

A Cross-Cultural Study of Rural and Urban Areas to their Learning Styles

Esther Mena-Villalon¹, Ma. Victoria A. Cabigan, EdD²

^a esther.villalon@deped.gov.ph, ma.victoriacabigan@lspu.edu.ph
Department of Education, Cabuyao City 4025, Philippines
Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz, Laguna 4019, Philippines

Abstract

The aim of this study was to compare the students' learning styles of two (2) differing environment, the urban and the rural areas which consists of 206 respondents. The researcher employed standard principles of scientific method of research design-random sampling techniques which were supposed to be unbiased, and reliable. And to establish phenomena, this study used survey, testing method, and in a descriptive research method. A standardized instrument-Honey and Mumford Learning Style based on the works of Kolb's Learning Style Inventory was used by the researcher.

Keywords: Learning Style, Cross-cultural, comparative study of rural and urban

1. Introduction

Urban areas have been the center of the seat of power of every government, the heart of trade and commerce, and the key to technological advancement in every country around the world. It is considered a vital factor in industrialization and modernization programs and has been the focus of growth and development of every single nation. The prominence of a nation-state is usually measured through its economic stability and political performance of its cities and urban areas.

The peoples in urban areas are usually regarded by its liberal culture, self-reliance, open-mindedness to new ideas and values, and high individualistic tendencies. These characteristics generally bring them forth to higher level of self-esteem and self-confidence.

Rural areas on the other hand play a crucial role in nation building. They are the bases of industrialization. They supply the needs of the industries i.e., light, medium and heavy. They are the sources of raw materials that make commerce function to its full potential. Rural regions give life to urban areas.

The peoples are hard-working individuals, patient, industrious and diligent. They are also conservative and commonly build close family ties and depend on each other for strength. These show strong teamwork and collective action that made them accomplish and achieve many things.

The different characteristics of these two (2) places have affected the lives of its peoples like study habits and learning styles. In a study of Cox and Sproles (2005), they found out that students in rural schools appear to be more concerned and engaged in the educational process than urban students. A larger proportion of rural

students appeared to be serious analytical learners and active, practical learners. And this phenomenon is what prompted the researcher to pursue this study. The environments they live in may or may not have great impact in these habits and styles and that, the researcher lead to discover how grade 10 students from remote and urban areas differ in how they go about learning, thinking and problem solving (a cross-cultural study).

The researchers (Castolo & Rebusquillo, 2007) pointed out in their study that learning styles have a big contribution to the academic performance of a student along with other factors such as learners' physical and emotional conditions, the characteristics and teaching methods of the teacher, the nature of school or learning environment and many others. In addition, it was recommended by (2014) in their study that teachers need to pay more attention in student's learning style and use appropriate teaching methods to enhance students learning.

Educators have gained great importance on the concept of learning style. They have a strong conviction regarding the potential of learning style for academic success. That is why a number of local and international researchers conducted studies on learning styles of students at different levels of education and attempted to explore their relationship with many socio-psychological variables. However, in the Philippines researchers (Cabaguing, 2016) (Castolo & Rebusquillo, 2007) have investigated learning style to various variables like gender, residential background, but no study has employed Honey and Mumford learning style inventory. In view of this, the researcher thought that there is a need to investigate learning style through the use of Honey and Mumford learning style inventory preferences of grade 10 students from remote and urban areas in relation to their gender, family and residential background, religion and how they differ to each other according to areas where they came from.

Every school year, Philippine public schools' (from elementary to senior high school) advisers will list down its Students at Risk of Dropping Out or SARDO's. These students who made the list are the ones who are always late, are no longer going to school, or those who come to school twice or thrice a month. Now, it has been the habit of the Department of Education and its school heads to put all the blame to teachers (as if the teachers are not doing their jobs), thus if students failed their subjects or dropped from school, it is the teachers who are at fault. At some point, perhaps this claim is half-truth and may relate to Felder and Brent study (2005). They discovered that the poor performance of their student-respondent is affected by their learning styles which are unfortunately, incompatible with their teachers' modes of teaching. Added to this consequence according to them is their shifting to other courses or much worst scenario is dropping out of school. In the Philippines, Lapinig (August 2006) found that the low satisfaction or poor academic performance of students is not necessarily attributable to either the difficulty or uninteresting topics of the subject or the students' lack of knowledge or ability. She concluded that many underachieving students fall behind because their learning styles are mismatched with the approaches used by their teachers to teach them. However, the Department of Education through its Project ReACH (Reaching All Children) - "Find them, Reach them, Keep them and Make them Complete School" is an initiative to lessen the dropout rate, in the attainment of zero dropout rates, in increasing participation rate and improving learning outcomes using formal, non-formal, and informal approaches.

The aim of this study is to compare the students' learning styles of two (2) differing environment, the urban and the rural areas which consists of 206 respondents.

Specifically, this study sought to answer to the following questions - (1) what is the profile of the student/s in terms of age, gender, and family background (family size, occupation of parents, family income,

educational attainment of parents, and religion); (2) what is the profile of the schools' as to population, and a self-made interview-questionnaire to School's Head; and (3) Is there any significant difference on the cross-cultural study of rural and urban areas on their learning style?

2. Methods and Materials:

The researcher employed standard principles of scientific method of research design-random sampling techniques which were supposed to be unbiased, and reliable. And to establish phenomena, this study used survey, testing method, and in a descriptive evaluative design.

Upon the approval of the proposal, the researcher prepared the research instrument. The questionnaire – checklist was checked, modified, and undergo content validation. The first section was consisted of personal information of the student-respondents, their age, gender, and their family background. Also, standardized test of Honey and Mumford learning style inventory was given to complete the information. Since the researcher used a standardized test, it was no longer be needed to undergo validation process. The researcher debriefed the student-respondents that the survey could help them recognize their strengths and encourage them to challenge themselves to finish the test. Also, the researcher was the one who administer the questionnaire.

Followed by the second section, the schools' head was the respondents to give information about the schools' profile which consists of the population, and support from the government or from the stakeholders.

Likewise, the researcher prepared a letter of requests addressed to the Schools Division Superintendents (SDS's) of the two divisions (City Schools Division of Cabuyao and Division of Laguna), to the principals of the chosen schools, and to barangay officials to conduct the study.

The two sets of data: (1) questionnaire-checklist and Honey and Mumford learning style inventory from student-respondent; and (2) an interview to schools' head to get the schools' profile to complete the needed information and collect then analyze accordingly.

3. Results and Discussions:

Table 1 Status of cross-cultural study of rural and urban areas in Laguna in terms of student profile with regards to age.

Age	Rural		Urban	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
14-17	98	96.08%	97	93.27%
18-21	3	2.94%	7	6.73%
22-25	1	0.98%	0	0.00%
Total	102	100%	104	100%

A very high percentage was noted by the students of rural aged 14-17, (96.08%) or a total of 98 out of 102 students and (93.27%) or a total of 97 out of 104 were the student's respondents in urban. Of the 102 students in rural there were (2.94%) of them were 18-21 years old, while of the 104 students in urban 7 or (6.73%) of them were also 18-21 years old. This means that almost equal number of students in rural and urban were generally young as evidenced by the data presented.

The results are closely like both rural and urban students wherein most of them are in regular age for grade 10 students-14-17 years of age. The outcomes were supported by DepEd Order s2019_021 which says that learners in secondary educations are in early adolescents. Early adolescents cover the ages 12- to 15-year-old. At this stage according to UNICEF (2011), it is a time of physical, socio-emotional, and intellectual development, and schools must ensure that teachers of young teens recognize and address the wide-ranging diversity of cognitive abilities inside their classrooms.

Table 2 Status of cross-cultural study of rural and urban areas in Laguna in terms of student profile with regards to gender.

Gender	Rural		Urban	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Male	52	50.98%	58	55.77%
Female	43	42.16%	42	40.38%
LGBT	7	6.86%	4	3.85%
Total	102	100%	104	100%

Of the 102 students in the rural area, (50.98%) or 52 of them identify as Male, while in the urban area, (55.77%) or 58 out of the 104 students identify as Male as well. A percentage of (42.16%) or 43 of the students in the rural area who identify as Female were recorded, while (40.38%) or 42 students in the urban area who identify the same were noted. Lastly, (6.86%) or 7 out of 102 students identify as LGBT, and (3.85%) or 4 out of the 104 students in the urban area identify as same. As evidenced by the data presented, there is almost an equal percentage in the number of Males and Females in rural and urban areas, where over half of the percentage were recorded as Males while the other minor half were Females. The percentage in this table shows that the distribution of questionnaires to various groups was in no way influenced by bias.

Table 3 Status of cross-cultural study of rural and urban areas in Laguna in terms of student profile with regards to family size.

Family Size	Rural		Urban	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
0-5	51	50.00%	77	74.04%
6-10	49	48.04%	26	25.00%
Others	2	1.96%	1	0.96%
Total	102	100%	104	100%

A percentage of (50.00%) or 51 out of 102 students was recorded in the rural area whose families consist of 0 – 5 members, and (74.04%) or 77 of the 104 students was recorded in the urban area with the same range of family size. Of the 102 students in the rural area, 49 of them, or (48.04%), have a family size ranging from 6 – 10, while (25.00%) or 26 of 104 students in the urban area have a family size that ranges from 6 – 10 as well. This shows that there are more students in the urban area whose family size ranges from 0 – 5 than the students in the rural area, while there are more students in the rural area whose family size ranges from 6 – 10 than the students in the urban area.

Table 4 presents the status of cross-cultural study of rural and urban areas in Laguna in terms of student profile with regards to parents' occupation.

Occupation	Rural				Urban			
	Mother		Father		Mother		Father	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Self-Employed	20	19.61%	53	51.96%	11	10.58%	46	44.23%
Employed	28	27.45%	48	47.06%	31	29.81%	56	53.85%
Unemployed	54	52.94%	1	0.98%	62	59.62%	2	1.92%
Total	102	100%	102	100%	104	100%	104	100%

A percentage of (19.61%) or 20 out of 102 mothers in the rural area are self-employed, while (10.58%) or 11 out of 104 mothers in the urban area are self-employed as well. On the other hand, 53 out of 102 fathers or (51.96%) in the rural area are self-employed, while (44.23%) or 46 out of 104 fathers are recorded as self-employed in the urban area. Of the 102 mothers in the rural area, (27.45%) or 28 of them are employed, while 31 or (29.81%) of the 104 mothers in the urban area are the same. On the other hand, out of 102 fathers in the rural area, (47.06%) or 48 of them are employed while there are (56.85%) or 53 fathers in the urban area who are the same. Meanwhile, (52.94%) or 54 out of 102 mothers in the rural area are unemployed, while a percentage of (59.62%) or 62 out of 104 mothers in the urban area was recorded as unemployed as well. In the rural area, there is a (0.98%) or 1 out of 102 fathers who is unemployed while there are 2 or (1.92%) out of 104 fathers in the urban area who are unemployed. These findings show that many of the mothers in both urban and rural areas are unemployed, with both areas having almost equal percentages, while most of the fathers in both urban and rural areas are either employed or self-employed.

Table 5 Status of Rural and urban areas in terms of students' profile with regards to family income.

Income of the Family	Rural		Urban	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
0-5,000	20	19.61%	13	12.50%
5,001-10,000	36	35.29%	24	23.08%
10,001-15,000	14	13.73%	20	19.23%
15,001-20,000	10	9.80%	18	17.31%
20,000 Above	22	21.57%	29	27.88%
Total	102	100%	104	100%

Of the 102 families in the rural area, (19.61%) or 20 of them earn Php 0 – Php 5,000, (35.29%) or 36 of them earn Php 5,001 – Php 10,000, (13.73%) or 14 of them earn Php 10,001 – Php 15,000, (9.80%) or 10 of them earn Php 15,001 – Php 20,000, and (21.57%) or 22 of them earn above Php 20,000. On the other hand, out of 104 families in the urban area, (12.50%) or 13 of them earn Php 0 – Php 5,000, (23.08%) or 24 of them earn Php 5,001 – Php 10,000, (19.23%) or 20 of them earn Php 10,001 – Php 15,000, (17.31%) or 18 of them earn Php 15,001 – Php 20,000, and (27.88%) or 29 of them earn above Php 20,000.

Table 6. Status of Cross-Cultural Study of Rural and Urban Areas in Terms of Students Profile with Regards to Educational attainment of Parents

Educational Attainment	Rural				Urban			
	Mother		Father		Mother		Father	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary Level	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Elementary Graduate	8	7.84%	6	5.88%	5	4.81%	5	4.81%
High School Level	10	9.80%	9	8.82%	11	10.58%	7	6.73%
High School Graduate	48	47.06%	44	43.14%	60	57.69%	54	51.92%
College Level	17	16.67%	18	17.65%	13	12.50%	10	9.62%
College Graduate	19	18.63%	19	18.63%	14	13.46%	22	21.15%
VocTech	0	0.00%	6	5.88%	1	0.96%	6	5.77%
Total	102	100%	102	100%	104	100%	104	100%

Of the 102 parents in the rural areas, there are (7.84%) or 8 mothers and (5.88%) or 6 fathers who are elementary graduate. In the urban areas, out of the 104 parents, (4.81%) or 5 mothers and (4.81%) or 5 fathers are elementary graduate. In rural areas, (9.80%) or 10 mothers and (8.82%) or 9 fathers are high school level, while (10.58%) or 11 mothers and (6.73%) or 7 fathers in the urban areas are of high school level as well. A percentage of (47.06%) or 48 mothers and (43.14%) or 44 fathers are high school graduates in the rural areas, while there are (57.69%) or 60 mothers and (51.92%) or 54 fathers in the urban areas that are high school graduates. (16.67%) or 17 of the mothers in the rural areas and (17.65%) or 18 fathers are in the college level, while (12.50%) or 13 mothers and (9.62%) or 10 fathers in the urban areas are in the same level. A percentage of (18.63%) or 19 mothers and (18.63%) or 19 fathers were recorded as college graduates, while a percentage of (13.46%) or 13 mothers and (21.15%) or 22 fathers were recorded as same.

Table 7. Status of Cross-Cultural Study of Rural and Urban Areas in Terms of Students Profile with Regards to Religion

Religion	Rural		Urban	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Roman Catholic	73	71.57	74	71.15
Iglesia Ni Cristo	6	5.88	4	3.85
Protestant	6	5.88	2	1.92
Islam	2	1.96	0	0.00
Others	15	14.71	24	23.08
Total	102	100	104	100

Of the 102 student-respondents from rural areas, there are 71.57% or 73 of them are Roman Catholic, 5.88% or 6 are Iglesia Ni Cristo, another 5.88% or 6 are Protestant, 1.96% or 2 of them are Islam, and 14.71% belong to other religious groups. In urban areas, with 104 student-respondents there are of 71.15% or 74 are Catholic, 3.85% or 4 are Iglesia Ni Cristo, 1.92% or 2 of them are Protestants, 23.08 or 24 were recorded to other religious groups.

Table 8. Status of Cross-Cultural Study of Rural and Urban Areas in terms of School Profile with regards to Population

	Schools	Population				Total	School Category
		Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10		
Rural	Siniloan Integrated National High School (SINHS)	1215	1341	1325	1030	4911	Big
	Gov. Felicisimo T. San Luis National High School (GFTSLNHS)	146	138	144	135	563	Small
	Mabitac National High School (MNHS)	215	209	211	203	838	Small
Urban	Marinig National High School (MNHS)	196	202	196	200	594	Small
	Pulo National High School (PNHS)	1009	1089	1101	1097	4296	Big

There are three (3) schools from rural areas. Of the three, Siniloan Integrated National High School is categorized as big school, and Gov. Felicisimo T. San Luis National High School, and Mabitac National High School are small. The total student population of Siniloan INHS is 4911. Of this, 1215 are from Grade 7; 1341 from Grade 8; 1325 from Grade 9; and 1030 from Grade 10. The total population of GFTSLNHS is 563. Of this 146 are from Grade 7, 138 are from Grade 8, 144 from Grade 9, and 135 from Grade 10. The total population of Mabitac National High School is 838. Of this 215 are from Grade 7, 209 from Grade 8, 211 from Grade 9, and 203 from Grade 10. There are two (2) schools from the urban area. Pulo National High School is categorized as big, and Marinig National High School is small. The total population of Pulo National High School is 4296. Of this 1009 are from Grade 7, 1089 from Grade 8, 1101 from Grade 9, and 1097 from Grade 10. The total population of Marinig National High School is 594. Of this 196 are from Grade 7, 202 are from Grade 8, 196 from Grade 9, and 200 from Grade 10.

Table 9. Schools' Profile in Urban and Rural Areas with regards to Self-made interview questionnaires for Schools' Head

Indicators	Rural			Urban		
	M	SD	VI	M	SD	VI
1. We receive financial support from local government (i.e. financing teachers in seminars, conduct varied activities for students to cater their learning preferences, etc.)	3.0.	0	A	3.5	0.71	SA
2. We receive financial support from stakeholders	3.33	0.58	SA	3.5	0.71	SA
3. We conduct teachers' training and seminar about learning styles	4.0	0	SA	3.5	0.71	SA
4. We observe our teaching force have taken into consideration the learning styles of their students	4.0	0	SA	3.5	0.71	SA
5. We observe our teachers have varied teaching methods/strategies to provide different learning styles	4.0	0	SA	3.5	0.71	SA
6. Schools' learning environment match with students' learning preferences	4	0	SA	4	0	A
Weighted Mean	3.72	0.46		3.58	0.51	
SD						

Legend	Range	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.26-4.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
3	2.51-3.25	Agree (A)
2	1.76-2.50	Disagree (DA)
1	1.00-1.75	Strongly Disagree (SD)

The first indicator that states that school heads' respective schools receive financial support from local government yielded a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.00, SD=0) with a verbal interpretation of "Agree" in the rural areas, and a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.5, SD=0.71) with a verbal interpretation of "Strongly Agree" in the urban areas. The school heads from both urban and rural areas "Strongly Agree" that they receive financial support from stakeholders, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.5, SD=0.71) in the urban areas, and a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.33, SD=0.58) in the rural areas. School heads from both urban and rural areas also "Strongly Agree" that their respective schools conduct trainings and seminars for teachers about learning styles, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.5, SD=0.71) in the urban areas, and a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.0, SD=0) in the rural areas. The school heads "Strongly Agree" as well that their teaching forces take into consideration the learning styles of their students in both urban and rural areas, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.5, SD=0.71) in the urban areas, and a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.0, SD=0) in the rural areas. School heads in both urban and rural areas "Strongly Agree" that their teachers have varied teaching methods/strategies to provide for the different learning styles, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.5, SD=0.71) in the urban areas, and a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.0, SD=0) in the rural areas. The school heads in urban and rural areas also "Strongly Agree" that their respective schools' learning environment match with the students' learning preferences, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.0, SD=0.71) in the urban areas, and a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.0, SD=0) in the rural areas.

Table 10. Status of Cross-Cultural Study of Rural and Urban Areas in terms of Activist

Indicator	Urban			Rural		
	Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. I often act without considering the possible consequences	1.37	2.24	Strongly Disagree	1.49	2.30	Strongly Disagree
2. I believe that formal procedures and policies restrict people.	2.79	2.49	Moderately Agree	2.84	2.49	Moderately Agree
3. I often find that actions based on feelings are as sound as those based on careful thought and analysis.	3.14	2.43	Moderately Agree	3.75	5.61	Agree
4. I actively seek out new experiences.	3.87	2.10	Agree	4.18	1.86	Agree
5. I am attracted more to novel, unusual ideas than to practical ones.	2.30	2.50	Disagree	2.26	2.50	Disagree
6. I thrive on the challenge of tackling something new and different.	2.70	2.50	Moderately Agree	3.80	2.15	Agree
7. I enjoy fun-loving spontaneous people	3.48	2.31	Agree	3.56	2.28	Agree
8. I tend to be open about how I'm feeling.	2.50	2.51	Disagree	3.37	2.36	Moderately Agree
9. I prefer to respond to events in a spontaneous, flexible way rather than plan things out	2.06	2.47	Disagree	2.79	2.50	Moderately Agree

in advance						
10. Quiet, thoughtful people tend to make me feel uneasy.	2.45	2.51	Disagree	2.55	2.51	Disagree
11. It is more important to enjoy the present moment than to think about the past or future.	3.77	2.16	Agree	4.09	1.94	Agree
12. In discussions, I usually produce lots of spontaneous ideas	2.06	2.47	Disagree	2.55	2.51	Disagree
13. More often than not, rules are there to be broken.	2.25	2.50	Disagree	2.55	2.51	Disagree
14. On balance I talk more than I listen.	2.25	2.50	Disagree	2.21	2.50	Disagree
15. I enjoy being the one that talks a lot.	2.60	2.51	Disagree	2.69	2.50	Moderately Agree
16. When things go wrong, I am happy to shrug it off and 'put it down to experience'	2.94	2.47	Moderately Agree	2.45	2.51	Disagree
17. I find the formality of having specific objectives and plans stifling.	1.96	2.45	Disagree	1.97	2.46	Disagree
18. I'm usually one of the people who puts life into a party.	1.76	2.40	Strongly Disagree	1.88	2.43	Disagree
19. I quickly get bored with methodical, detailed work.	1.91	2.44	Disagree	2.16	2.49	Disagree
20. I enjoy the drama and excitement of a crisis situation.	2.35	2.51	Moderately Agree	3.08	2.44	Moderately Agree
Weighted Mean: SD	2.53	2.50		2.81	2.73	

The learning styles of Activist in urban and rural areas was found common but somewhat different in some aspects as seen in the table.

Students in both urban and rural areas “Strongly Disagree” to the statement that says that they often act without considering the possible consequences, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.37, SD=2.24) in urban and (M=1.49, SD=2.30) in rural areas. Furthermore, they also “Disagree” to the statement that says that they are more attracted to novel, unusual ideas rather than the practical ones, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.30, SD=2.50) in urban areas and (M=2.26, SD=2.50) in rural areas. They also “Disagree” to the claim that they feel uneasy towards quiet and thoughtful people, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.45, SD=2.51) in urban areas and (M=2.55, SD=2.51) in rural areas. Students also “Disagree” that rules are often there to be broken, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.25, SD=2.50) in urban areas and (M=2.55, SD=2.51) in rural areas. It is also observed that students on both urban and rural areas tend to listen more than to talk, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.25, SD=2.50) in urban areas and (M=2.21, SD=2.50) in rural areas. Furthermore, they do not find the formality of having specific objectives and plans to be stifling, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.96, SD=2.45) in urban areas and (M=1.97, SD=2.46) in rural areas. They also do not get bored quickly with methodical, detailed work, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.91, SD=2.44) in urban areas and (M=2.16, SD=2.49) in rural areas.

The students seem to be active in seeking out new experiences, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.77, SD=2.16) in urban areas and (M=4.09, SD=1.94) in rural areas. Students who enjoy fun-loving, spontaneous people are also commonly observed in both urban and rural areas, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.48, SD=2.31) in urban areas and (M=3.56, SD=2.28) in rural areas. They also “Agree” that

it is more important to enjoy the present moment than to think about the past or future, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.87, SD=2.10) in urban areas and (M=4.18, SD=1.86) in rural areas.

Table 11. Level of Learning Style in terms of Theorist

Indicator	Urban			Rural		
	Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. I have strong beliefs about what is right and wrong, good and bad	4.70	1.19	Strongly Agree	4.81	0.97	Strongly Agree
2. I tend to solve problems using a step-by-step approach	3.68	2.22	Agree	4.23	1.81	Strongly Agree
3. I regularly question people about their basic assumptions	2.50	2.51	Disagree	3.13	2.43	Moderately Agree
4. I am keen on self-discipline such as watching my diet, taking regular exercise, sticking to a fixed routine, etc.	1.81	2.42	Disagree	2.16	2.49	Disagree
5. I get on best with logical, analytical people and less well with spontaneous, 'irrational' people.	2.35	2.51	Disagree	2.60	2.51	Disagree
6. I don't like disorganized things and prefer to fit things into a coherent pattern.	2.70	2.50	Moderately Agree	2.93	2.47	Moderately Agree
7. I like to relate my actions to a general principle, standard or belief.	3.68	2.22	Agree	3.03	2.46	Moderately Agree
8. I tend to have distant, rather formal relationships with people at work.	2.16	2.49	Disagree	1.92	2.44	Disagree
9. I find it difficult to produce ideas on impulse	2.60	2.51	Disagree	1.80	2.40	Strongly Disagree
10. Flippant, superficial people who don't take things seriously enough usually irritate me.	2.94	2.47	Moderately Agree	2.74	2.50	Moderately Agree
11. I tend to be a perfectionist	1.86	2.43	Disagree	1.39	2.25	Strongly Disagree
12. I can often see inconsistencies and weaknesses in other people's arguments.	2.70	2.50	Moderately Agree	2.93	2.47	Moderately Agree
13. I believe that rational, logical thinking should win the day.	2.65	2.51	Moderately Agree	3.13	2.43	Moderately Agree
14. I am keen to reach answers via a logical approach.	2.11	2.48	Disagree	2.07	2.47	Disagree
15. In discussions with people I often find I am the most dispassionate and objective.	1.23	2.16	Strongly Disagree	1.54	2.32	Strongly Disagree
16. I like to be able to relate current actions to the longer-term bigger picture	1.91	2.44	Disagree	2.07	2.47	Disagree

17. I tend to be tough on people who find it difficult to adopt a logical approach	2.01	2.46	Disagree	2.21	2.50	Disagree
18. I am keen on exploring the basic assumptions, principles and theories underpinning things and events.	2.21	2.49	Disagree	2.88	2.48	Moderately Agree
19. I like meetings to be run on methodical lines, sticking to laid down agenda.	1.62	2.35	Strongly Disagree	1.54	2.32	Strongly Disagree
20. People often find me insensitive to their feelings.	1.76	2.40	Strongly Disagree	1.83	2.42	Disagree
Weighted Mean: SD	2.46 : 2.50			2.55 : 2.50		

The students in both urban and rural areas “Strongly Disagree” to the statement that says they often find themselves to be dispassionate and objective during discussions with other people, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.23, SD=2.16) in urban areas and (M=1.54, SD=2.32) in rural areas. They also “Strongly Disagree” to the claim that they like meetings to be run on methodical lines and sticking to laid down agenda, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.62, SD=2.35) in urban areas and (M=1.54, SD=2.32) in rural areas. Moreover, students in the urban and rural areas seem to not be keen on self-discipline such as watching their diet, taking regular exercise, sticking to a fixed routine, etc., with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.81, SD=2.42) in urban areas and (M=2.16, SD=2.49) in rural areas. It is also observed that they do not get on best with logical, analytical people but more to people who are spontaneous and ‘irrational’, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.35, SD=2.51) in urban areas and (M=2.60, SD=2.51) in rural areas. The students “Disagree” to the statement that says they tend to have a distant, rather formal relationships with people at work, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.16, SD=2.49) in urban areas and (M=1.92, SD=2.44) in rural areas. Students who are not keen to reach answers via a logical approach are also commonly observed, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.11, SD=2.48) in urban areas and (M=2.07, SD=2.47) in rural areas. Furthermore, they do not like to be able to relate current actions to the longer-term, bigger picture, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.91, SD=2.44) in urban areas and (M=2.07, SD=2.47) in rural areas. They also are not tough to people who find it difficult to adopt a logical approach, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.01, SD=2.46) in urban areas and (M=2.21, SD=2.50) in rural areas.

On the other hand, students on both urban and rural areas “Strongly Agree” that they have strong beliefs about what is right and wrong, and good and bad, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.70, SD=1.19) in urban areas and (M=4.81, SD=0.97) in rural areas.

Table 12. Level of Learning Style in terms of Pragmatist

Indicator	Urban			Rural		
	Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. I have a reputation for saying what I think, simply and directly	3.58	2.27	Agree	3.37	2.36	Moderately Agree
2. What matters most is whether something works in practice	2.70	2.50	Moderately Agree	3.70	2.20	Agree
3. When I hear about a new idea or approach, I immediately start	3.19	2.42	Moderately Agree	3.13	2.43	Moderately Agree

working out how to apply it in practice						
4. I accept and stick to laid down procedures and policies so long as I regard them as an efficient way of getting the job done	3.04	2.45	Moderately Agree	3.32	2.37	Moderately Agree
5. In discussions, I like to get straight to the point.	3.58	2.27	Agree	3.70	2.20	Agree
6. I believe in coming to the point immediately.	2.45	2.51	Disagree	3.03	2.46	Moderately Agree
7. I tend to be attracted to techniques such as flow charts, contingency plans etc	2.45	2.51	Disagree	3.27	2.39	Moderately Agree
8. I tend to judge people's ideas on their practical merits	1.57	2.33	Strongly Disagree	1.63	2.36	Strongly Disagree
9. In meetings, I put forward practical, realistic ideas	2.89	2.48	Moderately Agree	3.08	2.44	Moderately Agree
10. I can often see better, more practical ways to get things done	2.45	2.51	Disagree	3.61	2.25	Moderately Agree
11. I think written reports should be short and to the point	3.33	2.37	Moderately Agree	3.41	2.34	Agree
12. I like people who approach things realistically rather than theoretically.	2.79	2.49	Moderately Agree	3.17	2.42	Moderately Agree
13. In discussions, I get impatient with irrelevant issues and digressions ⁷	1.86	2.43	Disagree	1.83	2.42	Disagree
14. I am keen to try things out to see if they work in practice	2.99	2.46	Moderately Agree	2.98	2.47	Moderately Agree
15. In discussions, I often find I am a realist, keeping people to the point and avoiding wild Speculations.	2.60	2.51	Disagree	2.74	2.50	Moderately Agree
16. I tend to reject wild, spontaneous ideas as being impractical	1.42	2.27	Strongly Disagree	2.02	2.47	Disagree
17. Most times I believe the end justifies the means.	2.79	2.49	Moderately Agree	2.84	2.49	Moderately Agree
18. I don't mind hurting people's feelings so long as the job gets done.	1.67	2.37	Strongly Disagree	2.18	2.49	Disagree
19. I do whatever is practical to get the job done	2.60	2.51	Disagree	2.74	2.50	Moderately Agree
20. People often find me insensitive to their feelings	2.72	2.50	Moderately Agree	2.93	2.47	Moderately Agree
Weighted Mean: SD		2.63 : 2.50			2.93 : 2.46	

The learning styles in terms of Pragmatist in urban and rural areas was found common but also somewhat different in some aspects as seen in the table.

Students who like to get to the point during discussions are commonly observed among those in both urban and rural areas, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.58, SD=2.27) in urban areas and (M=3.70, SD=2.20) in rural areas.

On the other hand, students “Strongly Disagree” to the statement that says they tend to judge people’s ideas on practical merits, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.57, SD=2.33) in urban areas and (M=1.63, SD=2.36) in rural areas. Results also show that they do not tend to get impatient on discussion about irrelevant issues and digressions, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=1.86, SD=2.43) in urban areas and (M=1.83, SD=2.42) in rural areas.

Table 13. Level of Learning Style in terms of Reflector

Indicator	Urban			Rural		
	Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. I like the sort of work where I have time for thorough preparation and implementation.	2.94	2.47	Moderately Agree	3.61	2.25	Agree
2. I take pride in doing a thorough job	1.52	2.31	Strongly Disagree	2.55	2.51	Disagree
3. I take care over how I interpret data and avoid jumping to conclusions	2.89	2.48	Moderately Agree	3.56	2.28	Agree
4. I like to reach a decision carefully after weighing up many alternatives	3.43	2.33	Agree	3.65	2.23	Agree
5. I pay careful attention to detail before coming to a conclusion	4.23	5.62	Strongly Agree	3.17	2.42	Moderately Agree
6. I am careful not to jump to conclusions too quickly	3.14	2.43	Moderately Agree	3.46	2.32	Agree
7. I prefer to have as many sources of information as possible – the more information to think over the better	3.58	2.27	Agree	3.94	2.05	Agree
8. I listen to other people’s points of view before putting my own view forward.	3.82	2.13	Agree	4.38	1.66	Strongly Agree
9. In discussions, I enjoy watching the plotting and scheming of the other participants.	2.65	2.51	Moderately Agree	3.22	2.41	Moderately Agree
10. It worries me if I have to rush work to meet a tight deadline	4.12	1.92	Agree	3.56	2.28	Agree
11. I often get irritated by people who want to rush things.	2.89	2.48	Moderately Agree	3.13	2.43	Moderately Agree
12. I think that decisions based on a careful analysis of all the information are better than those based on intuition.	2.75	2.50	Moderately Agree	3.22	2.41	Moderately Agree
13. I prefer to stand back from a situation and consider all the perspectives	2.79	2.49	Moderately Agree	2.84	2.49	Moderately Agree
14. I tend to discuss specific things with people rather than engaging in social discussion	2.16	2.49	Disagree	2.69	2.50	Moderately Agree
15. If I have a report to write, I tend to	2.65	2.51	Moderately	2.45	2.51	Disagree

produce lots of drafts before settling on the final version.			Agree			
16. I like to ponder many alternatives before making up my mind	2.84	2.49	Moderately Agree	2.79	2.50	Moderately Agree
17. In discussions I'm more likely to adopt a 'low profile' than to take the lead and do most of the talking	2.50	2.51	Disagree	2.31	2.50	Disagree
18. It's best to think carefully before taking action	4.02	1.99	Agree	3.85	2.12	Agree
19. On balance, I do the listening rather than the talking.	3.14	2.43	Moderately Agree	3.89	2.09	Agree
20. 'm always interested to find out what people think.	3.63	2.24	Agree	3.70	2.20	Agree
Weighted Mean: SD		3.08 : 2.70			3.30 : 2.37	

Students in both urban and rural areas "Agree" to the statement that says they like to reach a decision carefully after weighing up many alternatives, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.43, SD=2.33) in urban areas and (M=3.65, SD=2.23) in rural areas. They also prefer to have as many sources of information as possible, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.58, SD=2.27) in urban areas and (M=3.94, SD=2.05) in rural areas. It is also commonly observed among these students that meeting tight deadlines and having to rush work worries them, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.12, SD=1.92) in urban areas and (M=3.56, SD=2.28) in rural areas. Moreover, they "Agree" to the statement that says that it is best to think carefully before acting, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=4.02, SD=1.99) in urban areas and (M=3.85, SD=2.12) in rural areas. They are also interested to find out what other people think, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=3.63, SD=2.24) in urban areas and (M=3.70, SD=2.20) in rural areas.

On the other hand, the students in both urban and rural areas "Disagree" to the statement that says that they are more likely to adopt a 'low profile' rather than to take the lead and do most of the talking, with a mean and standard deviation of (M=2.50, SD=2.51) in urban areas and (M=2.31, SD=2.50) in rural areas.

Table 14. Significant Difference on the Cross-Cultural Study of Rural and Urban Areas on Their Learning Style

Cross-Cultural Study	Learning Style	t-stat	p-value	Analysis
Urban Rural	Activist	-0.76851	0.443112	Not Significant
Urban Rural	Theorist	-2.55832	0.011297	Significant
Urban Rural	Pragmatist	-2.42057	0.016408	Significant
Urban Rural	Reflector	-1.74719	0.08211	Not Significant

The findings indicate that the learning styles of the students in the urban and rural areas in terms of Activist and Reflector have no significant difference from each other. This is given by their p-values being (p=0.443112 and p=0.08211), which are higher than the 0.05 level of significance. It means that both rural and urban areas might have the same number of students or same intensity of learning styles in terms of

Activist and Reflector. While on the other hand, the p-values of urban and rural areas in terms of Theorist and Pragmatist are ($p=0.011297$ and $p=0.016408$), which are both lower than the 0.05 level of significance. In conclusion, in terms of Activist and Reflector, the learning styles of urban and rural areas have no significant difference; but, in terms of Theorist and Pragmatist, it can be concluded that, the learning styles of urban and rural areas have a significant difference. With regards to Theorist and Pragmatist, the learning styles of students in urban and rural areas might have a statistically significant difference in the number of actual students or the intensity of their learning styles.

4. Conclusions:

Considering the findings of the study based on the gathered data with regards to the learning styles in terms of Activist and Reflector, results show that the p-value is greater than the significance level, and thus, the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the learning styles of the students in urban areas and the learning styles of the students in rural areas. However, in terms of Theorist and Pragmatist, results show that the p-value is less than the significance level, and thus, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis. Therefore, it is concluded that in terms of Activist and Reflector, the learning styles of urban and rural areas have no significant difference; but, in terms of Theorist and Pragmatist, it can be concluded that, the learning styles of urban and rural areas have a significant difference. With regards to Theorist and Pragmatist, the learning styles of students in urban and rural areas might have a statistically significant difference in the number of actual students or the intensity of their learning styles.

Acknowledgement

Immeasurable appreciation and deepest gratitude for the help and support are extended to the following persons who in one way or another have contributed to making this study possible:

Hon. Prof. Mario R. Briones Ed.D., LSPU President, for valuable support to the graduate students and for opening the door for Graduate school and motivating students to flourish.

Dr. Ma. Victoria A. Cabigan, her research adviser, for her support, advice, guidance, valuable comments, suggestions, and provisions that benefited her much in the completion and success of this study.

Dr. Evelyn Sunico and Mrs. Marie Anne Gonzales, her statisticians, for their knowledge and helped in the analysis of data and some adjustments to do that helped her a lot to complete this study.

Dr. Ray Samuel Grecalda, her technical editor, for assistance and word of encouragement and for his time and effort in checking this manuscript.

Dr. August Tuiza, her subject specialist, for sharing his knowledge and enthusiasm that enabled the researcher to complete the manuscript.

Dr. Aileen M. Daran, her language critic, for her untiring support and patience in editing this manuscript.

Dr. Mel Anthony Liboon, her external panel during the final oral defense, for his commendable suggestions.

Dr. Rosario G. Catapang, the GSAR Coordinator, for her encouragement and guidance to finish the journey after several attempts.

A profusely thanks to Dr. Florhaida V. Pamatmat, Dean of College of Education and GSAR.

To all the Respondents, for lending their time to answering the questionnaire checklist honestly.

The researcher owes a deep sense of gratitude to her son Ezekiel, whom every step of the way clears his mother's path to finish this study.

A privilege thanks to her husband Joshua, for his calm and positive attitude that everything will be fine, and the universe will constantly align to both of them.

To Janara for taking care of her dogs when busy days.

To Nanay, and Ate Mary, for loosen-up the everyday problems the family have encountered.

References

- Cox, D.E. and Sproles, E.K., G.B. (1988). Learning Style Variations Between Rural and Urban Students. https://jrre.psu.edu/sites/default/files/2019-07/5-1_5.pdf
- Castolo, C.L. and Rebusquillo, L.R. (2008). Learning Styles of Sophomore Students of PUP Laboratory High School (School Year 2006-2007). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1066299>
- Mohammadi, I. and Thaginejhad H. (2014). Learning Styles of Nursing Students in Iran Using the Kolb's Theory: A Review Study. <https://jbrms.medilam.ac.ir/article-1-37-en.html>
- Cabaguing, A.M. (2016). Teaching and Learning Styles in Social Studies: The Samar State University Experience. International Conference on Research in Social Sciences, Humanities & Education, 102
- Felder, R. and Brent, R. (2005). Understanding Student Differences. [https://www.engr.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/drive/1pQQ7SL02ShCauYV13aI15hTQffqgsILv/2005-Understanding%20Student%20Differences%20\(JEE\).pdf](https://www.engr.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/drive/1pQQ7SL02ShCauYV13aI15hTQffqgsILv/2005-Understanding%20Student%20Differences%20(JEE).pdf)
- Magulod, Gilbert C. Jr. (2018). Learning Styles, Study Habits and Academic Performance of Filipino University Students in Applied Science Courses: Implications for Instruction. Journal of Technology and Science Education

Authors Profile:

Esther Mena-Villalon received a degree of Bachelor in Secondary Education, and her Master of Arts in Education Major in Social Sciences in Laguna State Polytechnic University. She is working as Teacher III, and an SSG Adviser in Pulo National High School in the City Schools' Division of Cabuyao for almost 6 years. She has been an advocate of teachers' rights and welfare, and women's rights.

Ma. Victoria A. Cabigan, Associate Prof II, full time faculty of College of Arts and Sciences at the Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz Campus, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Applied Research...Graduate of Doctor of Education, major in Industrial Education Management at Technological University of the Philippines, Manila.