



ACHIEVEMENT OF PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS OF TONK DISTRICT IN LANGUAGE WITH RESPECT TO MINIMUM LEVELS OF LEARNING (MLL)

Shikha Serva¹ and Dr. Meena Sirola²

¹Researcher , Banasthali Vidyapith .

²Associate Professor, Banasthali Vidyapith.

ABSTRACT

Primary schools are considered to be the basis for a child's foundation in language learning. Language plays important role not only for general communication in our day to day life but also as a medium of instruction in schools. Keeping this in mind MHRD has laid down the MLL for Language, mathematics, environmental studies. This study was conducted to assessing the MLL in Language among primary school students of Tonk district. For this purpose 360 students comprising 180 boys and 180 girls studying in different schools of Tonk district were selected through random sampling technique. They were selected from both urban and rural areas of Tonk district. Researcher used self-made MLL based achievement test. 't' test and percentage analysis were applied to find out the significance



of difference between gender and areas. Results revealed that there is a significant difference in the MLL as prescribed by the committee and the achievement of students in language.

KEYWORDS: Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL), Language, Region.

INTRODUCTION :

Primary education is the foundation on which the development of every citizen and the nation as a whole built on, so there is need for focusing not only on quantitative aspect of education but also on quality in terms of achievement levels as stated in national policy on education, 1986.

Ministry of human resource and development therefore constituted a committee dated 5 Jan 1990 under the chairmanship of prof. R.H.Dave, which specified the basic competencies to be achieved by all children at the primary stage which is known as Minimum Levels of Learning in selected subjects such as Language, Mathematics and Environmental Studies across the country.

Minimum level of learning in language was formulated keeping in mind that it will help pupil in mastering the nine basic skills of language namely, listening, speaking, reading, writing,

comprehension of ideas, functional grammar, self-learning, language use and vocabulary

Different types of studies have been conducted on MLL such as:

- + Saxena, Manjula, (2001). "A Study of Factors Influencing Mastery of Minimum Levels of Learning in Cognitive Areas at the Primary Level."
- + Farooque, Umer, (2005). "English Language Competence of Teachers and Students Achievement in English Medium Primary Schools of Kannur District."
- + Singh, Vasudha, (2008). "An Investigation of Minimum Levels of Learning in English."
- + Vijaya, K. and Vajravelu, (2012). "Development of Language Skills in Primary Classes

through Activity Based Learning.”

- + Sharma, Kavita, (2015). “Learning Outcomes and Learning Indicators: Shift in Indian Elementary Education.”

OBJECTIVES:

The objectives of the study are to know the MLL in Language with reference to:

- Gender
- Region – Urban and Rural

Main hypothesis:

1. There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among boys and girls students in Language.

Sub hypothesis:

1.1 There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among boys and girls students in content areas of Language.

Main hypothesis:

2. There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among students of Urban and Rural region in Language.

Sub hypothesis:

2.1 There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among students of Urban and Rural region in content area of Language.

Terms Defined:

(A) MLL (Minimum Levels of Learning)

In 1990 ministry of human resource and development has constituted a committee which specified the basic competencies to be achieved by all children at the primary stage which is known as Minimum Level of Learning in selected subjects such as Language, Mathematics, and Environmental Studies across the country.

In the present study the MLL in EVS among primary school students of Tonk district.

(B) Primary Level

In the present study primary level means students of 5th standard.

(C) Subject

In the present study the Subject is Language.

(D) Region

In the present study regions are Urban and Rural.

(E) Content areas

Language includes following areas:

- + Listening:- be able to listen with understanding;
- + Speaking:- be able to speak effectively in both informal and formal transactions;
- + Reading:- be able to read with comprehension and enjoy reading various kinds of instructional materials;
- + Writing:- be able to write neatly, with logical sequence and creativity;
- + Comprehensions of ideas:- be able to comprehend ideas through listening and reading;
- + Functional grammar:- be able to use grammar functionally in various contexts;
- + Self-learning:- be able to use junior dictionary where available;
- + Language use:- learn about difference between formal and informal language;
- + Vocabulary use:- be able to acquire reading comprehension vocabulary of approx. 4000 words.

Method of the study:

The research scholar used descriptive method in the study.

Population:

The population of the study is the students of Tonk district who are studying in 5th standard.

Sample:

The research scholar selected two types of school namely – government and private from six blocks of Tonk district i.e. Tonk, Newai, Uniyara, Deoli, Malpura and Todaraisingh. Sixty students were selected from each block. They have been selected from both urban and rural region of Tonk district.

Variables:

In the present study, variables are:

(A) Dependent variable – Minimum levels of learning

(B) Independent variable – Gender, Urban and Rural region

Nature of Data:

Data is quantitative in nature.

Sources of Data:

The source of data is primary in the study.

Tool:

Research scholar has developed achievement test according to the guidelines of MLL in Language. The achievement test consist of two papers i.e. English-I and II. The test helps in measuring the competencies of the students in different areas of Language.

Statistics used:

The researcher used quantitative analysis, namely – Percentage analysis, Mean, Standard deviation and t – test.

Analysis and Interpretation:

1. Main hypothesis: There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among boys and girls students in language.

Table- 1: Gender wise MLL in Language

Sex	N	Mean	SD	t value	df
Male	180	23.98	9.30	0.14	358
Female	180	24.13	10.38		

df = (358), value of t at 0.05 level of significance = 1.96

Table - 1 indicates gender wise MLL in Language. The mean score of male students is 23.98 and SD is 9.30 and mean score of female students is 24.13 and SD is 10.38. The table value at 0.05 level is 1.96 and calculated t value is 0.14. Since calculated value 0.14 is less than table value 1.96.

Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

1.1 Sub hypothesis:

There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among boys and girls students in content areas of Language.

Table – 2: MLL in Language among boys and girls with respect to content areas

Areas	Boys (N=180)		Girls (N=180)	
	Correct (%)	Incorrect (%)	Correct (%)	Incorrect (%)
Writing	36.69	63.31	38.25	61.75
Comprehension of Ideas	51.94	48.06	48.12	51.88
Functional grammar	50.76	49.24	54.23	45.77
Vocabulary control	52.10	47.90	55.25	44.75
Self – learning	8.22	91.78	5.61	94.39
Listening and speaking	32.08	67.92	30.06	69.94
Reading	31.87	68.13	28.81	71.19

Table 2 represent MLL in Language among boys and girls with respect to content areas.

The correct answers given by boys are greater than girls in areas as follows – “Comprehension of ideas; Self – learning; Listening and speaking; and Reading”. The correct answers given by girls are seen greater than boys in the areas: “Writing; Functional grammar; and Vocabulary control”. Highest scores of boys and girls were in the area “Vocabulary control” while least score was observed in the area “self – learning”.

2. Main hypothesis: There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among students of Urban and Rural region in Language.

Table– 3: Region wise MLL in Language

Region	N	Mean	SD	t value	df
Urban	180	25.15	10.73	2.11	358
Rural	180	22.96	8.76		

df = (358), value of t at 0.05 level of significance = 1.96

Table no. 3 represents that mean score of urban school students is 25.15 and SD is 10.73 and mean score of rural school students is 22.96 and SD is 8.76. The table value at 0.05 level is 1.96 and calculated t value is 2.11. Since calculated value 2.11 is more than table value 1.96.

Thus the hypothesis “There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among students of Urban and Rural region in Language” is not accepted.

So the MLL of Urban region students is more than Rural region students.

2.1 Sub hypothesis:

There is no significant difference in the Minimum Levels of Learning (MLL) among students of Urban and Rural region in content area of Language.

Table – 4: MLL in Language among Urban and Rural region students with respect to content areas

Areas	Urban (N=180)		Rural (N=180)	
	Correct (%)	Incorrect (%)	Correct (%)	Incorrect (%)
Writing	40.14	59.86	34.80	65.2
Comprehension of Ideas	52.22	47.78	47.84	52.16
Functional grammar	41.91	58.09	42.08	57.92
Vocabulary control	54.16	45.84	53.19	46.81
Self – learning	11.5	88.5	2.33	97.67
Listening and speaking	35.62	64.38	26.52	73.48
Reading	36.59	63.41	24.09	75.91

Table no. 4 indicates the MLL in Language among Urban and Rural region students with respect to content areas. The correct answers given by urban school students are greater than rural school students in

areas as follows i.e. "Writing; Comprehension of ideas; Vocabulary control; Self – learning; Listening and speaking; and Reading". The correct answers given by rural school students are greater than urban school students in area: "Functional grammar". Highest scores of urban and rural school students were in the area, "Vocabulary control" while least score was seen in the area, "Self – learning".

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS:

- There is no significant difference in the MLL among boys and girls students of Tonk district.
- Gender wise Percentage Analysis of MLL among primary school students are not seen equal in any area.
- The MLL of boys is greater than girls in areas as follows- "Comprehension of ideas; Self – learning; Listening and speaking; and Reading".
- The MLL of girls are seen greater than boys in the areas – "Writing; Functional grammar; and Vocabulary control".
- The MLL of boys and girls are seen highest in the area "Vocabulary control" while least in the area "Self – learning".
- There is significant difference in the MLL among students of Urban and Rural region of Tonk district. The MLL of Urban region students is more than Rural region students.
- In language the MLL of urban and rural school students are not seen equal in any area.
- The MLL of urban school students is greater than rural school students in areas as follows - "Writing; Comprehension of ideas; Vocabulary control; Self – learning; Listening and speaking; and Reading".
- The MLL of rural school students is greater than urban school students in area: "Functional grammar".
- The MLL of urban and rural school students are seen highest in the area: "Vocabulary control" while least in the area "Self – learning".

On the basis of the above results we can say that there is a significant difference in the MLL as prescribed by the committee and the achievement of students.

Educational Implication: In the present study the researcher had found that there is a remarkable difference in the MLL as prescribed by the committee and students achievement. On the basis of it, the following educational implications could be implemented.

1. The present study will help curriculum planners –

- It will help in deciding the level of Language subject curriculum, according to the age of children.

2. This study will help administrators –

- To look that MLL guidelines are followed while teaching in classroom and they should also provide the document of MLL to teachers. This will also help them in finding out the basic requirements to set an infrastructure, so that each standard get MLL in Language subject.

3. The present study will help teachers –

- In the selection of the proper method of teaching in Language.
- It helps in evaluating students in their exams according to MLL of Language.
- To enhance the learning outcomes of students according to MLL and to understand the importance of MLL in Language.

4. This study will help students –

- To understand and learn the content easily and effectively with the help of MLL based curriculum of Language.
- It suggests students to tell teachers/authorities about the problem in curriculum, so that necessary changes can be made to improve the quality of curriculum.

5. The present study will help parents –

- In analysing the level of their children and also help parents not to put extra pressure on their studies.
- It helps parents in giving suggestions to school for improving the quality of curriculum.

6. This study will help the researchers –

- It helps those researchers, who are pursuing research in the field of MLL in Language.

DELIMITATIONS:

1. Research work is done in Tonk district of Rajasthan only.
2. The research includes six blocks of the district Tonk – Tonk, Newai, Uniyara, Deoli, Malpura and Todaraisingh.
3. Research work is done on students of 5th standard only and their Minimum level of learning is checked on the basis of their previous class i.e. 4th standard. The subject selected for the research work is Language.

REFERENCES:

1. Best, John. W. & Khan, James. V. (2011). Research in Education. New Delhi: PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.
2. Central Himalayan Rural Action Group (CHIRAG). (2012). Minimum Levels of Learning of School Children in Kumaon. Retrieved From chirag.org/wt-content/uploads/2009/02/minimum/levels-of-learning-_kumaon.pdf
3. Chaudhary, Dorilal. & Kamal, Peeyush. (2010). Attainment Level of X Class Students in Commerce with Respect to MLL Programme. Edusearch, 1(2), 111-116.
4. Dalal, Suman. (2002). Effect of Inductive Thinking Strategy on English Language Development and Concept Formation. Retrieved From http://www.educationinindia.net/download/Research_Abstract_Volume_2.pdf
5. Garrett, Henry. E. (2007). Statistics in Psychology and Education. New Delhi: Paragon International Publishers.
6. Ministry of Human Resource Development (department of education) Government of India. (1991). Minimum levels of learning at primary stage. New Delhi.
7. Koshi, Suja. (2005). Enhancing the Reading Skills of Advantaged and Dis-advantaged Children of Standard I through Systematic Reading of Children's Literature. Seventh All India School Education Survey, Vol.8 (1), pg.no. 9.
8. Krogh, Suzanne. L. & Slentz, Kristine. L. (2001). The Early Childhood Curriculum. New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
9. Phan, Huy p. (2012). The Development of English and Mathematics Self-Efficacy: A Latent Growth Curve Analysis. The Journal of Educational Research, 105(3), 196-209.
10. Rajput, J.S. (2004). Encyclopedia of Indian Education. Vol. 1. NCERT.
11. Sharma, Lakshmi. & Dua, Binti. (2013). MLL in Biology for IX Class of U.P. Board of Secondary Education. International Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 3(1), 35-50.
12. Sharma, Purnima., Bhatnagar, Ashok Kumar., and Dhawan, Arun. (2011). Aravali Reader. Class 5th. Jaipur: Rajasthan State Textbook Board.
13. Sindhu, S. and Sinha Manjari (2008). The Study of Language And Communication Skills of The Primary School Students. Journal of Teacher Education and Research, 3(1), 81-85.
14. Singh, Vasudha. (2008). An Investigation of Minimum Levels of Learning in English. Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Faculty of Education Research Abstract, (DEIFOERA) Inaugural Issue, pg.no. 34.
15. Vashishtha, K.K. & Jain, Manju. (2001). Curriculum Load on Children at Pre-primary and Primary Stages; An Exploratory Study. Seventh All India School Education Survey, Vol.8 (1), pg.no. 3-4.
16. Vasisht, R.P. (2003). Elementary school curriculum. Common- wealth Publishers.
17. Venkataiah. (2001). Primary Education. New Delhi: Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd.



Shikha Serva
Researcher , Banasthali Vidyapith.