

A Study on “Relationship between Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence among Government Higher Secondary School Students”

Gomathi. P¹ and Dr. K.C. Bindhu²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Education, Mother Teresa Women’s University, Kodaikanal, Tamil Nadu, India.

²Professor and Head, Research Scholar, Department of Education, Mother Teresa Women’s University, Kodaikanal, Tamil Nadu, India.

Received: 05-09-2024, Revised: 16-10-2024, Accepted: 13-11-2024

ABSTRACT

Language learning depends on effective reading and the reasoning ability. It is understanding reasoning using concepts framed in words. It aims at evaluating ability to think constructively rather than at simple. It is important in most aspects of school work. Reading and language arts tasks required Language learning skills. Even the more abstract such as mathematics and physics require Language learning skills, as most concepts are either introduced orally by the teacher or introduced in written form in textbook. Language learning is typically assisted in a full intelligence tests and languages assessment. The proficiency in a language can be influenced by the verbal capacity one has developed in the particular language. Several researches have shown that the linguistic minded children easily acquire a new language. The Differential Aptitude Test (DAT) developed by the investigator has been helpful to identify the aptitude of children for different activities. One of the tests of Differential Aptitude Tests namely Test of Language learning has been shown to predict language attainment of individuals through several research studies. Therefore, the investigator has included Language learning as the variable in the present investigation.

Key Words: Language learning and Differential Aptitude Test.

INTRODUCTION

Consequently achievement involves using the skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing at a level of mastery. It includes the ability to use the language in different ways and in different situations, which correspond to real life. That is the proper situational use of the language is stated to be the hallmark of these achievement in English. It stresses the fact that language is situation based and functions of the language are properly met and tackled with the help of the language, it is possible for the beginner to locate and pick the appropriate language that is, the functional language from the situation and use of the same in his situations. This cyclic process in language use and language acquisition explains the fact that language is not only situation based but also individual oriented.

When there are hundreds and thousands of situations demanding the use of language in one's day life, equivocally in hundred and thousands of ways the individuals differ from one another in their perception, conception and execution of the language learnt. Therefore the researcher has conceptualized that situational factors or environment oriented factors and individual oriented factors may with all probability influence one's achievement in English. These two types of factors give rise to three categories of achievement variables namely, organismic variables, psycho-socio variables, and environmental variables. The organismic factors are something permanent and born with an individual, the psycho-social

characteristics of an individual may have the seed at the time of birth, but may be developed differently due to the difference in organismic characteristic as well as the type of environment available for him from the time of birth. A study of the psychological and sociological characteristics of the individuals has enabled the investigator to identify cognitive characteristic that seem to have influence on achievement in English and Learning Style.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

To develop reading skills, individual instruction and increased practice opportunities are desirable. The computer is the most used tool for providing instructional strategies and individualizing instruction. English is the world's widely spoken language, which is the common means of communication between people of different nationalities. Although 20% of the school time is spent on the teaching of English, most of our pupils have a weak foundation in the language. While talking about the teaching of English we have a weak foundation in the language. While talking about the teaching of English we have to bear in mind that in India, it is being taught as a foreign language. So far as the teaching of mother tongue or regional language is concerned, a child learns a lot from the environment. But for the learning of a foreign language such an environment needs to be created, hence the disparity of achievement in the learning of English. The present study received its impetus from the optimistic assumption that even in the face of unfavorable circumstances, it is possible to develop acquisition of the basic skills- LSRW-at least to a 'minimal adequate' extent provided a sincere, whole hearted effort is made. The present study examines the effect of cognitive variable Language learning on achievement of Government Higher Secondary students in English. By the time the student reaches class IX, he/she will have acquired the ability to think independently.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

"A STUDY ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNING STYLE AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG GOVERNMENT HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS."

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To find out the level of Language learning of Government Higher Secondary students.
2. To find out the level of Language learning of Government Higher Secondary students with reference to background variables such as sex, locality of school, type of school and nature of school.
3. To find out whether there is any significant difference between boys and girls Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
4. To find out whether there is any significant difference between rural schools and urban schools Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
5. To find out whether there is any significant difference between Hostler and Day- scholar Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
6. To find out whether there is any significant difference between Tamil Medium and English Medium Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
7. To find out whether there is any significant difference between Nuclear family and Joint family Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
8. To find out whether there is any significant difference among Boys, Girls, and Co-education Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.

9. To find out whether there is any significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
10. To find out whether there is any significant difference among SC/ST, MBC, BC and OC Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
11. To find out whether there is any significant association between father's occupation and Achievement in English. of Government Higher Secondary students.
12. To find out whether there is any significant association between father's education and Achievement in English. of Government Higher Secondary students.
13. To find out whether there is any significant association between mother's occupation and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
14. To find out whether there is any significant association between mother's education and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
15. To find out whether there is any significant relationship between Language learning and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
16. To find out whether there is any significant relationship between Language learning and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students with reference to background variables such as Sex, Locality of school, Accommodation, Medium of Instruction, and Type of Family.

NULL HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant difference between boys and girls Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
2. There is no significant difference between rural school and urban school Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
3. There is no significant difference between Hostler and Day-scholar Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
4. There is no significant difference between Tamil medium and English medium Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
5. There is no significant difference between Nuclear family and Join family Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
6. There is no significant difference among Boys, Girls, and Co- education schools Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
7. There is no significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
8. There is no significant difference among SC/ST, MBC, BC and OC Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
9. There is no significant association between father's occupation and Language learning of Government Higher Secondary students.
10. There is no significant association between father's education and Language learning of Government Higher Secondary students
11. There is no significant association between mother's occupation and Language learning of Government Higher Secondary students.
12. There is no significant association between mother's education and Language learning of Government Higher Secondary students.
13. There is no significant association between boys and girls Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
14. There is no significant difference between rural and urban school Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
15. There is no significant difference between Hostler and Day-scholar Government Higher

Secondary students in their Achievement in English.

16. There is no significant difference between Tamil medium and English medium Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
17. There is no significant difference between Nuclear family and Joint family of Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
18. There is no significant difference among Boys, Girls, and Co- education schools Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
19. There is no significant difference among among Hindu, Christian and Muslim Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
20. There is no significant difference among SC/ST, MBC, BC and OC Government Higher Secondary students in their Achievement in English.
21. There is no significant association between father's occupation and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
22. There is no significant association between father's education and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
23. There is no significant association between mother's occupation and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
24. There is no significant association between mother's education and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
25. There is no significant relationship between Language learning and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students.
26. There is no significant relationship between Language learning and Achievement in English of Government Higher Secondary students with reference to background variables such as Sex, Locality of School, Accommodation, Medium of Instruction, and Type of Family.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The main limitations of the study are

1. Only Government Higher Secondary students are taken for the study.
2. Achievement in English is noted from the Quarterly examination English mark.
3. The Sample has been limited to 304 Government Higher Secondary students in Vellore Educational District.
4. Questionnaire was the only tool used in this study.

METHOD USED FOR THE STUDY

The investigator has adopted survey method of research to study the Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students. Survey research is a procedure in which information is systematically collected from a population through some form of direct solicitation such as face to face interview, administering questionnaire or schedule.

TOOLS USED IN THE PRESENT STUDY

Suitable tools are used for collecting the data required for the study. The selection of suitable tools is necessary for successful research. The investigator can use one or more tools for a single study. The nature of the tools depends on the nature of the problem under investigation and the sample of the study. By keeping the various objectives of the study in mind, here the investigator used the following tools for data collection.

Tools

- 1) Personal data sheet
- 2) Learning Style questionnaire
- 3) Artificial Intelligence

DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOLS

The personal data sheet

It includes 17 items of general information about the respondents regarding their name of the school, sex, medium, location of the school, family type, accommodation, religion, father's education, mother's education, father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's income and mother's income. Out of this 15 items except item number 1 & 15 which are necessarily to be open type, all other 13 items are prepared in the closed form type giving chance of two or three options

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE

Artificial Intelligence Scale developed by the Investigator and the Guide, (2021). This tool consists of 50 questions, and each question has one mark.

POPULATION

According to John W. Best and James V. Kahn (1992), "a population is any group of individuals that have one or more characteristics in common that are of interest to the researcher. The population may be all the individuals of a particular type, or a more restricted part of that group". The population for the present study consists of all the Government Higher Secondary students in Vellore Educational District.

SAMPLE

The investigator stratified the schools in Vellore Educational district according to their Nature (Boys, Girls and Co - education). From the Government Higher Secondary students of these schools the investigator randomly selected 117 students from boys' schools, 167 students from girls' schools and 20 students from co-education schools.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE TOOLS

A well-planned programme, by the investigator helped him to collect the required data in an orderly manner. With prior permission of heads of institutions, the investigator visited government schools in Vellore Educational District. The investigator, after a self-introduction and thereby building rapport with students, explained to them the purpose of the research and encouraged them to be free and frank while giving responses. The tools were distributed to 304 Government Higher Secondary students of Vellore Educational District. The time allotted to complete the questionnaire was about 40 minutes. Doubts raised by students regarding certain terms were cleared. The responses of the students were carefully scored and tabulated for statistical analysis.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

Depending upon the objectives and the nature of the hypotheses of the study the investigator used the following statistical techniques for analyzing and interpreting the data.

1. Percentage Analysis, 2. Arithmetic Mean, 3. Standard Deviation (SD), 4. 't'-test,
5. ANOVA, 6. Chi-Square Test, 7. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation

OBJECTIVE TESTING PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

Objective-1

To find out the level of Learning style of Government Higher Secondary School Students

TABLE: 1

LEVEL OF LEARNING STYLE OF GOVERNMENT HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Variable	Low		Average		High	
Learning style	N	%	N	%	N	%
	67	22.0	17.0	55.9	67	22.0

It is inferred from the above table that 22.0% of the Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 55.9% of them have average and 22.0% of them have high level of Learning style.

Objective-2: To find out the level of Learning style of Government Higher Secondary School Students with reference to background variables such as sex, locality of school, type of school and Nature of School.

TABLE: 2
LEVEL OF LEARNING STYLE OF GOVERNMENT HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOLSTUDENTSWITHREFERENCETOBACKGROUNDVARIABLES

S.No	Background Variables	Categories	Low		Average		High	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Sex	Boys	29	21.8	66	49.6	38	28.6
		Girls	38	22.2	104	60.8	29	17.0
2.	Locality of school	Rural	22	17.2	97	75.8	9	7.0
		Urban	45	25.6	73	41.5	58	33.0
3.	Type of school	Government	46	23.4	129	65.5	22	11.2
		Aided	19	25.0	28	36.8	29	38.2
		Unaided	2	6.5	13	41.9	16	51.6
4.	Nature of school	Boys	28	23.9	60	51.3	29	24.8
		Girls	36	21.6	104	62.3	27	16.2
		Co-education	3	15.0	6	30.0	11	55.0

It is inferred from the above table that 21.8%, of IX standard boys have low, 49.6% of them have average and 28.6% of them have high level of Learning style. 22.2% of IX standard girls have low, 60.8% of them have average and 17.0% of them have high level of Learning style. It is inferred from the above table that 17.2% of rural school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 75.8% of them have average and 7.0% of them have high level of Learning style. 25.6% of urban school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 41.5% of them have average and 33.0% of them have high level of Learning style.

Objective-3

To find out the level of Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary School Students.

TABLE: 3: LEVEL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE OF GOVERNMENT HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Variable	Low		Average		High	
Artificial Intelligence	N	%	N	%	N	%
	63	20.7	176	57.9	65	21.4

It is inferred from the above table that 20.7%, of the Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 57.9% of them have average and 21.4% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence.

Objective-4: To find out the level of Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary School Students with reference to background variables such as sex, locality of school, type of school and nature of school.

TABLE 4**LEVEL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE OF GOVERNMENT HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH REFERENCE TO BACKGROUND VARIABLES**

S. No	Background Variables	Categories	Low		Average		High	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Sex	Boys	28	21.1	72	54.1	33	24.8
		Girls	35	20.5	104	60.8	32	18.7
2.	Locality of School	Rural	33	25.8	83	64.8	12	9.4
		Urban	30	17.0	93	52.8	53	30.1
3.	Type of School	Government	52	26.4	121	61.4	24	12.2
		Aided	11	14.5	37	48.7	28	36.8
		Unaided	0	0	18	58.1	13	41.9
4.	Nature of School	Boys	26	22.2	63	53.8	28	23.9
		Girls	33	19.8	102	61.1	32	19.2

		Co- education	4	20.0	11	55.0	5	25.0
--	--	------------------	---	------	----	------	---	------

It is inferred from the above table that 21.1%, of IX standard boys have low, 54.1% of them have average and 24.8% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence. 20.5% of IX standard girls have low, 60.8% of them have average and 18.7% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence.

It is inferred from the above table that 25.8%, of rural school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 64.8% of them have average and 9.4% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence. 17.0% of urban school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 52.8% of them have average and 33.1% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence.

It is inferred from the above table that 26.4%, of Government school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 61.4% of them have average and 12.2% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence. 14.5% of Aided school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 48.7% of them have average and 38.8% of them have high level of Learning style. .0% of unaided school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 58.1% of them have average and 41.9% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence.

It is inferred from the above table that 22.2%, of boys school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 53.8% of them have average and 23.9% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence. 19.8% of Girls school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 61.1% of them have average and 19.2% of them have high level of Learning style. 20.0% of Co-education school Government Higher Secondary School Students have low, 55.0% of them have average and 25.0% of them have high level of Artificial Intelligence.

CORRELATION ANALYSIS:

Null hypothesis-12

There is no significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary School Students.

TABLE: 4.29:

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNING STYLE AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE OF GOVERNMENT HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Variables	N	Calculated " γ " value	Remarks at 5% level
Learning style	304	0.748	S
Artificial Intelligence	304		

(At 5% level of significance, for $\text{df} = 304$ the table value of γ^* is 0.113)

It is inferred from the above table that there is significant correlation between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary School Students.

Null hypothesis-13

There is no significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary School Students with reference to background variables.

TABLE: 4.30
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNING STYLE AND ARTIFICIAL
INTELLIGENCE OF GOVERNMENT HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
STUDENTS WITH REFERENCE TO BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Background Variables	Categories	N	Calculated γ^2 values	Table values	Remarks
Gender	Boys	133	.762	.159	S
	Girls	171	.733	.138	S
Locality of School	Rural	128	.633	.159	S
	Urban	176	.799	.138	S
Accommodation	Hostler	66	.775	.232	S
	Day-scholar	238	.739	.113	S
Medium of Instruction	Tamil Medium	273	.739	.113	S
	English Medium	31	.719	.325	S
Types of family	Nuclear family	238	.738	.113	S
	Join family	21	.845	.413	S

1. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard boys students.
2. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard Girls students.
3. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard rural schools students.

4. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard urban schools students.
5. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard hostler students.
6. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard day-scholar students.
7. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard Tamil medium students.
8. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard English medium students.
9. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard Nuclear family students.
10. It is inferred from the above table that there is significant relationship between Learning style and Artificial Intelligence of IX standard Joint family students.

FINDINGS, INTERPRETATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

FINDINGS FROM OBJECTIVES

1. 22.0% of Government Higher Secondary students in Vellore Educational District have high level of Learning Style.
2. High level of Learning Style of Government Higher Secondary students with reference to background variables.
 - i. 28.6% and 17.0% of boys and girls Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Learning Style respectively.
 - ii. 7.0% and 33.0% of rural and urban schools Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Learning Style respectively.
 - iii. 11.2%, 38.2% and 51.6% of government schools, aided schools and unaided schools of Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Learning Style respectively.
 - iv. 24.8%, 16.2% and 55.0% of boys school, girls school and Co-education Schools of Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Learning Style respectively.
3. 21.4% of Government Higher Secondary students in Vellore Educational District have high level of Artificial Intelligence.
4. High level of Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students with reference to Background variables.
 - i. 24.8% and 18.7% of boys and girls Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Artificial Intelligence respectively.
 - ii. 9.4% and 30.1% of rural and urban schools Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Artificial Intelligence respectively.
 - iii. 12.2%, 36.8% and 41.9% of government school, aided school and unaided school Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Artificial Intelligence respectively.
 - iv. 23.9%, 19.2% and 25.0% of boys school, girls school and Co-education school of Government Higher Secondary students have high level of Artificial Intelligence respectively.

FINDINGS FROM HYPOTHESES

1. The „t“ test reveals that there is no significant difference between boys and girls Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style.
2. The „t“ test reveals that there is significant difference between rural schools and urban schools Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style. While comparing

the mean scores the urban schools students ($M=28.99$) are better than rural school students ($M=27.02$) in their Learning Style.

3. The „t“ test reveals that there is significant difference between Hosteller and Day- scholar Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style. While comparing the mean scores the Hosteller students ($M=30.05$) are better than Day- scholar students ($M=27.64$) in their Learning Style.
4. The „t“ test reveals that there is significant difference between Tamil medium and English medium Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style. While comparing the mean scores the English medium Government Higher Secondary students ($M=32.81$) are better than Tamil medium Government Higher Secondary students ($M=27.64$) in their Learning Style.
5. The „t“ test reveals that there is significant difference between Nuclear family and join family Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style. While comparing the mean scores Nuclear family Government Higher Secondary students ($M=28.50$) are better than Joint family Government Higher Secondary students ($M=23.62$) in their Learning Style.
6. The „F“ test reveals that there is no significant difference among Boys, Girls, and Co-education school Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style
7. The „F“ test reveals that there is significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style. While comparing the mean scores Muslim students (31.75) are better than the Christian (30.58) and Hindu Government Higher Secondary students (27.46) in their Learning Style.
8. The „F“ test reveals that there is significant difference among SC/ST, MBC, BC and OC Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style. While comparing the mean scores OC students (31.77) are better than SC/ST (25.30), MBC (29.05), and BC Government Higher Secondary students (29.65) in their Learning Style.
9. The „ χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between father’s occupation and Learning Style of Government Higher Secondary students
10. The „ χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between father’s education and Learning Style of Government Higher Secondary students.
11. The „ χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between mother’s occupation and Learning Style of Government Higher Secondary students.
12. The „ χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between mother’s education and Learning Style of Government Higher Secondary students.
13. The „t“ test reveals that there is no significant difference between boys and girls Government Higher Secondary students in their Artificial Intelligence.
14. The „t“ test reveals that there is significant difference between rural and urban school Government Higher Secondary students in their Artificial Intelligence. While comparing the mean scores the urban school Government Higher Secondary students ($M=28.99$) are better than rural school Government Higher Secondary students ($M=27.02$) in their Artificial Intelligence.
15. The „t“ test reveals that there is no significant difference between Hostler and Day- scholar students of Government Higher Secondary students in their Artificial Intelligence.
16. The „F“ test reveals that there is no significant difference among Boys, Girls, and Co-education school Government Higher Secondary students in their Artificial Intelligence.
17. The „F“ test reveals that there is significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim Government Higher Secondary students in their Artificial Intelligence. While comparing the mean scores Muslim students (57.92) are better than the Christian (47.94) and Hindu Government Higher Secondary students (44.28) in their Artificial Intelligence.

18. The ,F“ test reveals that there is significant difference among SC/ST, MBC, BC and OC Government Higher Secondary students in their Artificial Intelligence. While comparing the mean scores OC students (58.90) are better than SC/ST (38.00), MBC (46.02), and BC students (49.16) in their Artificial Intelligence.
19. The χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between father’s occupation and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students.
20. The, χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between father’s education and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students.
21. The , χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between mother’s occupation and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students
22. The , χ^2 “ test reveals that there is significant association between mother’s education and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students.
23. The γ “ test reveals that there is significant relationship between Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students. The “ γ ” test reveals that there is significant relationship between Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students with reference to background variables such as Gender, Medium of Instruction, Locality of School, Types of Family.

INTERPRETATIONS

The “t” test reveals that there is significant difference between rural and urban Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. While comparing the mean scores the urban school students are better than the rural school students in their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. This may be due to fact that the urban schools provide all the needed facilities for the students and the medium of instruction is English in almost all the schools. There is always a stiff competition between the urban schools when it comes to academic performance this competition results in urban school students get in pressured to perform well and the students also perform under pressure.

The “t” test reveals that there is significant difference between Hostler and Day- scholar Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style. While comparing the mean scores the Hostel students are better than the Day-scholar students in their Learning Style. This may be due to fact that the hostler have greater opportunity to interact with their class friends of different personalities than the day scholar and they are having group discussion, because of staying in same place they share their information with their friends this helps them to learn new vocabulary.

The “t” test reveals that there is significant difference between Tamil medium Government Higher Secondary students and English medium Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. While comparing the mean scores the English medium Government Higher Secondary students are better than the Tamil medium Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. This may be due to the fact that the entire curriculum of the English medium students is in English which enable them to improve their vocabulary. The infrastructure available in the English medium schools are excellent when compare to Tamil medium schools. This also contributes to the overall superior achievement performance of the English medium students.

The “F” test reveals that there is significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. While comparing the mean scores the Government Higher Secondary Muslim students are

better than the Government Higher Secondary Christian and Hindu students in their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. This may be due to the fact that the faith they profess, the belief they uphold, the religious practices they follow and importantly community affiliation color their development of Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence.

The “F” test reveals that there is significant difference among SC/ST, MBC, BC and OC Government Higher Secondary students is their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. While comparing the mean scores the Government Higher Secondary OC students are better than SC/ST, MBC and BC Government Higher Secondary students in their Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence. This may be due to the fact that the Government eligible marks for the OC students are higher than the other caste students. This makes OC students to perform well in their academics, keeping this carrier prospects in mind and this also results in their Learning Style skills naturally enhanced.

Chi- square test reveals that significant association is observed between Learning Style, Artificial Intelligence and the parent’s education. This may be due to the fact that the values given by the parents and family environment influence their children and also educated parents will always give special care to their children to solve their problems and encourage their activities for achievement.

Chi- square test reveals that significant association is observed between the Learning Style, Artificial Intelligence and parent’s occupation. This may be due to the fact that the employed parents know the values of education. They may motivate and encourage their children to score high marks and they could afford to send their children for private tuition.

The correlation analysis shows that there is significant relationship between Learning Style and Artificial Intelligence of Government Higher Secondary students. This may be due to the fact that the students are very eager to study. They keep their family situation in their mind and they work hard to improve their Vocabulary knowledge as well as to increase their Artificial Intelligence. Many students go for special classes and tuition to improve their studies and they may have more understanding capacity and English fluency.

The understanding capacity of the Government Higher Secondary students is excellent which in turn makes them to achieve well in English learning. Teachers, generally teach before a live audience, that is the students. The active presence of the student in the classroom where the class is being taught is one of the crucial factors in assessing whether the content that was delivered by the teacher was understood or not. The teacher can verify, whether the students have understood what was taught by asking questions, asking randomly selected students to read certain passages narrated by the teacher or to solve a question on the board, etc. The classroom, is kept free from disruptions and distractions in form of smart phones and idle talk, depending on the persuasiveness power of the teacher to enforce the above. The emergency transition from the offline route to the online one has its own share of unique challenges.

A major challenge is to keep the student in focus to receive the content and to provide feedback. Being that the student is in his home environment, there is a lack of fear based respect for the teacher, which is usually observed in case of classrooms. This is most common in case of students who are particularly naughty or are not much interested in the class, who require correction by the teacher in form of scolding or sending the student out of

the class. This is not possible in case of online learning as the teacher cannot physically enforce his presence in the student's home environment and there is no guaranteed means for the teacher to verify whether the student is actually paying attention to his lecture or not before the computer or smartphone.

Another distraction is in the form of social media, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Telegram, Discord etc. Student can resist falling prey to the lures of this distraction and the teacher cannot stop the student from accessing social media as he is in his own house and not in the classroom as the jurisdiction of the teacher stops at the classroom door or at the gate of the school. Therefore, it is difficult for the teachers to actually ensure that the students are indeed, studying seriously in their houses. Another difficulty is in the creation of online content. Further, a teacher is expected to use PowerPoint, tools for conversion of PPTs into videos, audio and video editing software for making his or her videos, before making them available to the students. Many teachers who may not be used to this new paradigm will find it difficult to deliver the content on time to the students due to them being on familiar with the tools of online teaching. Also, it cannot be taken for granted that all the students are in possession of the necessary equipment - laptops, smart phones, good internet connectivity, etc and there will be many students who will miss out on receiving education via the online route due to the absence of the above.

CONCLUSION

Students have to weather through a set of unique problems and challenges caused by the Covid 19 pandemic (12). A student generally feels comfortable in a classroom as he is in the company of his friends and peers. His presence in the group, 'hides' him from the teacher, like a tree in a forest as until he does an act of mischief or misbehavior, he is not generally seen by the teacher. In case of online education delivery, this is not possible as the camera has a clear view of the student which can be seen by the teacher. This creates a sense of psychological isolation within the student as he is now a tree in a desert, rather than a forest. Further, it has been observed that many students have complained that the online education system has created a stressful environment for them in their homes as the active observation of the teacher on the student, the workload to be completed from the home and the absence of friends force them to study in an environment that is not conducive for them to study in peace. The reason which can be said for the heavier workload is that, since the student is in his house, he can be expected to cover more volume of the study material. A few smart students have made use of technology to 'fool' the teacher by creating a virtual presence of themselves for the teacher by prerecording a few routine study patterns and response patterns and editing them using video and audio editing software to make the virtual presence look more authentic to the teacher. Being that the teacher is teaching in a stressful environment, caused due to the lockdown and the workload on his head, he may not be able to recognize this trick and get fooled due to this 'Jugaad'. However, not everyone is as smart or daring enough to resort to this method to fool the teacher and therefore, students are forced to study in a stressful environment. In addition, a few students due to their economic or social condition may not be in a state to afford internet enabled smartphones and computers. This has caused them to miss out on the content being delivered to their friends, which may cause them to suffer during the examinations.

REFERENCES

1. Aggarwal, Y.P. (2000), *Statistical Methods*, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
2. Best, John W. & Khan James V. (1989), *Research Methodology*, Prentice Hall of India Pvt Ltd., New Delhi.
3. Bhatia, K.K. & Narang, C.L. (2007), *Philosophical and sociological bases of Education*, Tandon Publications, Ludhiana.
4. Bornstein, Marc H. & Michael E. Lamb (1999), *Development Psychology: An Advanced Textbook*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publications, London.

5. Chauhan, S.S. (1999), *Advanced Educational Psychology*, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
6. Crow, Lester D. & Alice Crow (2007), *Educational Psychology*, Sureject Publications, Delhi.
7. Hurlock, Elizabeth B. (2006), *Child Growth and Development*, Tata McGraw - Hill Publishing Company Ltd., New Delhi.
8. Kothari, C.R. (1989), *Research Methodology : Methods and Techniques*, Wiley Eastern Ltd., New Delhi.
9. Koul, Lokesh (2007), *Methodology of Educational Research*, Vikas Publishing House, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
10. Kundu, C.L. and Tutoo, D.N. (2000), *Educational Psychology*, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
11. Mangal, S.K. (2007), *Advanced Educational Psychology*, Prentice Hall of India, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
12. Mangal, S.K. (2005), *Educational Psychology*, Tandon Publications, Ludhiana.
13. Parameswaran, E.G. & Beena, C., *An Invitation to Psychology*, Neelkamal Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
14. Shaffer, David R. & Katherine Kipp (1996), *Development Psychology; Childhood and Adolescence* Books/ Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Groere(USA).
15. Sharma, R.A (2007), *Fundamentals of Educational Research*, Loyal Book Depot, Meerut.
16. Sidhu, K.S. (1999), *Methodology of Research in Education*, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
17. Yadav & Yadav, *Education in Emerging Indian Society*, Tandon Publications, Ludhiana.