948	172				
Year of study	Between groups	1.693	2	.847	2.703	.070	NS
	Within groups	53.255	170	.313			
	Total	54.948	172				
Medium of Instruction in School	Between groups	.007	1	.007	.021	.884	NS
	Within groups	54.941	171	.321			
	Total	54.948	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	.256	4	.064	.196	.940	NS
	Within groups	54.692	168	.326			
	Total	54.948	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	.740	2	.370	1.161	.316	NS
	Within groups	54.208	170	.319			
	Total	54.948	172				

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Thus from the above table it is concluded that the Personal profile of the respondents does not influence the visual learning styles.

Auditory Learning Styles

Analysis of Auditory Learning Styles of BCOM PA

BCOM PA							
AUDITORY		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	1.394	3	.465	1.000	.394	NS
	Within groups	78.525	169	.465			
	Total	79.919	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	6.334	7	.905	2.029	.054	S
	Within groups	73.585	165	.446			
	Total	79.919	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	.386	1	.386	.830	.364	NS
	Within groups	79.533	171	.465			
	Total	79.919	172				
Year of study	Between groups	4.004	2	2.002	4.483	.013	S
	Within groups	75.915	170	.447			
	Total	79.919	172				
Medium of Instruction in School	Between groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.987	NS
	Within groups	79.919	171	.467			
	Total	79.919	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	1.068	4	.267	.569	.685	NS
	Within groups	78.851	168	.469			
	Total	79.919	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	.837	2	.419	.900	.409	NS

	Within groups	79.082	170	.465			
	Total	79.919	172				

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 except „mother tongue and year of study“ where in mother tongue $F=2.02, p<0.05$ indicates that the significant value is 0.05 and the „year of study“ $F=4.48, P<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.01. Thus from the above table it is concluded that there is significant difference between mother tongue, year of study of the respondents in auditory learning styles.

Kinesthetic learning styles

Table No.4.3.3: Analysis of Kinesthetic

BCOM PA							
KINESTHETIC		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	1.664	3	.555	1.645	.181	NS
	Within groups	57.006	169	.337			
	Total	58.671	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	2.845	7	.406	1.201	.305	NS
	Within groups	55.826	165	.338			
	Total	58.671	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	.105	1	.105	.306	.581	NS
	Within groups	58.566	171	.342			
	Total	58.671	172				
Year of study	Between groups	1.867	2	.933	2.794	.064	NS
	Within groups	56.804	170	.334			
	Total	58.671	172				

Medium of Instruction in School	Between groups	.588	1	.588	1.732	.190	NS
	Within groups	58.082	171	.340			
	Total	58.671	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	.394	4	.098	.284	.888	NS
	Within groups	58.277	168	.347			
	Total	58.671	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	.590	2	.295	.863	.424	NS
	Within groups	58.081	170	.342			
	Total	58.671	172				

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Thus from the above table it is concluded that the Personal profile of the respondents does not influence the kinesthetic learning styles.

Read and Write learning styles

Table No.4.3.4: Analysis of Read and Write

BCOM PA							
READ AND WRITE		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	.816	3	.272	.577	.631	NS
	Within groups	79.704	169	.472			
	Total	80.520	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	7.541	7	1.077	2.436	.021	S
	Within groups	72.979	165	.442			
	Total	80.520	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	.112	1	.112	.237	.627	NS
	Within groups	80.409	171	.470			
	Total	80.520	172				
Year of study	Between groups	4.695	2	2.348	5.264	.006	S
	Within groups	75.825	170	.446			
	Total	80.520	172				
Medium of Instruction in School	Between groups	.261	1	.261	.557	.457	NS
	Within groups	80.259	171	.469			
	Total	80.520	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	1.402	4	.350	.744	.563	NS
	Within groups	79.119	168	.471			
	Total	80.520	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	1.015	2	.508	1.085	.340	NS
	Within groups	79.505	170	.468			
	Total	80.520	172				

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 except „mother tongue“ where in mother tongue $F=2.43, P<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.02 and „year of study“ where in year of study $F=5.26, P<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.05. Thus from the above table it is concluded that there is significant difference between mother tongue, year of study of the respondents in read and write learning styles.

CONCLUSION:

Visual learning style has highly influenced all the three years of Bcom PA students. This study suggests that the teachers to show attractive learning videos with more clarity related to their subjects using tools like „Adobe Spark“ and „Flash Cards“. Teachers should encourage students to practice self-reflection which will improve both their intrapersonal and interpersonal communication skills. The present study found students are highly involved in doing rather than reading directions. So teachers can conduct frequent quizzes, crosswords inside the classroom to effectively engage the students. Read/write learning styles suggests students to write down the things to remember what they are learning, thus teachers can encourage students to do mind map after each session inside the classroom. Teachers can use gamification of learning approach to motivate students to learn by using game elements in learning environment. More activities in relation to improving communication skills both verbal and written can be suggested by the faculty to students. Students can be encouraged to participate in competitions, seminars and to present papers.