http://www.eab.org.tr

Educational Research Association
The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education
2018, 9(1): 1-5
ISSN: 1308-951X

http://ijrte.eab.org.tr

Study of Learning Resistance Among Pupil Teachers

Santosh Pal[1]
K. S. Mısra[2]

Abstract

This study explores the effect of gender and grade level on learning resistance among D.El.Ed. students. The sample comprised of 92 students of D.El.Ed. course from two colleges of Lucknow. Learning resistance was assessed with the help of Learning Resistance Inventory (LRI) of K. S. Misra. 2x2 ANOVA was used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that male students exhibit more learning resistance than female students, students of D.El.Ed. I and III semesters do not differ from one another on learning resistance, and the effect of interaction between gender and semester is not significant. Remedial measures for reducing learning resistance have been suggested.

Keywords: Learning resistance, pupil teachers.

[1] University of Allahabad. santosh.pal@yahoo.com
[2] Prof. Dr., University of Allahabad. ksmisra1955@yahoo.co.in

Introduction

Education is an attempt by the generation of society to transfer its knowledge to the lower generation of its own. In this thought, education works as an institution. This institution focuses on the excellence of skills. For this innovation and technology are being used to simplify learning and to maximize learning and its experiences. But not all practices get their goals because there exist some obstacles that do not allow learning to reach the learner. Resistance is such an obstacle, offered by one person to the orders, suggestions, or actions of another. In education, the resistance is directed against active participation in learning. Resistance to learning has a twofold meaning. The immediate psychological understanding of the thought refers to the situation in which one or many individuals directly or indirectly refuse any engagement in a learning possibility. There exist sociological and political perspective, in which learning resistance is considered as a part of the general opposition to social learning conditions by laden populations. Resistance to learning appears at every educational level. It prevents students themselves from correctly organizing their learning activity and refers to one who fails to apply him-self to the learning tasks of the school. It is convenient to assume that the origins of student resistance lie in classroom active-learning strategies themselves (Prince and Felder, 2007). For the contemporary education system learning resistance is a challenge. Although it is intangible and invisible, but is responsible for many incidents in the class and as educationist, we first need to recognize that how resistance and learning may be inextricably linked? In India, when questions are being raised on the efficiency of the teachers' teaching in the primary schools, this issue becomes more important especially when this problem is being seen in future teachers. The bulk of those who do qualify to be teachers, observed the Justice Verma Commission – a Supreme Court-appointed panel that studied the state of teacher education – in its 2012 report, are trained through sub-standard "teaching shops" (private institutes) that fail to address the pedagogic needs of diverse classrooms. The present study attempts to find out the effect of gender and grade level on learning resistance among D.El.Ed. students.

Objectives

Following objectives have been formulated for the study:

1. To study the effect of gender on learning resistance.
2. To study the effect of grade level on learning resistance.
3. To study the effect of interaction between gender and grade level on learning resistance.

Hypotheses

To achieve the objectives following hypotheses have been formulated and tested:

H_{01}: There exists no significant difference in learning resistance of male and female students.

H_{02}: There exists no significant difference in learning resistance of D.EL.ED. I and III semester students.

H_{03}: The effect of interaction between gender and grade level on learning resistance is not significant.

Methodology

The sample of this study consists of 92 (46 males and 46 females) student-teachers of D.El.Ed. course from two colleges of Lucknow. Learning resistance was measured with the help of 'Learning Resistance Inventory' (LRI) developed by K. S. Misra. 2x2 ANOVA was used to analyze the data.

Results and Discussion

Table 1

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Dependent Variable: LR Total

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
Gender	4097.783	1	4097.783	5.382*
Grade Level	1586.130	1	1586.130	2.083
Gender*Grade Level	.043	1	.043	.000
Error	66997.478	88	761.335	
Total	2942926.000	92		

*Significant at .05 level

Table 2

Mean and standard deviations for male and female D.El.Ed. students

Class	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Total	Male	180.78	27.944	46
	Female	172.48	28.268	46
	Total	176.63	28.261	92

Two way ANOVA was used to find out the effect of gender on learning resistance among D.El.Ed. students. A look at table 1 shows that the value of F ratio is 5.382. It is significant at 0.05 level. So, the null hypothesis that 'there exists no significant difference in learning resistance of male and female students.' can be rejected. It means that male students differ from female students on learning resistance. Table 2 shows that mean and SD for male D.El.Ed. students on learning resistance are 180.78 & 27.944. Mean and SD for male D.El.Ed. students on learning resistance are 172.48 & 28.268. Mean for male D.El.Ed. students is greater than that for female D.El.Ed. students. It can be inferred that male D.El.Ed. students exhibit more learning resistance than female D.El.Ed. students. It means female students possess less learning resistance than the male students. Interestingly, the gender differences in learning emerge after puberty, whereas no gender differences are observed before or during puberty. There do appear to be gender differences in brain development and competency on specific cognitive tasks. Males have larger brains, but females' brains mature faster. Male students get frustrated and angry when they can't understand the content, which distract them from learning. This difference in maturation process is responsible for the slight difference in learning resistance.

Table 3

Mean and standard deviations of D.El.Ed. students of I and III semester

Class	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
D.El.Ed. I	Total	169.96	24.400	46
D.El.Ed. III	Total	183.30	30.475	46

It was hypothesized that 'there exists no significant difference in learning resistance of D.El.Ed. I and III semester students.' Two way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis. Table 3 shows that means & standard deviations for D.El.Ed. I and III semester students on learning resistance are 169.96 & 24.400 and 183.30 & 30.475 respectively. Table 1 shows that the value of F ratio is 2.083. It is not significant at 0.05 level. So, the null hypothesis can be accepted. It means students of D.El.Ed. I and III semester have equal learning resistance, which indicates that grade level doesn't influence the learning resistance. This may be due to the reason that the entire curriculum of D.El.Ed. is a scaled-down version of the B.Ed. and slightly higher version of graduation, which suffers from lack of contextual relevance. In addition to that, it is being carried by the unqualified and low merit teachers, who are not explicit with students about the reasoning behind their pedagogical choices. The described factors including disjunction

between learning and teaching styles result in the form of learning resistance among the students. Learning resistance started in the first semester, after achieving its peak, becomes stagnant by holding the form of a plateau. This plateau remains even in the third semester and probably that is why students of first and third semester often resist efforts that seek to make them learn and they show same learning resistance.

Table 4

Mean and standard deviations for male and female students of D.El.Ed. I and III semester

Class	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
D.El.Ed. I	Male	174.13	27.277	23
	Female	165.78	20.913	23
D.El.Ed. III	Male	187.43	27.579	23
	Female	179.17	33.216	23

It was hypothesized that 'the effect of interaction between gender and grade level on learning resistance is not significant.' The data were analyzed using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Table 4 shows that mean and standard deviation for the learning resistance among D.El.Ed. I semester male students are 174.13 and 27.277 respectively. Mean and standard deviation for the learning resistance among D.El.Ed. I semester female students are 165.78 and 20.913. Mean and standard deviation for the learning resistance among D.El.Ed. III semester male students are 187.43 and 27.579. Mean and standard deviation for the learning resistance among D.El.Ed. III semester female students are 179.17 and 33.216. Table 1 shows that F ratio is 0.000, which is not significant at 0.05 level. So, the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that effect of interaction between gender and grade level on learning resistance is not significant. Thus it can be inferred that the effect of gender on learning resistance among D.El.Ed. I and III semester students is the same.

Educational implication

This study, being of an exploratory and interpretive nature, raises a number of opportunities for future research, both in terms of theory development and concept validation. This study offers the opportunity to refine and validate the concept of learning resistance and constructs that emerged from our inductive analysis. More researches are necessary to refine and further elaborate these findings. The study can also be extended in longitudinal and comparative ways with different grade level and course programmes respectively. This study can be reiterated on government D.El.Ed. colleges.

Conclusion

Research indicates that resistance to learning appears at higher educational level. Students resist learning when they don't see how or what an activity contributes to their efforts to learn. If it looks like busywork or a waste of time, students resist. In absence of motivation or due to lack of maturity and poor teaching learner start refusing the learning on very short intervals. It is a silent boycott of learning being provided in class. Therefore, it can not be left at all. It should be taken seriously. Otherwise, this emerging tendency among future educators will put a question mark on their future role. On the basis of the results of the statistical analysis and hypotheses testing discussed in the earlier sections, the following tentative conclusions may be drawn in the present study:

1. Male D.EL.ED. students exhibit more learning resistance than female D.El.Ed. students.
2. Students of D.El.Ed. I and III semester have equal learning resistance, which means grade level doesn't influence the learning resistance.

3. Gender and grade level do not interact for learning resistance significantly i.e. the pattern of difference in the learning resistance of male and female students in terms of D.El.Ed. students of I and III semester are same.

References

Chandra, R. (2004). Social development in India. In R. Chandra, Social development in India (p. 103). Gyan Publishing House.

Flynn, Jim; Rossi-Casé, Lilia (2011). "Modern women match men on Raven's Progressive Matrices". Personality and Individual Differences. 50 (6): 799–803.

Gorham J, Millette DM. A comparative analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. Commun Educ. 1997;46:245–261.

Hodes GE, Shors TJ. Distinctive stress effects on learning during puberty. Horm Behav. 2005;48 (2):163–71.

Morris D. Caplin, Resistance to learning, Peabody Journal of Education July 1969 Pages 36-39 | Published online: 02 Nov 2009

