

Language and Work Education Achievement Gap among 9th Grade Minority and Other-than Minority Students: An Analytical Study of Murshidabad District, West Bengal.

Najmus Sakib

Research Scholar

School of Education

Central University of South Bihar

SH-7, Gaya Bela - Panchanpur Road Karhara, Fatehpur, Bihar 824236

najmuss34@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study aims to find out Language and Work Education achievement gap among secondary students, minority students and other-than minority students at Lalgola block, Murshidabad. The descriptive survey design was adopted and simple random sampling is used for the study. The population of the study consist of class 9 students of Lalgola block. 300 students were requested to provide their last year final examination marks on researcher prepare format of academic achievement. This study identifies the phenomena related to language and work education achievement gap among total students, minority students and other-than minority students with regards to gender and types of school. Demographic factors influence on achievement gap was reported by inferential statistical techniques. Results and finding shows that there is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender. There is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among students with respect to types of school. There is a significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among minority students with respect to types of school. There is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to the types of school. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among minority students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to types of school. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among minority students with respect to types of school. There is no significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.

Keywords: Language and Work Education Achievement Gap, Gender, Minority Students, Other-than Minority Students, Types of school.

Introduction:

The "achievement gap" in education refers to the disparity in academic performance between the groups of students. This achievement gap shows up in grades, standardized test scores, course selection, dropout rates and college completion rate. Achievement Gap is not a birth problem it is the problem of treating the child. Achievement Gap totally depends on how you treat the child and how they react towards your nurture. Achievement Gap is the gap between individual expectation and individual real situation. Achievement Gap is an arbiter which can be conciliated by proper education. Language is the method of human communication and Work Education is the bearer of education which helps the students in earning

while learning. Every Individual is unique in nature, the individual difference is there but individuals are not crippled if education gives proper guidance to them, they will grow up. Denouncing the poor quality of education is like blaming a mirror because you do not like your reflection. Society has the school system which it deserves. So special care should be taken up to bridge the gap because all are the elements of human resource or an indispensable part of society. Students of Class IX are at the stage of Adolescents. Murshidabad district's Class IX students cannot escape from this situation. Secondary education is the premier stage of higher education. Lalgola is mainly minority community dominated area. The main source of income for these areas' people is agriculture. The population of this area is 335,831. The population density of Lalgola block is 2,500/km² (6,500/sq. mi). Due to less birth control, it is very difficult to fulfil the primary needs of the child's. The mentality of minority students is not education oriented. Sometimes the total family depends on class IX student and for fulfilling the family demands they chose the wrong way. Most of the guardians are illiterate. In this situation to overcome these problems and make India progressive a study on Minority and Other than minority students is needed.

Research Gap:

In 2010 **Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten and Holland** conducted a study on The Implicit Prejudiced Attitudes of Teachers: Relations to Teacher Expectations and the Ethnic Achievement Gap. In 2009 **Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor** worked on The Academic Achievement Gap in Grades 3 TO 8. Their research objectives are to examine achievement gaps between white students and students from other racial and ethnic groups. In 2008 **Konstantopoulos Spyros** conducted a study on Do Small Classes Reduce the Achievement Gap between Low and High Achievers? **Spielhagen. R Frances (2006)** worked on closing the Achievement Gap in Math: Considering Eighth Grade Algebra for All Students. **Bob and Berry (2005)** conducted a study on Secondary Mathematics Teachers' Perceptions of the Achievement Gap. In 1989 **Douglas and Michael** attempted a study on The Effects of Ability Grouping on the Ethnic Achievement Gap in Israeli Elementary School. Irrespective of his best effort, the researcher could not find any study in the line which address the issue of the kind where in the phase of Language and Work Education Achievement Gap among 9th Grade Minority and Other-than Minority Students: An Analytical Study of Murshidabad District, West Bengal. By observing above mentioned studies researcher found that several studies were conducted on Achievement Gap. But the researcher didn't able to locate any single study in the line, especially in 9th grade students. As they are future destiny makers of the nation. So, the question is; does the student of 9th Grade have proper development in present scenario? The present study will try to find out the answer to this question and will try to fill the knowledge gap.

Statement of the Problem:

The problem formally stated as:
Language and Work Education Achievement Gap among 9th Grade Minority and Other-than Minority Students: An Analytical Study of Murshidabad District, West Bengal.

Operational definitions of key terms Used:

Language:

Language, researcher refers to Bengali and English subjects.

Work Education:

Work Education, researcher refers to Work Education subject.

Achievement Gap:

Achievement Gap, researcher refers to disparity in Academic Achievement of the Students.

9th Grade:

9th Grade, research refers to 9th class students.

Minority Students:

Minority students, researcher refers to Muslim Community Students.

Other-than Minority Students:

Other-than minority students, researcher refers to Hindu Community Students.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To assess the mean difference in the language group subject's Achievement among students with respect to their gender.

2. To assess the mean difference in the language group subject's achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender.
3. To assess the mean difference in the language group subject's Achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender.
4. To assess the mean difference in the language group subject's Achievement among students with respect to types of school.
5. To assess the mean difference in the language group subject's Achievement among minority students with respect to types of school.
6. To assess the mean difference in the language group subject's Achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.
7. To assess the mean difference in work Education Achievement among students with respect to their gender.
8. To assess the mean difference in work education achievement of Minority Students with respect to their gender.
9. To assess the mean difference in work education Achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender.
10. To assess the mean difference in work education Achievement among students with respect to types of school.
11. To assess the mean difference in work education Achievement among minority students with respect to types of school.
12. To assess the mean difference in work education Achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.

Hypothesis of the Study:

The following hypothesis were tested:

- H0₁:** There is no significant difference in the language group subject's achievement among students with respect to their gender.
- H0₂:** There is no significant difference in the language group subject's achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender.
- H0₃:** There is no significant difference in the language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender.
- H0₄:** There is no significant difference in the language group subject's achievement among students with respect to types of school.
- H0₅:** There is no significant difference in the language group subject's achievement among minority students with respect to the types of school.
- H0₆:** There is no significant difference in the language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.
- H0₇:** There is no significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to their gender.
- H0₈:** There is no significant difference in work education achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender.
- H0₉:** There is no significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender.
- H0₁₀:** There is no significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to types of school.
- H0₁₁:** There is no significant difference in work education achievement among minority students with respect to types of school.
- H0₁₂:** There is no significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.

Delimitations of the Study:

1. This study focusing only on five educational Institutions (High School and High Madrasah).
2. This study is delimited to Lalgola Block of Murshidabad District only.
3. This study is delimited to 300 Samples only.

Methodology of the study:

The research methodology is a way of conducting or a way to solve the problem systematically. By a large, methodology followed in this study has been worked out in accordance with its objectives. This study is based on descriptive survey research.

Population:

Human Population of the study is comprise all schools and madrasahs students of Lalgola block. Non-human population for the proposed study is include 8th class final mark sheet of the students.

Sample of the study:

In this Study, simple random sampling technique has been used in the selection of schools situated at Lalgola block and the students of these high school or high madrasah. For the determination of the sample, the investigator collects the list of High school and High Madrasah. The primary goal before the researcher was to select the sample of senior secondary schools. In this investigation, the sample consists of 300 students, 60 students from different high school and high madrasah. Out of these 300 students, 176 were minority and 124 were other-than minority students. The major institutions contacted for data collection were Sekhalipur High School, Sekhalipur; ICR High Madrasa, Sadar Nashipur; Lalgola SM Girls High School, Lalgola; Chhaitani High Madrasah, Chhaitani; Lalgola MN Academy, Lalgola.

Tools used:

In order to collect the Academic Achievement score of the respondents, the students (IX Class) were requested to provide their previous class (8th Class) final year mark sheet. The score of previous class final examination mark sheet's score was considered as their academic achievement score.

Techniques Used:

Inferential statistics viz "t" test methods was applied.

Results:

1. Table 1
Shows the mean difference in the language group subject's achievement among students with respect to their gender.

Variable Name	Male			Female			df	"t" value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Language group Achievement	131	74.51	65.99	169	82.69	63.31	298	-1.089 ^{NS}

NS: Not Significant at both the level, at .01 level and .05 level of confidence

Table 1—it shows that there is no significant difference in mean scores in Language group achievement with respect to their gender for the sample of 300. The calculated "t" value is -1.089 which is not significant at both the level at 0.01 level of confidence and 0.05 level of confidence. The mean score with its SD of male students were 74.51 and 65.99, the mean score and SD for female students were 82.69 and 63.31. Thus it can be said that they're no significant difference in the language group achievement among male and female secondary students. Consequently, the null hypothesis **"There is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among students with respect to their gender"** is not rejected.

2. Table 2
Shows the mean difference in the language group subject's achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender.

Variable Name	Male			Female			df	"t" value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Language group achievement	75	23.10	18.91	101	39.04	33.90	174	-3.668**

**** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).**

Table 2—It shows that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Language group subject's achievement of Minority Students with respect to their gender for the sample of 176. The calculated "t" value is -3.668 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean score with its SD of male students were 23.10 and 18.91 respectively, the mean score and SD for female students were 39.04 and 33.90 respectively that means the female students score higher than the male students in Educational Equity. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in the language group subject's achievement of minority students among male and female minority students. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender." is rejected.

3. Table 3
Shows the mean difference in the language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender.

Variable Name	Male			Female			df	"t" value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Language group achievement	56	143.37	37.18	68	147.52	34.59	122	-.643 ^{NS}

NS: Not significant at both the level, at 0.01 and at 0.05 level of confidence

Table 3—It shows that there is no significant difference in mean scores in Language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender for the sample of 124. The calculated "t" value is -.643 which is not significant at both the level at 0.01 level of confidence and 0.05 level of confidence. The mean score with its SD of male students were 143.37 and 37.18 respectively, the mean score and SD for female students were 147.52 and 34.59 respectively. Thus it can be said that they're no significant difference in the language group subject's achievement among male and female other than minority students. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender." is not rejected.

4. Table 4
Shows the mean difference in the language group subject's achievement among students with respect to types of school.

Variable Name	High School			High Madrasah			df	"t" value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Language group achievement	180	104.63	60.75	120	40.85	49.45	298	-9.576**

**** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).**

Table 4—It shows that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Language group subject's achievement of Secondary Students with respect to the type of school for the sample of 300. The calculated "t" value is -9.576 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean score with its SD of high school students were 104.63 and 60.75 respectively, the mean score and SD for High Madrasah students were 40.85 and 49.45 respectively that means the high school students score higher than the High Madrasah students in Language group subject's achievement. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in the language group subject's achievement of High school and High Madrasah students. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among students with respect to types of school" is rejected.

5.

Table 4.20

Shows Mean difference in Language Group Achievement among male and female students on the total sample

Variable Name	High Madrasah			High School			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Language group achievement	105	23.66	19.74	71	44.95	36.38	174	-5.008**

** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).

Table 5—show that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Language group subject’s achievement of Minority Students with respect to the type of school for the sample of 176. The calculated “t” value is -5.008 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean score with its SD of High Madrasah students were 23.66 and 19.74 respectively, the mean score and SD for High School students were 44.95 and 36.38 respectively that means the high school students score higher than the High Madrasah students in Language group subject’s achievement. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in the language group subject’s achievement of High school and High Madrasah students. Consequently, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference in Language group subject’s achievement among minority students with respect to types of school” is rejected.

6.

Table 6

Shows the mean difference in the language group subject’s achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.

Variable Name	High Madrasah			High School			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Language group achievement	15	161.20	12.73	109	143.51	37.31	122	1.816 ^{NS}

NS: Not significant at both the level, at 0.01 and 0.05 level of confidence

Table 6—show that there is no significant difference in mean scores in Language group subject’s achievement other than minority students with respect to the types of school for the sample of 124. The calculated “t” value is 1.816 which is not significant at both the level at 0.01 level of confidence and 0.05 level of confidence. The mean score with its SD of High Madrasah Students is 161.20 and 12.73 respectively, the mean score and SD for High School students are 143.51 and 37.31 respectively. Thus it can be said that there is no significant difference in the language group subject’s achievement among other than minority students in the context of types of school. Consequently, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference in Language group subject’s achievement among other than minority students with respect to the types of school.” is accepted.

7.

Table 7

Shows the mean difference in work education achievement among students with respect to their gender.

Variable Name	Male			Female			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Work education achievement	131	65.77	19.76	169	49.27	26.91	298	5.891**

** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).

Table 7—show that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Work Education achievement of Secondary Students with respect to types of gender for the sample of 300. The calculated “t” value is 5.891 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean score with its SD of male students were 65.77 and 19.76 respectively, the mean score and SD for female students were 49.27 and 26.91 respectively that means the male students score higher than the female students in Work Education achievement. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in work education achievement among male and female secondary students. Consequently, the null hypothesis “There is no

significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to their gender” is rejected.

8. **Table 8**
Shows the mean difference in work education achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender.

Variable Name	Male			Female			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Work education achievement	75	60.34	15.53	101	44.35	26.78	174	4.622**

** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).

Table 8–It shows that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Work Education achievement of Minority Students with respect to types of gender for the sample of 176. The calculated “t” value is 4.622 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean score with its SD of male students were 60.34 and 15.53 respectively, the mean score and SD for female students were 44.35 and 26.78 respectively that means the male students score higher than the female students in Work Education achievement. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in work education achievement among male and female minority students. Consequently, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference in work education achievement among minority students with respect to their gender” is rejected.

9. **Table 9**
Shows the mean difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender.

Variable Name	Male			Female			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Work education achievement	56	73.07	22.46	68	56.57	25.58	122	3.765**

** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).

Table 4.36–It shows that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Work Education achievement among other than minority Students with respect to types of gender for the sample of 124. The calculated “t” value is 3.765 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean score with its SD of male students were 73.07 and 22.46 respectively, the mean score and SD for female students were 56.57 and 25.58 respectively that means the male students score higher than the female students in Work Education achievement. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in work education achievement between male and female students. Consequently, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender” is rejected.

10. **Table 10**
Shows the mean difference in work education achievement among students with respect to types of school.

Variable Name	High School			High Madrasah			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Work education achievement	180	60.96	22.81	120	49.74	27.54	298	-3.838**

** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).

Table 10–It shows that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Work Education achievement of Secondary Students with respect to the type of school for the sample of 300. The calculated “t” value is -3.838 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean

score with its SD of high school students were 60.96 and 22.81 respectively, the mean score and SD for High Madrasah students were 49.74 and 27.54 respectively that means the high school students score higher than the High Madrasah students in Work Education achievement. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in work education achievement of High school and High Madrasah students. Consequently, the null hypothesis **“There is no significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to types of school”** is rejected.

11. **Table 11**
Shows Mean difference in Work Education achievement among male and female students on the total sample

Variable Name	High Madrasah			High School			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Work education achievement	105	46.10	26.95	71	58.66	16.19	174	-3.517**

**** Significant at 0.01 level of confidence (2-Tailed).**

Table 11—It shows that there is a significant difference in mean scores in Work Education achievement of Minority Students with respect to the type of school for the sample of 176. The calculated “t” value is -3.517 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence and indicates a negative value. The mean score with its SD of high madrasah students were 46.10 and 26.95 respectively, the mean score and SD for High School students were 58.66 and 16.19 respectively that means the high school students score higher than the High Madrasah students in Work Education achievement. Thus it can be said that there is a significant difference in work education achievement of High school and High Madrasah students. Consequently, the null hypothesis **“There is no significant difference in work education achievement among minority students with respect to types of school”** is rejected.

12. **Table 12**
Shows the mean difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.

Variable Name	High Madrasah			High School			df	“t” value
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Work education achievement	15	75.20	16.05	109	62.46	26.21	122	1.831 ^{NS}

NS: Not Significant at both the level, 0.01 and 0.05 level of confidence

Table 12—show that there is no significant difference in mean scores in Work Education achievement among other than minority students with respect to the types of school for the sample of 124. The calculated “t” value is 1.831 which is not significant at both the level at 0.01 level of confidence and 0.05 level of confidence. The mean score with its SD of High Madrasah Students is 75.20 and 16.05 respectively, the mean score and SD for High School students are 62.46 and 26.21 respectively. Thus it can be said that there is no significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students in the context of types of school. Consequently, the null hypothesis **“There is no significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.”** is not rejected.

Conclusion:

From the above tables of hypothesis treatment, it is clear that there is no significant difference in Language group subject’s achievement among students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in Language group subject’s achievement among Minority Students with respect to their gender. There is no significant difference in Language group subject’s achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in Language group subject’s achievement among students with respect to types of school. There is a significant difference in Language

group subject's achievement among minority students with respect to types of school. There is no significant difference in Language group subject's achievement among other than minority students with respect to the types of school. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among minority students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to their gender. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among students with respect to types of school. There is a significant difference in work education achievement among minority students with respect to types of school. There is no significant difference in work education achievement among other than minority students with respect to types of school.

Acknowledgement:

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations have been made accordingly based upon the findings of the study

1. Govt. should promote research on language and work education.
2. School should ensure mastery learning at language level for student's betterment.
3. School should ensure time for work education class at their own level.
4. School should promote learning while earning facility to the students.

Suggestions for further study:

1. The same study should be conducted in a large sample by including more block.
2. Similar studies can be conducted at a different level of education, ie Upper Primary, Secondary Level of Education.

References:

Best, J.W. (2004). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd.

Creswell, J.W. (2015). *Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Noida: Pearson India Education Services Pvt. Ltd.

Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten and Holland (2010) The Implicit Prejudiced Attitudes of Teachers: Relations to Teacher Expectations and the Ethnic Achievement Gap, *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 497-527, Retrieved From <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40645448>

Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor (2009) The Academic Achievement Gap In Grades 3 To 8, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 91, No. 2 pp. 398-419. Retrieved From <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25651345>

Konstantopoulos Spyros (2008) Do Small Classes Reduce the Achievement Gap between Low and High Achievers? Evidence from Project STAR. *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 108, No. 4 (March 2008), pp. 275-291. Retrieved From <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/528972>

Spielhagen. R Frances (2006) Closing the Achievement Gap in Math: Considering Eighth Grade Algebra for All Students, *American Secondary Education*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 29-42. Retrieved From https://www.jstor.org/stable/41064581?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

Bol and Berry (2005) Secondary Mathematics Teachers' Perceptions of the Achievement Gap, *The High School Journal*, Vol. 88, No. 4, pp. 32-45. Retrieved From <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40364254>

Douglas and Michael (1989) The Effects of Ability Grouping on the Ethnic Achievement Gap in Israeli Elementary Schools, *American Journal of Education*, Vol. 97, No. 3 pp. 237-257, Retrieved From <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1085166>

<https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/gaps/> Retrieved on Nov 25th 2018

<https://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/achievement-gap/index.html> Retrieved on Nov 25th 2018

<http://www.maplandia.com/india/west-bengal/murshidabad/lalgola/lalgola-google-earth.html>
Retrieved on Nov 25th 2018

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lalgola_\(community_development_block\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lalgola_(community_development_block)) Retrieved on Nov 25th 2018

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Racial_achievement_gap_in_the_United_States Retrieved Nov 25th 2018