

RIGIDITY AMONG PERSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN RELATION TO DISCIPLINE AND GENDER

Indu Rathee

Associate Professor, Tika Ram College of Education, Sonipat (Haryana)

Abstract

Term rigidity includes preservation, conservation, dogmatism, analytic, intolerance of ambiguity and compulsiveness. The present study is proposed to understand the nature of rigidity in relation to discipline and gender of perspective teachers. The study has been conducted on a sample of 70 perspective teachers selected randomly from four B. Ed. colleges located in Sonipat city (Haryana). Coulter' Rigidity Scale (CRS)(1994) was used to collect data. The obtained data was analyzed by using Mean, S.D's and t-test. The findings of the study revealed: i) No significant difference between Perspective teachers of Arts and Science streams regarding rigidity ii) No significant difference was reported in the rigidity of perspective teacher regarding their gender.

Keywords- *Rigidity, Perspective Teachers, Discipline and Gender*



Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com

INTRODUCTION

Rigidity is a highly interesting psychological construct because it refers to, two aspects of individual differences personality and ability that are usually regarded as separate. More than 100 years of systematic study of rigidity have produced a large body of research with some clear and established findings. However, controversies surrounding several fundamental aspects of rigidity still remain. Behavioral rigidity refers to a student's difficulty maintaining appropriate behavior in new and unfamiliar situations. The opposite of rigidity would be flexibility, which enables any student to shift effortlessly from task to task in the classroom, from topic to topic in conversation, from one role to another in games, etc. Rigidity can also affect thinking. According to Piaget, affective and moral development is inseparable from cognitive development. Therefore, the rigid behavior found in intellectual tasks have their parallels in the lack of autonomy, perseveration and rigid constructions of personal and interpersonal values found in social behavior. Cognitive rigidity occurs when anyone is unable to consider alternatives to the current situation, alternative viewpoints, or innovative solutions to a problem. The student with rigid thinking tends to view things in "either-or"

terms (e.g., things are either right or wrong, good or bad). He or she wants concrete, black and white answers.

Werner (1946) defined rigidity as the lack of response variability or the lack of adaptability of behavior. Werner further made the distinction that stability is not the same as rigidity but a “flexibility of response in order to preserve the functional equilibrium of the organism in the face of mutable situations” Although the term rigidity may be somewhat out of vogue among personality and social psychologists today, we continue to see considerable interest in a range of highly related personality variables, such as flexibility, need for closure, and openness to experience. Chown noted that the construct of rigidity had proved difficult to define. Indeed, the term had been used to describe mental sets, extreme attitudes, ethnocentrism, stereotypy, lack of flexibility, perseveration, authoritarianism, and the inability to change habits. Rokeach defined rigidity as a resistance to change in beliefs, attitudes, or personal habits. The usefulness of this definition is its multidimensional nature. Rigidity is not simply the perseveration of behavior on a behavioral task, but can be divided into cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral components. Rigidity may be cognitive, especially; perceptual that is, it may be an ability to perceive things differently even when the objective conditions have changed. Rigidity may also be affective, or it may show itself in overt action. Despite the long history of research on rigidity, the construct continues to attract research from a variety of psychological disciplines (D'anno& Sutton, 1992). Systematic study of rigidity has produced a large body of research with some clear and established findings. Systematic research on rigidity can be traced back to the Gestalt psychologists of the late 19th and early 20th century (Cattell, 1946; Chown, 1959; Luhcins&Luchins, 1994; Stewin, 1983). An examination of published research reveals that the term rigidity continues to be commonly used by psychological researchers. Werner (1946) stated that rigidity is a multiform rather than a uniform trait. He discriminated two types of rigidity i.e. subnormal rigidity and abnormal rigidity. Subnormal rigidity is observed in feeble-minded persons of familial (endogenous) type. It is assumed that this kind of rigidity is mainly the result of differentiation of mental functions. A person who is sub normally rigid, fails to solve problems because he over-simplifies them. Abnormal rigidity is found mainly in mentally defected persons of brain injured (exogenous) type. This type of rigidity is said to be the result of lack of integration and lack of coherence. The present study is proposed to understand the nature of rigidity in relation to discipline and gender of perspective teachers.

OBJECTIVES

1. To compare the mean scores of perspective teachers on rigidity regarding their discipline (Arts and Science).
2. To compare the mean scores of perspective teachers on rigidity regarding their gender (Male and Female).

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of perspective teachers on rigidity regarding their discipline (Arts and Science).
2. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of perspective teachers on rigidity regarding their gender (Male and Female).

METHODOLOGY

Normative survey method was used for the study. The subjects in this study consisted of seventy, second year B.Ed. students of science and arts stream from four B. Ed. colleges located in Sonapat city (Haryana). In the selection of the sample, due representation was given to sex and discipline of the subjects. Coulter' Rigidity Scale (CRS)(1994) was used to collect the data. The data was collected and statistically analyzed using mean, standard deviation and t-test.

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

Table-1 Showing means, SD & 't' value of rigidity of perspective teachers in relation to their discipline.

Sr.No	Group	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Significant / Not Significant
1.	Perspective Teachers (Arts)	3 5	15.74	1.82	1.00	Not Significant
2.	Perspective Teachers(Science)	3 5	15.31	1.79		

Not Significant at 0.05 level.

Interpretation- As it can be seen from table- 1 that 't' value of 1.00 is significant at 0.05 level. This means that the two groups under the study do not differ significantly in relation to rigidity. The mean score of perspective teachers related to Arts stream is 15.74 as against the mean score of 15.31 of the Science perspective teachers. It should be remembered here that, according to the scoring pattern, higher score indicate high rigidity. Thus from the result it could be said that Perspective Arts teachers have high rigidity than the perspective Science teachers but the difference is not significant. Thus hypothesis that "There is no significant

difference in the mean scores of perspective teachers on rigidity regarding their discipline (Arts and Science).” is accepted.

Table-2 Showing mean, SD & ‘t’ value of rigidity of perspective teachers in relation to their gender.

Sr.No	Group	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value	Significant / Not Significant
1.	Male Perspective Teachers	31	15.45	1.52	0.02	Not Significant
2.	Female Perspective Teachers	39	15.44	2.01		

Not Significant at 0.05 level.

Interpretation- Table 2 depicts that the ‘t’ -value (0.02) for the mean scores of rigidity of male and female perspective teachers is not differ significantly at 0.05 level. On comparison of mean scores, it was found that the male perspective teachers and their female counterparts are almost at same level regarding rigidity. Thus, the hypothesis 2 “There is no significant difference in the mean scores of perspective teachers on rigidity regarding their gender (Male and Female).” stands retained.

CONCLUSION

Flexibility is what enables individuals to generate new ways to solve a problem, adapt to changes in routines, and adjust to the unexpected. Cognitive and emotional flexibility are included in most lists of executive or self-regulatory functions. Cognitive flexibility enables teachers and students to shift effortlessly from task to task at school, from topic to topic in conversation, from one role to another in any activity, and the like. Emotional flexibility is also important to experience the full range of emotion, like happiness, sadness, or anger. Nowadays, the actual practical role of emotions in professional teaching activity is not clearly evaluated, ambiguous and sometimes contradictory. Teachers and future teachers specially are not prepared to possible emotional overload, do not form deliberately his relevant knowledge, skills, personal qualities needed to minimize and overcoming emotional difficulties of profession. The present study revealed that perspective teachers possess high level of rigidity in respect to their discipline and gender. The study further found no significant difference in the rigidity of perspective teachers of Arts stream and perspective teachers of Science stream. No significant difference was observed in the mean scores of rigidity of male and female perspective teachers.

Perspective teachers with high scores of rigidity should be helped by the teacher educators to

be able to lower their level of rigidity because it is detrimental to their performance. Harsh punishment, sarcastic commands and negative attitudes are to be avoided by the teachers to develop positive outlook among their students with a well-adjusted personality. Therefore, as prevention, it is better to conducting special workshops with the psychological unloading and training methods and techniques of self-regulation and ability to change. Such preventive work will help to maintain emotional health of perspective teachers.

REFERENCES

- Cattell, R. (1946). *The riddle of perseveration*. *Journal of Personality*, 14, 239-267.
- Chown, S.M. (1959). *Rigidity: A flexible concept*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 195-223.
- Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). *Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotions and prevention in decision-making*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision-Making*, 69, 117-132.
- D'Aunno, T., & Sutton, R. (1992). *The responses of drug abuse treatment organizations to financial adversity: A partial test of the threat - rigidity thesis*. *Journal of Management*, 18, 11-131.
- Luchins A.S., & Luchins, E.H. (1994). *The Water Jar Experiment and Einstellung Effects*, *Gestalt Theory*, 16, 101-121.
- Muthar I. S. & Bhatia P. (1994). *Coulter' Rigidity Scale (CRS)*, National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Spearman, C. (1927). *The abilities of Man, their nature and measurement*. London: Mac Millan.
- Stewin, L. (1983). *The concept of rigidity An enigma*. *International Journal of Advanced Counselling*, 6, 227- 232.
- Roeach, M (1960). *The open and closed mind*, New York; Basic Books.
- Werner, H. (1940). *Comparative psychology of mental development*. New York: Harper.
- Werner, H. (1946). *The concept of rigidity: A critical evaluation*.