



## APPROACHES TO STUDYING AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN THE PUPIL'S LEARNING

Anas K.

### ABSTRACT

*Intelligence is the most debated and intriguing constructs in educational psychology. How human beings use their abilities is more important than that of the possession of Intellectual abilities by an individual. Hence the focus of research in educational psychology shifted from learning and developmental behaviour from teacher's objective perceptions to learner's subjective experience based on perceptions. The variables such as approaches to studying, student burnout, cognitive styles, intellectual styles, metacognition etc. are the outcome of this perspective. Affective aspects such as stress, anxiety, self-efficacy, motivational belief etc. also received much attention of researches in educational psychology.*



**KEYWORDS :** *Intelligence , . learner's subjective , educational psychology.*

### INTRODUCTION

It has often been said that obtaining a good education is the key to being successful in the world. People need all their skill to be operating in perfect order to be successful in life. Yet many educational programmes seem to develop people's intelligence in analytical reasoning only or mental capacity. These three approaches can be categorized with reference to the intention that informs the students' act of studying. In a 'deep' learning approach, a student's intention is to understand the content of the learning task. In a 'surface' learning approach, a student's intention is simply to complete the requirements of the task, irrespective of any understanding of the educational content of the task. In a 'strategic' learning approach, a student's intention is to "obtain the highest possible grades", rather than process the intrinsic educational content of the task. While it can be argued that from a tutor's perspective a deep approach to studying is one that fulfils a higher education focused on nurturing an intrinsic interest in learning, from a student's perspective it is a combination of a deep and strategic approach that may help to maximize learning outcomes. Different approaches to studying relate to different sets of study habits. In the case of a deep approach, learning behavior is composed of acts intended to process the meaning of the educational content. In the case of a surface, approach learning behavior is composed of acts intended to process educational content at an informational or symbolic level simply. In the case of a strategic approach, learning behavior is composed of acts intended to process educational content in a manner.

## TYPES OF APPROACHES OF STUDYING

There are different types of Approaches to Studying are practicing the students for their academic and non-academic studies. Following are the different types of approaches to usually studying students used for their studies.

### MEANING ORIENTATION

It involves an intention to understand and give meaning and focusing on relations between parts of subject matter, the author's message in association with the evidence used to support it. The subscales of Meaning Orientations are:

- Deep Approach - in deep approach, the learner involves in active questioning while learning interrelating ideas, here the learner is trying to relate the content matter with other parts of the course.
- Inter relating ideas - here the learner is trying to relate the content matter with other parts of the course.
- Use of Evidence - the learner uses evidence while concluding a learning material.
- Intrinsic Motivation - here the learner is involved in active learning for learner's own sake.

### REPRODUCING ORIENTATION

It encompasses minimalist engagement with the task, focussing on memorising or applying procedures unreflectively. The learner sees school learning as a mean towards some other end, such as obtaining a better job or just keeping out of trouble. The strategy is thus limited to the target of essentials and reproducing through rote learning. Its subscales are

- Surface Approach - the learner, is preoccupied with memorisation for reproducing it when the need arises.
- Syllabus Boundness - the learning process is centred around the syllabus and the learner is relying on staff to define the learning tasks.
- Fear of Failure - the learner shows pessimism and anxiety about academic outcomes and the learning is guided by the goal of avoiding failure.
- Extrinsic Motivation - the student is interested in courses and studies for the qualifications and benefits they offer

### ACHIEVING ORIENTATION

This is related to the competitive form of motivation called the need for achievement or hope for success. Its related strategies are organizing time, working space and syllabus coverage in the most efficient way. It includes

- Strategic Approach - Implications of academic demands made by staff.
- Disorganized study method - in this learning strategy learners are unable to work regularly and effectively.
- Negative Attitude to Studying - Pupils show a negative attitude of studying by lack of interest in content matter and the application.
- Achievement Motivation - Learners are showing confidence and highly competitive.
- Achievement Motivation - Learners are showing confidence and highly competitive.

### NON-ACADEMIC ORIENTATION

It involves broad strategies of Learning with logical sequences and over-reliance on details. The techniques adopted for learning are ineffective and weak to achieve a higher level of understanding. It includes

- Comprehension Learning - The learners are ready to map out the subject area and think divergently.
- Operation Learning - While learning, the learners emphasize facts and logical analysis.
- Globetrotting - The learners show a tendency to jump into conclusion without an adequate factual basis.
- Improvidence - It is a learning pathology characterized by over-reliance on details and failure to develop an overall understanding

### MEASUREMENT OF APPROACHES TO STUDYING

An exhaustive review of the related studies revealed the different instruments developed to measure the student's Approaches to Studying.

**Schmeck et al.** (1985) developed a 62 item Inventory of Learning Processes, which was derived from the factor analysis of self-report items. In that, **Schmeck** (1985) reported four main factors, namely, Surface processing, Disorganised Study Methods, Fact retention and Elaborative processing.

**Biggs** (1978) developed a Study Process Questionnaire (SPQ) in which 10 unidimensional scales were included to assess the study process of higher education students. The dimensions are Pragmatism, Academic motivation, Neuroticism, Internality, Study skills, Role learning, Meaningful learning, Test anxiety, Openness and class dependence. When factor analysis of Study process Questionnaire (SPQ) showed a stable second-order structure consisting three dimensions viz., Reproducing, Internalizing and Achieving.

**Entwistle et al.** (1979) developed Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI). Three orientations to studying viz., the Meaning, Reproducing and Achieving were developed from an initial pool of 15 subscales.

**Entwistle et al.** (1979) developed a short version of ASI (30 item) included the scales viz., Achieving Orientation, Reproducing Orientation, Meaning Orientation, Comprehension learning, Operation learning, Improvidence and Globetrotting.

**Entwistle and Ramsden** (1983) designed another approach to Studying Inventory. They reported four Orientations to study viz., Achieving orientation, reproducing orientation, Meaning orientation and Non-academic orientation.

Working within the framework of cognition, information processing and memory rather than intention, motivation and personality **Schmeck** (1983) have developed the Inventory of Learning Process (ILP) which consists of a series of behaviorally oriented statements and identified four orientations. Deep processing, Elaborate process, Fact retention and Methodical study.

Utilising the cognitive basis **Weinstein et al.** (1983) constructed the Learning and Study Strategy Inventory (LASSI) comprising of 10 scales; such as Anxiety, Attitude, Concentration, Information Processing, Motivation, Scheduling, Selecting the main idea, Self-testing, Study aids and Test strategies.

**Pillai et al.** (1992) developed a Science Studying Approach Inventory (SSAI) for measuring the Approach of Pupils towards learning Science. It covers two aspects viz., Deep Approach versus Surface Approach and Organised study method versus Disorganized study Method.

**Kumar and Koya** (2001) developed the Approaches to Studying Inventory for measuring the variable Approaches to Studying. These Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI) takes advantage by encompassing the four components of Approaches to Studying viz., Meaning Orientation, Reproducing Orientation, Achieving Orientation and Non-Academic Orientation. Each component, in turn, include four subscales. In the present study, the researcher used a standardized tool for assesses the different components of Approaches to Studying.

### RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher has followed the normative survey technique for the study. Normative survey technique describes and interprets what exist at present. In Normative-Survey method, the word 'survey' indicates the gathering of the data, the word 'normative' is used because surveys are frequently made for the purpose of ascertaining which is the normal or typical conditions or practice.

## POPULATION OF THE STUDY

Population means the aggregate or totality of objects or individuals regarding inferences is to be made in a sampling study. All the Higher Secondary School students studying in Government and Government aided schools of Kerala state as the population of the present study.

## SAMPLE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

The presented study is conducted using a representative sample of 800 Higher Secondary School Students selected from Kannur, Calicut, Malappuram, Trichur and Palakkad Districts of Kerala. Stratified Random sampling method is adopted for this study. Due Representation was given to these factors like Gender, Locality and Type of School.

## FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Results of the Statistical analysis shows that 74.1% of students have Moderate Desirable Approaches to Studying (MDAS), 15.8% coming under Highly Desirable Approaches to Studying (HDAS) group and 10.1% of students include in the group of Less Desirable Approaches to Studying (LDAS). The result indicates that the majority of Higher Secondary School students have Moderate Desirable Approaches to Studying (MDAS).

The t-value obtained for Male and Female Students in Meaning orientation is 3.43, which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=3.43$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of the Meaning orientation of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the meaning Orientation. The "t"-value obtained for Male and Female Students in Reproducing Orientation is 5.92 which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=5.92$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) It shows that the mean scores of Reproducing Orientation of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the Reproducing Orientation. The t-value obtained for Male and Female Students in Achieving Orientation is 5.54.

The t-value obtained for Male and Female Students in Meaning orientation is 3.43, which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=3.43$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Meaning orientation of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the meaning Orientation. The "t" value obtained for Male and Female Students in Reproducing Orientation is 5.92 which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=5.92$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) It shows that the mean scores of Reproducing Orientation of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the Reproducing Orientation. The "t"-value obtained for Male and Female Students in Achieving Orientation is 5.5, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=5.54$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Achieving Orientation of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of female students than male students in Achieving Orientation. The t-value obtained for Male and Female Students in Non-Academic Orientation is 4.24, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=4.24$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Non-Academic Orientation of Male and Female students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the Non-Academic Orientation. The t-value obtained for Male and Female Students in Approaches to studying is 7.81, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=7.81$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean score of Approaches to studying of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the Approaches to Studying.

The t-value obtained for Rural and Urban students in Meaning orientation is 4.73, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=4.73$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Meaning Orientation of Rural and Urban Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Urban students, which shows the superiority of Urban students than Rural students in the Meaning Orientation. The t-value obtained for Rural

and Urban Students in Reproducing Orientation is 4.08, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=4.08$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Reproducing Orientation of Rural and Urban students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Urban students, which shows the superiority of Urban students than Rural students in the Reproducing Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Rural and Urban students in Achieving Orientation is 4.69, which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=4.69$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Achieving Orientation of Rural and Urban students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Urban students, which shows the superiority of Urban students than Rural students in Achieving Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Rural and Urban Students in Non-Academic Orientation is 3.70, which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=3.70$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Non-Academic Orientation of Rural and Urban students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Rural students, which shows the superiority of Rural students than urban students in the Non-Academic Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Rural and Urban Students in Approaches to studying is 3.68, which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=3.68$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Approaches to studying of Rural and Urban students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Urban students, which shows the superiority of Urban students than Rural students in the Approaches to Studying.

The “ $t$ ” value obtained for Government and Government Aided students in Meaning orientation is 4.75, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=4.75$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of the Meaning orientation of Government and Government Aided Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Government Aided School students, which shows the superiority of Government Aided School students than Government School students in the Meaning Orientation. The “ $t$ ”-value obtained for Government and Government Aided students in Reproducing Orientation is 6.37, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=6.37$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) It shows that the mean scores of Reproducing Orientation of Government and Government Aided students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Government Aided School students, which shows the superiority of Government Aided School students than Government School students in the Reproducing Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Government and Government Aided students in Achieving Orientation is 4.64 which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=4.64$ ;  $p<0.05$ ) It shows that the mean scores of Achieving Orientation of Government and Government Aided Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Government Aided School students, which shows the superiority of Government Aided School students than Government School students in Achieving Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Government and Government Aided Students in Non-Academic Orientation is 2.34, which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=2.34$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Academic Orientation of Government School and Government Aided Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Government School students, which shows the superiority of Government School students than Government Aided School students in the Non-Academic Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Government and Aided Students in Approaches to studying is 5.00, which is significant at 0.01 level ( $t=5.00$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Approaches to studying of Government and Government Aided students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Government Aided School students, which shows the superiority of Government Aided School students than Government School students in Achieving Orientation. From the above observation, it is showing that all the “ $t$ ” values are significant at 0.01 level of significance, so the hypothesis is not accepted. Which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=5.54$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Achieving Orientation of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of female students than Male students in Achieving Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Male and Female Students in Non-Academic Orientation is 4.24, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=4.24$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean scores of Non-Academic Orientation of Male and Female students differ significantly. The high mean score is associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the Non-Academic Orientation. The  $t$ -value obtained for Male and Female Students in Approaches to study is 7.81, which is significant at 0.01 level. ( $t=7.81$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). It shows that the mean score of Approaches to studying of Male and Female Students differ significantly. The high mean score is

associated with Female students, which shows the superiority of Female students than Male students in the Approaches to Studying.

Researchers in the late 1990's pointed out that, student differ in quality of what they had learned and understood (**Entwistle & Robinson**, 1976; **Marton & Saljo**, 1976). It is to be remembered that learning is individualistic; that is there occurs qualitative differences in ways students express their understanding. This differences in the way one approaches a learning material are termed Approaches to Studying. This study visualizes the recent Scenario of approaches to studying of girls and boys, Government and Government aided and Rural and Urban students.

## REFERENCES

- Biggs, J.B.(1987). Student approaches to learning and studying. Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Entwistle, N.J., Hanley, M., & Hounsell, D.J. (1979). Identifying distinctive approaches to studying. *Higher Education*, 8, 365-380
- Entwistle, N.J, Hanley, M., & Ratcliffe, G. (1979). Approaches to learning and levels of understanding. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51, 99-114.
- Kumar, S.P.K. (1997). Approaches to studying and learning style discriminating high achievers and low achievers in secondary school biology. Paper presented at the National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi
- Kumar, S.P.K., & Koya, H.M.P. (2001). Approaches to studying inventory.
- Pillai, K.S., & Kumar, S.P.K. (1994). Achievement in biology as affected by sex, locale, cognitive style and approaches to studying. *Experiments in Education*, 22,243-255.