CHAPTER IV

EXECUTION OF THE RESEARCH

4.1 DATA COLLECTION
4.2 DATA INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER IV

Execution of the Research

4.1 Data Collection

For collection of data researcher visited village Barkhedi Kala for collection from rural area and with the help of village Sarpanch and Gram sevika 50 students of the age group 5-6 year those getting admitted to class one were selected

First rapport was established with the children by talking to them freely then interview was conducted of the students individually. Sample for urban area was selected from Bhopal city and the same procedure was adopted.

4.2 Data Analysis

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' of Urban and Rural children getting admitted to class one.

Table 1 Status of learning readiness among urban and rural children.

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
Urban	-	50	37.54	8.20	0.43	1.98 at
Rural	-	50	36.92	5.79		0.05 level

Result

Since table value 1.98 is more than the calculated value 0.43 hence null hypothesis is accepted and therefore no significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' was obtained , but although there has been no significant difference but looking into the percentage, and mean there is difference among urban and rural children. Mean of urban children is higher than rural children.

Hypothesis 2

There is significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' among boys and girls getting admitted to class one.

Table 2. Status of learning readiness among boys and girls

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
-	Boy	50	37.02	7.07	0.29	1.98 at
-	Girl	50	37.44	7.13		0.05 level

Result

Since table value 1.98 is more than calculated value 0.29 therefore difference is not significant hence learning readiness has no differential effect on sex of students and performance of both the sex is almost same.

Hypothesis 3

There is significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' among urban boys and urban girls getting admitted to class one.

Table 3 Status of learning readiness among urban boys and urban girls

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
Urban	Boys	25	35.92	8.30	1.38	2.01 at
Urban	Girls	25	39.12	7.77		0.05 level

Result

Since table value 2.01 is more then the calculated value 1.38 hence the directional hypothesis is rejected and there no significant difference in the status of learning readiness among urban girls and boys has been found, but the mean of urban girls is better then the urban boys.

Hypothesis 4

There is significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' among rural boys and rural girls getting admitted to class one.

Table 4 Status of learning readiness among rural boys and rural girls.

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
Rural	Boys	25	38.12	5.35	0.12	2.01 at
Rural	Girls	25	35.72	5.96		0.05 level

Result

Since table value 2.01 is more then the calculated value 0.12 hence the directional hypothesis is rejected and there no significant difference in the status of learning readiness among rural boys and rural girls has been found.

Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' among urban boys and rural boys getting admitted to class one.

Table 5 Status of learning readiness among urban boys and rural boys.

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
Urban	Boys	25	35.92	8.30	1.09	2.01 at
Rural	Boys	25	38.12	5.35		0.05 level

Result

The table value 2.01 is more than the calculated value 1.09 hence null hypothesis is accepted and no significant difference found but although there

is no significant difference but there is difference in the mean of urban and rural boys and rural boys have high performed better than urban boys

Table 6 Status of learning readiness among urban girls and rural girls.

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
Urban	Girls	25	39.12	7.77	1.71	2.01 at
Rural	Girls	25	35.72	5.96		0.05 level

Result

The table value 2.01 is more than the calculated value 1.71 hence null hypothesis is accepted and no significant difference found but although there is no significant difference but there is difference in the mean of urban and rural girls and rural girls have high performed better than urban girls

Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' among urban boys and rural girls getting admitted to class one.

Table 7 Status of learning readiness among rural boys and rural girls

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
Urban	Boys	25	35.92	8.30	0.09	2.01 at
Rural	Girls	25	35.72	5.96		0.05 level

Result

The table value 2.01 is more than the calculated value 0.09 hence null hypothesis is accepted and no significant difference found in learning readiness of urban boys and rural girls, and the performance of both urban boys and rural girls was almost same..

Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' among urban girls and rural boys getting admitted to class one.

Table 8 Status of learning readiness among rural boys and rural girls.

Category	Sex	N	Mean	S.D	t	table value
Urban	Girls	25	39.12	7.77	0.52	2.01 at
Rural	Boys	25	38.12	5.35		0.05 level

Result

Since Table value 2.01 is more then the calculated value 0.52 hence null hypothesis is accepted and no significant difference in the status of 'Learning Readiness' among urban girls and rural boys getting admitted to class one.

Table 9 Item wise Analysis of Status of Learning Readiness in percentage.

| S.No. | ITEM | URBAN | | RURAL | | TOTAL |
		BOYS	GIRLS	BOYS	GIRLS	
1	IDENTIFICATION	68.50	73.50	68.00	69.00	69.75
2	IDENTIFICATION	54.00	64.00	66.00	62.00	61.50
3	CLASSIFICATION	47.00	55.00	59.00	39.00	50.00
4	DISCRIMINATION	84.00	79.00	88.00	91.20	85.55
5	CLASSIFICATION	60.50	63.40	61.00	65.00	62.47
6	IMAGINATION	46.00	53.60	42.60	37.00	44.80
7	IMAGINATION	6.40	11.20	12.80	10.40	10.20
8	MATCHING	33.16	30.60	60.00	65.00	47.19
9	PROBLEM SOLVING	6.40	7.20	4.80	8.80	6.80
10	APPLICATION	92.00	85.00	81.00	83.00	85.25

Result

The interpretation of this table is shown graphically. Urban and rural were able to identify and classify objects they were able to match the object, discriminate the objects nicely They were also able to give the application of the given object, but the performance in items related to imagination and problem solving was very poor both in urban children as well as rural children.