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***Abstract*— Traditionally if the context of education is analyzed, it then seems that the carrier of education is the child, which was long back realized by naturalists and pragmatists like Dewey. The most crucial problem of education is, how to cater to the individual differences. Each classroom consists of students having wide range of differences with regard to various abilities, back ground characteristics, intelligence, learning styles, personality traits etc. To compare the Bodily Kinesthetic intelligence, Spatial-Visual intelligence, Interpersonal intelligence among gender difference. For pursuing the study simple two group research design was adopted and was considered quite appropriate for the study. The choice of research method is determined by the theory of the topic under study, objectives of the study, resources of the investigator etc. The nature of study is such that it requires descriptive analysis of learning styles in its relevant context, survey method of research has been suitable used. Survey provides a basis for theory construction or generalization in addition to it is implications for educational planning and reform. For comparison of Bodily Kinesthetic Intelligence, Spatial-Visual Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence t-test has been used as statistical technique.Results and Conclusion: In this study the analysis shows that the hypothesis was accepted and there was no significance difference found among the gender difference in case of bodily kinesthetic intelligence, visual-spatial intelligence and interpersonal intelligence.**
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

 Traditionally if the context of education is analyzed, it then seems that the carrier of education is the child, which was long back realized by naturalists and pragmatists like Dewey.

Mass communication processes, hardware and software and educational technologies have made efforts to make the individualized learning more effective. It is the time now when the learner has to be equipped with that kind of knowledge and skill which will soothe their adjustment in school and larger society in coming time.

The goal of, education can no longer be the transmission of the longer chunk of knowledge as such but to equip the student with the intellectual tools and resources which would enable him to involve in the process of gaining the existing knowledge and creating knowledge new. A phrase that emerges and represents a stage in the evolution of knowledge about teaching is instructional technology which emphasize upon systematic way of diverging, carrying out and involving human and non human resources just to cater to the learning needs of an individual or individuals. Educational innovations like computers, super computers, video, teaching machines, and satellite based T.V. programme, and Programmed instructions approaches are basically invented with the idea of meeting individual learner’s challenges.

The most crucial problem of education is, how to cater to the individual differences. Each classroom consists of students having wide range of differences with regard to various abilities, back ground characteristics, intelligence, learning styles, personality traits etc.

Multiple Intelligence and Learning Style:

 Gardner believes that, “we all possess at least seven unique intelligences through which we are able to learn and teach new information”. He believes that “we can all improve each of the intelligences, though some people will improve more readily in one intelligence area than the others”.

Intelligence can be measured by short-answer tests:

* Stanford- Binet Intelligence Quotient
* Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISCIV)
* Woodcock Johnson test of Cognitive Ability
* Scholastic Aptitude Test

Gardner does not believe in short-answer tests to measure intelligence because “short answer tests do not measure disciplinary mastery or deep understanding, rather they measure root memorization skills and only one’s ability to do well on short-answer tests”.

Assessments that value the process over the final answer, such as the Performance Assessment in Math (PAM) and the Performance Assessment in Language (PAL), are more accurate measures of intelligence in Gardner’s theory than short-answer tests.

M-I- pedagogy implies that teachers teach and assess differently based on individual intellectual strengths and weaknesses. According to him an individual has such intelligence which is:

* Visual-Spatial Intelligence - capacity to think in images and pictures, to visualize accurately and abstractly.
* Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence - ability to control one's body movements and to handle objects skillfully.
* Interpersonal Intelligence - capacity to detect and respond appropriately to the moods, motivations and desires of others. .

According to the Educational Researcher, to arrive at Gardner’s first seven intelligences Gardner and his colleagues examined literature on the “development of cognitive capacities in normal individuals, the breakdown of cognitive capacities under various kinds of organic pathology, and the existence of abilities in ‘special populations,’ such as prodigies, autistic individuals, idiots savants, and learning disabled children” (Gardner & Hatch, 1989).

Gardner and his colleagues also examined literature on “forms of intellect that exist in different species, forms of intellect valued in different cultures, the evolution of cognition across the millennia, as well as two forms of psychological evidence—the results of factor- analytic studies of human cognitive capacities and the outcome of studies of transfer and generalization” (Gardner & Hatch, 1989).

Intelligences that appeared repeatedly in Gardner’s research were added to a provisional list, whilst intelligences only appearing once or twice were discarded. Gardner claimed that, “as a species, human beings have evolved over the millennia to carry out at least these seven forms of thinking” on his provisional list (Gardner & Hatch, 1989).

In addition to the learning styles identified by Reissman, other aspects of behavior that might also be classified as learning styles are the mode of response and the thinking pattern (Nations, 1967).

Response mode in this sense refers to the manner in which an individual prefers to work, alone or in a group. *Thinking pattern* refers to the tendency of some individuals to gather details first and organize them later, as compared with the tendency of others to look for the overall picture first and to obtain supporting information afterward. Reissman's (1966) position with regard to learning styles is that they are developed early in life as a result of a combination of predisposition and environmental experience, and are not later subject to fundamental change. Consequently, teachers should help each individual student discover the learning style that is most effective for him and use this information in formulating learning plans. Thus, for example, the child who likes to learn by actively doing, but dislikes reading, might begin to take more of an interest in r reading activities if they were combined with role-playing activities.

Objectives:

* To see the effect of gender difference on Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence of Multiple Intelligence.
* To see the effect of gender difference on Spatial-Visual intelligence of Multiple Intelligence.
* To see the effect of gender difference on Interpersonal intelligence of Multiple Intelligence.

**Hypothesis:**

1. Ho1- There will be no significant effect of gender difference on Bodily- Kinesthetic intelligence of Multiple Intelligence.
2. Ho2- There will be no significant effect of gender difference on Spatial-Visual intelligence of Multiple Intelligence.
3. Ho3- There will be no significant effect of gender difference on Interpersonal intelligence of Multiple Intelligence.
4. **METHODOLOGY**

This Methodology is a process, which reveals all those methods and tools used by the researcher during the course of his research. The role of methodology is to carry out the research work in a scientific and valid manner. Adaptation of suitable methodology can raise the efficiency and dignity of research work. The success of any research mainly depends on the research tools, techniques and the use of proper methods in the research.

Universe and Selected Universe:

 Universe in the present study involves the High School Male and Female students of 18 C.B.S.E. schools situated in Haldwani city of Nainital District. A list of ten schools was selected by **Stratified** **convenient sampling**. In the second step, sample of 100 students was taken.

Research Design:

For pursuing the study simple two group research design was adopted and was considered quite appropriate for the study, with non-experimental survey methods.

**Tools Used:**

 The selection of tools for a particular study depends upon various considerations such as – objectives of the study, the amount of time at the disposal of researcher, availability of suitable test, personal competence of the investigator, technique of scoring and interpretation etc.

 The following tools have been used to measure variables in the study.

1. Multiple Intelligence Rating Scale by Mark R. Kaser.(25 items)
2. VAK Learning Style Self Assessment Questionnaire by Victoria Chislett (30 items)

These are most suitable tools for the study, scoring pattern is quite easy. These tools designed to give a broad indication of preferred learning styles and multiple intelligence.

**Methodology:**

The choice of research method is determined by the theory of the topic under study, objectives of the study, resources of the investigator etc. The nature of study is such that it requires descriptive analysis of learning styles in its relevant context, survey method of research has been suitable used. Survey provides a basis for theory construction or generalization in addition to it is implications for educational planning and reform. It also provides the dues which may be utilized for solving certain practical problems of educational and social nature or may help setting up of program on right lines. For this purpose survey has been selected as a most appropriate method in this study. In the present investigation all the steps and characteristics have been used which are essential for the survey method of research.

**Statistical Design:**

For comparison of Bodily Kinesthetic Intelligence, Saptial-Visual Intelligence and Interpersonal Intelligence **t-test** has been used as statistical technique.

1. **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

Analysis The purpose of analysis is to reduce data to intelligible and interpretable form so that the relations of research problems can be studied and tested. The analysis of research data, however, does not in and of itself provides the answers to research questions. Interpretation takes the results of analysis, makes inferences pertinent to the research relations studied, and drawn conclusions about these relations. The researcher who interprets research results searches them for their meaning and implications. This chapter deals with the tabulation, analysis and interpretation of the data with reference to the objectives of the study.

**TABLE- 1**

**Significance of Mean Difference among Male and Female Students In relation to Bodily- Kinesthetic intelligence**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **CR value** | **Sig. of CR value** | **Verfication of Ho** |
| Male | 50 | 16.06 | 2.57 | 0.038 | Insigni-ficant | Ho1 Acc-epted |
| Female | 50 | 16.04 | 2.66 |

**Inference:-**

CRcal. (0.038) < CR stand.(1.96) at 0.05 level.

Therefore CRcal. Value is insignificant. Ho is accepted.

**Analysis:-**

The above table-1 indicates the value of Bodily- kinesthetic intelligence scores of Male and Female students. The mean of Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence scores of male and female students are 16.06 and 16.04 and S.D. is 2.57 and 2.66 respectively.

To find out the significance of this difference ‘t’-test was used. The CRcal. of male and female students is 0.038. This calculated value of t is less than the CR stand.1.96.

Hence there is no evidence against the Ho1.

**Result:-** Ho1  is accepted.

**Interpretation:-**

Table-1 revealed insignificant difference between male & female students in relation to Bodily - kinesthetic intelligence as CRcal.  (0.038) is lower than CR stand.(1.96) at 0.05 level.

There is no effect of gender difference on bodily – kinesthetic intelligence because both are good enough to use their body parts to solve problems or to express their views like dancers, doctors, mechanic, craft person etc. There is no categorization in these fields regarding gender difference.

**Graphical Presentation of Mean Difference of Male & Female Students with regard to Bodily- Kinesthetic Intelligence**

**Fig. 1**

**Graphical Analysis: -** Here, thegraph of mean difference of male & female students regarding Bodily - kinesthetic is showing very minor difference which came insignificant after checking the significance of this difference by using ‘t’-test.

**Conclusion: -** There is no significant effect of gender difference on bodily - kinesthetic intelligence.

**TABLE- 2**

**Significance of Mean Difference among Male and Female Students In relation to Spatial- Visual intelligence**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **CR value** | **Sig. of CR value** | **Verfication of Ho** |
| Male | 50 | 13.82 | 2.28 | 0.911 | Insigni-ficant | Ho2 Accep-ted |
| Female | 50 | 14.24 | 2.32 |

**Inference:-**

CRcal. (0.911) < CR stand. (1.96) at 0.05 level.

Therefore CRcal. Value is insignificant. Ho is accepted.

**Analysis:-**

The above table-4.7 indicates the value of Spatial- visual intelligence scores of Male and Female students. The mean of Spatial intelligence scores of male and female students are 13.82 and 14.24 and S.D. is 2.28 and 2.32 respectively.

To find out the significance of this difference ‘t’-test was used. The CRcal. of male and female students is 0.911. This calculated value of t is less than the CR stand. 1.96.

Hence there is no evidence against the Ho2.

**Result:-** Ho2 is accepted.

**Interpretation:-**

Table-2 revealed insignificant difference between male & female students in relation to Spatial- visual intelligence as CRcal. (0.911) is lower than CR stand. (1.96) at 0.05 level.

In today’s world both males and females are equally involved in fields where spatial skill is necessary like graphic artists, architects and map makes. Both are highly spatially intelligent. There is no difference in their work quality with regard to gender difference.

**Graphical Presentation of Mean Difference of Male & Female Students with regard to Spatial- Visual Intelligence**

**Fig. 2**

**Graphical Analysis: -** Here, thegraph of mean difference of male & female students regarding Spatial- visual intelligence is showing very minor difference which came insignificant after checking the significance of this difference by using ‘t’-test.

**Conclusion: -** There is no significant effect of gender difference on Spatial- Visual intelligence.

**TABLE- 3**

**Significance of Mean Difference among Male and Female Students In relation to Interpersonal intelligence**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **S.D.** | **CR value** | **Sig. of CR value** | **Verfication of Ho** |
| Male | 50 | 15.90 | 2.65 | 0.757 | Insigni-ficant | Ho3 Accep-ted |
| Female | 50 | 15.40 | 2.82 |

**Inference:-**

CRcal. (0.757) < CR stand. (1.96) at 0.05 level.

Therefore CRcal. Value is insignificant. Ho3 is accepted.

**Analysis:-**

The above table-3 indicates the value of Interpersonal intelligence scores of Male and Female students. The mean of Interpersonal intelligence scores of male and female students are 15.90 and 15.40 and S.D. is 2.65 and 2.82 respectively.

To find out the significance of this difference ‘t’-test was used. The CRcal. of male and female students is 0.757. This calculated value of t is less than the CR stand. 1.96.

Hence there is no evidence against the Ho3.

**Result:-** Ho3 is accepted.

**Interpretation:-**

Table-3 revealed insignificant difference between male & female students in relation to Interpersonal intelligence as CRcal.  (0.757) is lower than CR stand. (1.96) at 0.05 level.

In today’s context both males and females are working. They have to interact with different type of people and work with them so to make the professional as well as personal relation healthy. They are developing their interpersonal intelligence so they can become social, easily understand intentions of other people, can make good number of friends. So there is no influence of gender difference on interpersonal intelligence.

**Graphical Presentation of Mean Difference of Male & Female Students with regard to Interpersonal Intelligence**

**Fig. 3**

**Graphical Analysis: -** Here, thegraph of mean difference of male & female students regarding Interpersonal Intelligence is showing very minor difference which came insignificant after checking the significance of this difference by using ‘t’-test.

**Conclusion: -** There is no significant effect of gender difference on interpersonal intelligence.

.

1. **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

 In this chapter, the researcher is going to discuss whole work in summarized form. Conclusion of the study, suggestions for students, teachers and parents is mentioned in this chapter so that the reader can understand the importance of this study and utilize the suggestions for their further benefits and at last of this chapter researcher has given some recommendations for further studies. Statement of the problem was to comparison bodily linguistic intelligence, Spatial-Visual intelligence, and Interpersonal intelligence among male and female gender differences.

Edward Tines (1973) concluded that certain learning styles are more conducive to success in some subject areas than they are in others. N.Kagan and Krathwohl's (1967) concluded that students can be helped to learn a learning style different from their own.

Jcllema (1976) took an investigation to measure the learning styles of students and to provide experimental research evidence of the effectiveness of matching the learning style of the studying students with instructional mode. He concluded that matching of learning style with mode of instruction yielded inconclusive results and that a variety of learning styles occurs in each of occupational area which can also be used in developing learning environment.

Bayliss (1977) tried to investigate the differences in reading utilization and reading achievement when analyzed by learning style preference and sex. It was concluded from the findings that there was no relationship between learning style preference and the utilization of reading as a knowledge source preference or reading achievement.

Drake (1977) designed a study in which he analyzed the effects of matching and mismatching learning styles and learning environments. He reached to the conclusion that self-perception as to learning style may only reflect perception of grading method and not learning method. He further found out that the factors contributing to success with a given environment differ from one environment to another.

Multiple Intelligences (MI) curriculum has demonstrated increased student achievement including improved engagement and performance on standardized tests. MI-based instruction also improves student achievement in science. Many educators focus solely on delivering content standards instead of infusing their curriculum with pedagogy that engages students and deepens their understanding of complex concepts. The purpose of this literature review is to explore the effect of MI based curriculum on student achievement in core curriculum at the elementary school level. The literature reveals several trends such as schools that have implemented MI have successfully increased student achievement in all areas of the core curriculum.

The review of the literature addresses the following:

* Increase in Student Achievement;
* Multiple Intelligences and Science Education; and
* MI as a Pedagogical Organizer and Framework for Structuring Curriculum.

The literature review is limited to elementary education. The literature discusses Mi-based curriculum in Kindergarten through sixth grade classes with an emphasis on science. Future research should focus on investigating the relationship between Mi-based curriculum and student achievement as well as providing specific examples of MI- based lessons. These lessons will help teachers implement MI into a variety of education environments. In conclusion, teachers should be educated in ways to infuse their curriculum with an MI framework to help create authentic learning experiences that will ultimately increase student performance and achievement.

1. **RESULTS, INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION**

Result: - Ho1 is accepted.

Interpretation:-

Regarding bodily – kinesthetic, the data revealed insignificant difference between male & female students in relation to bodily - kinesthetic intelligence as CRcal. (0.038) is lower than CR stand.(1.96) at 0.05 level of significance.

There is no effect of gender difference on bodily – kinesthetic intelligence because both are good enough to use their body parts to solve problems or to express their views like dancers, doctors, mechanic, craft person etc. There is no categorization in these fields regarding gender difference.

Conclusion: - There is no significant effect of gender difference on bodily - kinesthetic intelligence.

Result: - Ho2 is accepted.

Interpretation:-

The data revealed insignificant difference between male & female students in relation to Spatial intelligence as CRcal. (0.911) is lower than CR stand. (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance.

In today’s world both males and females are equally involved in fields where spatial skill is necessary like graphic artists, architects and map makes. Both are highly spatially intelligent. There is no difference in their work quality with regard to gender difference.

Conclusion: - There is no significant effect of gender difference on Spatial intelligence.

Result: - Ho3 is accepted.

Interpretation:-

Regarding interpersonal intelligence the data revealed insignificant difference between male & female students in relation to Interpersonal intelligence as CRcal. (0.757) is lower than CR stand. (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance.

In today’s context both males and females are working. They have to interact with different type of people and work with them so to make the professional as well as personal relation healthy. They are developing their interpersonal intelligence so they can become social, easily understand intentions of other people, can make good number of friends. So there is no influence of gender difference on interpersonal intelligence.

Conclusion:- There is no significant effect of gender difference on interpersonal intelligence.

Educational Implication of Research Study:

There a lot of benefits of using the multiple intelligence approach and understanding the learning styles of students. The teacher should adopt the suitable teaching style in classroom and student will learn better when using preferences in which they are successful. This study will help in understanding individual differences with regard to intelligence and learning styles.

1. For Teachers: - Teacher will provide opportunities for authentic learning based on their students need s, interests and talents. Teachers can construct activities that includes multiple intelligence.
2. For Students:- Students will learn better when using preferences in which they are successful and they will be better learners when they can expand their preferences. They can learn effectively by using various learning styles like by doing, acting, sensing, feeling and through direct experiences.
3. For Parents:- Parents and Community involvement in the school may increase activities involving learning. Bring members of the community into the learning process. This happens as students demonstrate their works successfully.

Recommendations for future Studies through this paper:

 On the basis of conclusions drawn the following recommendations have been made –

1. It is recommended to conduct study on comparison of learning styles with regard to multiple intelligence.
2. Leaning style can be compared with other psychological variable.
3. Multiple intelligence can be compared with achievement of student.
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