#### Volume-4, Issue-8, August-2015 • ISSN No 2277 - 8160

Juil FOR RESEARCE	Research Paper	Education				
International	A Study on Cognitive Styles of Student Teachers In Relation to Their Gender and Location					
Krishna Mohan P	Junior Research Fellow Faculty of Education, Osmania Un Hyderabad- 500 007	iversity,				
M. Ravi Babu	Senior Research Fellow Faculty of Education, Osmania Un Hyderabad- 500 007	iversity,				
ABSTRACT The p way i condu	resent study describes the cognitive styles of secondary school students. Cognitive Style ndividual processes information. Systematic Style and Intuitive style are the two cognitiv ucted on 600 student teachers from Mahabubnagar district of Telangana State. The result itive styles with respect to gender and location among student teachers.	es refer to the preferred ve styles. The study was revealed that there was				
ABSTRACT The p way i condu a significant difference in cogn	resent study describes the cognitive styles of secondary school students. Cognitive Style ndividual processes information. Systematic Style and Intuitive style are the two cognitiv icted on 600 student teachers from Mahabubnagar district of Telangana State. The result itive styles with respect to gender and location among student teachers.	is refer to the preferre re styles. The study we revealed that there we				

# KEYWORDS : Cognitive Style, Systematic Style, Intuitive Style.

## Introduction

Cognitive Styles refer to the preferred way individual processes information. Unlike individual differences in abilities which describe peak performance, styles describe a person's typical mode of thinking, remembering or problem solving. Further more, styles are usually considered to be bipolar dimensions whereas abilities are unipolar. Having more of an ability is usually considered beneficial while having a particular Cognitive Style simply denotes a tendency to behave in a certain manner. Cognitive Style is usually described as personality dimension which influences attitudes, values, and social interaction.

Cognitive-Style is a hypothetical construction that has been developed to explain the process of mediation between stimulus and response. The term Cognitive Style refers to the characteristic ways in which an individual conceptually organizes the environment. It is viewed that Cognitive Style refers to the way an individual fitters and processes stimuli so that the environment takes on psychological meaning. As such cognitive representations modify the one-to-one relationship between stimulus and response, if it were not for these cognitive representations; stimuli would have been irrelevant for the individual as the individual would respond to the stimulation in a robot like fashion.

Cognitive Style is also understood in terms of consistent patterns of organizing and processing information. Coop and Sigel (1971) equated Cognitive Style with modes of behaviour rather than a mediating processes. They used the term Cognitive Style to denote consistencies in individual modes of functioning in a variety of behavioural situations. Therefore, it is proper to mention here that Cognitive Style is conceived as one of the aspects of psychological differentiation. Psychological differentiation refers to differentiate mode of perceiving, judging and appraising things to which people are exposed to under different conditions.

The notion of Cognitive Style has been defined as self-evident modes of functioning which the individual shows in his perceptual and intellectual activities (Witkin, et.al, 1962). It is conceptualized as stable attitude or habitual strategy which determines a persons' typical modes of perceiving, remembering and problem-solving. There are several types of cognitive functioning among which field dependence and field independence are well known. A field dependent individual is found to be passive and less competent in analytical functioning having greater social orientation. He has poor impulsive control and undifferentiated self-concept. He is more socially sensitive. On the other hand, a field independent individual is found to be more active and competent in analytical functioning having less social orientation. He is less impulsive and socially sensitive.

## **OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS**

**Cognitive styles:** The way an individual search and acquire, interpret, categories, remember and retrieve information in making decisions and solving problems in daily life.

**Systematic Style:** An individual who typically operates with a systematic style uses a well defined step-by-step approach when solving a problem; looks for an overall method or pragmatic approach; and then makes an overall plan for solving the problem.

**Intuitive Style:** An individual who uses an unpredictable ordering of analytical steps when solving a problem, relies on experience patterns characterized by universalized areas or hunches and explores and abandons alternatives quickly.

## Objectives

- 1. To find the Systematic Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their location.
- 2. To find the Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their location.
- 3. To find the Systematic Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender.
- 4. To find the Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender.

## Hypothesis

- 1. There is no significant difference in the the Systematic Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their location .
- 2. There is no significant difference in the Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their location.
- 3. There is no significant difference in the the Systematic Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender .
- 4. There is no significant difference in the Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender.

## Sample of the Study

The sample size of the study is 600, which includes student teachers. Out of 4285 population, 600 – Student Teachers (B.Ed) sample has been derived by Stratified Random sampling method.

**Tool of the Study:** Cognitive Style Inventory developed by Praveen Kumar Jha (2010)

# Analysis and Interpretation

1. **Hypothesis – 1:** There is no significant difference in the the Systematic Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their location .

Table 4.1: Showing	Systematic St	tyle Location wise
--------------------	---------------	--------------------

Systematic Style	Location	Ν	Mean	SD	F	Sig.	df
	Urban	300	72.18	12.35	8.027	.005	1,598
	Rural	300	68.30	12.49			
	Total	600	70.24	12.56			

From the above table, the mean score obtained for urban student teachers was 72.18 and rural students teachers were 68.30. The obtained F value 8.027 with a df of 1,598 was found to be statistically

highly significant at 0.00 level. Therefore, it may be inferred that, the Systematic style among student teachers with urban locality appear to be better than student teachers with rural locality and it was statistically significant.

It is clear from the above table that F-Ratio for student teachers with Systematic style came out to be 8.027, which was highly significant at 0.00 level of significance.

Hence the hypothesis 1, which states that 'There exists no significant difference in the Systematic among Student Teachers in relation to their location', is rejected.

2. Hypothesis - 2: There is no significant difference in the Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their location.

**Table 4.2: Showing Intuitive Style Location wise** 

	Location	Ν	Mean	SD	F	Sig.	df
Intuitive Style	Urban	300	71.96	12.37	14.589	.000	1,598
	Rural	300	67.41	10.59			
	Total	600	69.69	11.73			

From the above table, the mean score obtained for urban student teachers 71.96 was and rural student teacher was 67.41. The obtained F value 14.589 with a df of 1,598 was found to be statistically highly significant at 0.00 level. Therefore, it may be inferred that, the Intuitive style among student teachers with urban locality appear to be better than student teachers with rural locality and it was statistically significant.

It is clear from the above table that F-Ratio for student teachers with Intuitive style came out to be 14.589, which was highly significant at 0.00 level of significance.

Hence the hypothesis 2, which states that 'There exists no significant difference in the Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their location', is rejected.

3. Hypothesis – 3: There is no significant difference in the Systematic Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender.

**Table 4.3: Showing Systematic Style Gender wise** 

Systematic Style	Gender	Ν	Mean	SD	F	Sig.	df
	Male	300	69.98	12.22	0.162	.688	
	Female	300	70.51	12.91			1 508
	Total	600	70.24	12.56			1,390

From the above table, the mean score obtained for male student teachers was 69.98 and female student teachers was 70.51. The obtained F value 0.162 with a df of 1,598 was found to be statistically not significant. However, based on the mean scores, it may be said that female student teachers seem to be better than male student teachers in Systematic Style.

It is clear from the above table that F-Ratio for student teachers with Systematic style came out to be 0.162, which was not significant.

Hence the hypothesis 3, which states that 'There exists no significant difference in Systematic Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender', is accepted.

4. Hypothesis – 4: There is no significant difference in the Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender.

#### **Table 4.4: Showing Intuitive Style Gender wise**

	Gender	Ν	Mean	SD	F	Sig.	df
Intuitive Style	Male	300	69.54	11.57	0.188 .665	.665	
	Female	300	69.83	11.90			1 500
	Total	600	69.69	11.73		1,390	

From the above table, the mean score obtained for male student teachers was 69.54 and female student teachers was 69.83. The obtained F value 0.188 with a df of 1.598 was found to be statistically not significant. However, based on the mean observation, female student teachers seem to be better than male student teachers in Intuitive Style.

It is clear from the above table that F-Ratio for student teachers with Intuitive style came out to be 0.188, which was not significant.

Hence the hypothesis 4, which states that 'There exists no significant difference in Intuitive Styles among Student Teachers in relation to their gender', is accepted.

## Findings:

- The Systematic style among student teachers with urban locality 1. appears to be better than student teachers with rural locality.
- 2. The Intuitive style among student teachers with urban locality appears to be better than student teachers with rural locality.
- 3. Female student teachers seem to be better than male student teachers in Systematic Style
- Female student teachers seem to be better than male student 4. teachers in Intuitive Style.

## **Conclusion:**

The result reveals that there is a significant difference in cognitive styles with respect to location among student teachers.

There exists no significant difference in cognitive styles with respect to gender among student teachers.



Allport,G.W.(1937). Personality: A psychological interpretation. New York: Holt & Co. | Arif Altun.A., and Mehtap cakan, M(2006). Undergraduate students Academic Achievement, Field independent /Dependent Cognitive Styles and attitude towards computers. Educational Technology & Society,9(1), 289-297. | Ausburn,L.J.,And Asburn, F.B. (1978).Cognitive Styles .Some information and implications for instructional design Educational communication and technology Journal 26,337,354. | Botkin,J.W. (1974). An Intuitive computer System: A cognitive approach to the management learning process. Un-publish doctoral: Harward University; Cambridge (Taken from the 1989Annual Developing Human Resources). | Cano,J.(1999) The relationship between learning Style, academic major, and academic performance of college students. Journal of Agricultural Education, 40 (1), 30-37. | Chadha N.K. and Usha Ganeshan (2009). Manual for Social Intelligence Scale. Agra: National Psychological Corporation. | Cheryl E. Sanders and Gary D. Phye (2004), "Bullying Implications for the Classroom", Elsevier Inc, UK. Coop: A.H.; and Sigel,I.E. (1971). Cognitive Style: Implication for learning and instruction. psychology in the schools;2,152-161. (Taken from "cognitive Style" (1978);P.3). Denes-Raj and Epstein, S. (1994) Conflict between intuitive and rational processing ;When people behave against their better judgment .Personality and Social Psychology Bolletein;66,819-829. | Dun,R & Dunn, K., (1978). Teaching Students through their learning styles. Engle wood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. | Forgas. J.P. (1994). Sad and Guilty? Affective influence on attribution for simple and serious interpersonal conflict. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,56-68. | Frederick Nicholas Kerlinger (1978), "Behavioral Research: A Conceptual Approach", Harcourt School Publishers, Orlando. | Galton, F. (1883). Human faculty and development. London; Mecmillan. | Garton, B.L., Dauve ,J.L. & Thomson, R.W. (1999). Predictors of student achievement in an introductory agricultural economics course. Proceedings from the 53rd Annual Central Religion Research Conference in Agricultural Education (pp.102-108) St. Louis, MO. | Goleman, Daniel (1996) "Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ", Bantam Books, New York. Goleman, Daniel (1998) "Working with emotional Intelligence", Bantam Books, New York. | Harvey, O.J., Hunt, D.E. & Schroder, H.M. (1961). Conceptual systems and personality orientation | Jerrel C. Cassady and Mourad All Eissa (2008) "Emotional Intelligence – Perspectives on Educational and positive Psychology", Peter Lang Publishing, Inc. New York. John W. Best and James V. Khan, 1999 "Research in Education", Prentice Hall of India (P) Limited, New Delhi. | Jung, C. (1923). Psychological types, London: Routledge & Kogan Paul. | Kagan, J., Moss, H.A. & Siegel. I.E. (1963). Psychological significance of styles of conceptualization. Monographs of the society for research in child development, 28 (2. Serial No.86, Whole No.2). | Keen, P.G.W. (1973). The implications of Cognitive style for individual decision making. Unpublished doctoral dissertation; Harward University; Cambridge. (Taken from the 1989 Annual Developing Human Resources). | Kelly, G.A. (1955). The Psychology of personal construct (Vol. 1) New York: Norton. | Kogan. N. (1971). Educational Implications of Cognitive Styles. In G.S. Lesser (Ed.), Psychology and educational practice, Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foreman. | Kolb, D.A. (1984). Experiential learning; Experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood cliffs, N.J.; Prentice Hall. | Low Enfield, V.(1945). Tests for visual and haptical aptitudes, American Journal of Psychology, 58, 100-112. | Plutchik, Robert (1980), "Theories of emotion", Emotion: Theory, research, and experience, New York. | Praveen Kumar Jha (2010). Manual for Cognitive Style Inventory. Agra: National Psychological Corporation. | Reuven Bar-on and James D.A.Parker (2000) "The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence", Jossey -Bass A Wiley Company, San Francisco. | Srinivasan P and Murugesan K (2013). Manual for Emotional Intelligence Scale. Agra: National Psychological Corporation. |