

Examination of Student Resistance Behaviors towards Physical Education and Sports Teachers in the Teaching-Learning Process

Gökhan Arıkan (Corresponding author)

School of Physical Education and Sports, Harran University, Şanlıurfa, Turkey

Tel: 90-532-636-3661 E-mail: arikangokhan@hotmail.com

Received: July 25, 2020 Accepted: August 27, 2020 Published: September 5, 2020

doi:10.5296/jei.v6i2.17432

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v6i2.17432>

Abstract

This study aims to identify the perceptions of examination of student resistance behaviors towards physical education and sports teachers in the teaching-learning process. For this purpose to define students' resistance behaviors. In education, students' resistance to teaching-learning processes affects the entire school community. Resistance behaviors during the teaching-learning process cause students to fail and create an important problem for teachers and administrators for preventing the formation of efficient learning environments, increasing the number of students showing similar resistance, and developing negative thoughts regarding school and the school community. For this purpose, to examine how physical education and sports teachers perceive students' resistance behaviors throughout the school. Therefore, this study was designed as a descriptive study that reveals the current situation for 157 physical education and sports teachers working in the center of Şanlıurfa. In the study, Student Resistance Behaviors Scale Teacher Form SRBS-T which is a five-point Likert scale consisting of 25 items and four identifying factors that are "Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher Authority," "Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher," "Constantly Being Angry" and "Passive Resistance" was used. In analyzing the data, a t-test test was used in pairwise comparisons, and One-Way ANOVA tests were used in multiple comparisons. Tukey test was conducted to determine where the difference was in the group. In the study, the findings were statistically significant in the sub-dimensions of "Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher" and seniority, "Passive Resistance" and "Passive Resistance" at the school level. In this study showed that there is no significant difference between genders in the sub-scales of SRBS-T and total scores. In addition "Hostile Attitudes towards the Teacher" sub-dimension were found to be significantly different in teachers with 16-20 years of seniority from other teachers. In the "passive resistance" dimension, teachers with 11-15 years of seniority had

significantly higher scores than other teachers.

Keywords: Resistance behaviours, Student resistance, High school, Sports teacher, Student

1. Introduction

As a social entity, an individual continues to maintain all the characteristics of the society, in which they grow up, including all social and cultural, positive, or negative behavioral characteristics, in schools that are reflections of the society.

In these schools, when all social and cultural, positive, or negative behaviors come together, it will be natural to have differences between an individual's societal environment they grow up in and the school environment since the upbringing, personality traits and world views of individuals will be different from each other. Therefore, it will be inevitable for students to face problems in adapting to the new environment.

Students' behaviors vary per the social and psychological structure of their school or even their class. Therefore, the response of each student to a given event may also be different. These reactions are manifested sometimes as positive, constructive, developmental, and soft behaviors while sometimes as negative, not following disciplinary rules, harmful, hurtful and harsh, and problematic behaviors.

Another type of behavior that encounter during the teaching-learning process in education is student resistance behaviors. Resistance behaviors are defined as "reactive behaviors that students demonstrate in a planned, systematic, and conscious way against their teachers, friends, lessons and the environment in the teaching-learning process" (Canoğulları, 2019).

In education, students' resistance to teaching-learning processes affects the entire school community. Resistance behaviors during the teaching-learning process cause students to fail and create an important problem for teachers and administrators for preventing the formation of efficient learning environments, increasing the number of students showing similar resistance, and developing negative thoughts regarding school and the school community. Parents desire that their children be educated in a problem-free school, and every manager and teacher wants to work in a problem-free school. This complicates the work of the whole school community. In resistance behaviors, it is necessary to determine the source of resistance well. The student is at the center of the student-originated resistance behaviors, and the responsibility belongs to the student (Gjesfjeld, 2014). At the same time, students are not obedient to student-originated resistance behaviors and they act aggressively (Goodboy & Bolkan, 2011). Stated the reasons for these as problems in the family, the impact of the violence observed on television and uncontrolled tablet or computer, and the insufficient interest of families to their children in terms of education (Korkmaz et al., 2007). Students can demonstrate resistance behaviors as active or passive resistance behaviors to their teachers, school administrators, families, peers, environment, any unwanted event, or situation (Koyuncu, 2017). In teacher-originated resistance behavior, the student feels inconsistency in the teacher. Students have satisfactory expectations from their teachers in terms of lessons. Students' perceptions of the incompetency, unpreparedness, unwilling behaviors, or the emotional feelings of the teacher towards students are associated with

teacher-originated resistance (Gjesfjeld, 2014).

Reducing the teacher center and decreasing teacher-induced behavior are the responsibilities that the physical education teacher will assume to maintain order in the class in alignment with the objectives of the course and without hurting the actions and freedom of games in alignment with the students' expectations. On the other hand, a possible conflict environment can occur such as not being able to meet the expectations of students from physical education lessons. The tense classroom atmosphere that will occur in the physical education class will negatively affect both the students and the physical education teacher, thereby reducing the effectiveness and outcomes of the physical education class (Ünlü & Aydos, 2010). Regarding the teaching-learning process, what is needed to be paid attention to is that the students' resistance behaviors and unwanted behaviors should not be in the same category.

At school or in the classroom, unauthorized behavior is described as unwanted behavior in terms of talking loudly or with friends, making disturbing noises, getting up during class and similar behaviors (Tertemiz, 2000).

Unwanted student behaviors: Depending on the student's environment, students' instant actions without planning to get attention while resistance behaviors include planning, preparation, and being conscious. At the beginning of the teaching and learning process, we can describe the time spent by the administrators and teachers to prevent the unwanted behaviors students exhibit as maintaining discipline. In this process, based on the principle of equality, it is possible to make effective plans, use approaches such as ensuring effectiveness for all students, keeping the classes under constant control by being consistent about the desired behaviors. The students' resistance to the teacher and the learning process concludes that it affects every unit of the school community negatively.

Although "resistance behavior" is often perceived as rebellious, when examine the concept of resistance, it is not possible to see every rebellious behavior as resistance. For an observed action to be a resistance behavior, it must be thought, planned, and designed in advance and it should be purposefully and constantly repeated. When studies are examined, there is a state of being conscious of this type of behavior (Sever & Güven, 2014).

Complaining about the negative situations faced by the students during the teaching-learning process, the opposition to the negative attitudes or behaviors of the administrators and teachers, and their wrong practices may produce positive results. When resistance is not shown, the same mistakes made by administrators and teachers are repeated while these mistakes can be recognized, and ways to correct these mistakes can be sought when resistance is shown.

Another feature that distinguishes the resistance behavior from unwanted student behavior is that there is anxiety for the motivation of learning and not being able to learn in resistance behaviors (Yüksel, 2004).

From another point of view, resistance behavior is the result of long-term, planned results, taking power from the contradictions between the conditions of the society in which the student lives in daily life and school conditions, and includes behaviors that may be more

destructive or constructive than unwanted student behavior

2. Method

In the method section, the research model, population sample, data collection instruments, and statistical techniques used in the analysis of the data are discussed.

2.1 Research Model

This is a descriptive study that reveals the current situation. A quantitative approach was used in the study as the purpose of the study is to determine the perceptions of physical education and sports teachers on student resistance behaviors in their schools.

2.2 Purpose of Research

In the present study, it was aimed to determine the examination of student resistance behaviors towards physical education and sports teachers in the teaching-learning process

2.3 Research Method

The population of the study consists of Physical Education and Sports Teachers in Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality, working in public and private, secondary and high schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education during 2019-2020 academic year. The sample consists of 157 Physical Education and Sports (BES) Teachers selected by random sampling from private and public schools within the districts of the Şanlıurfa Metropolitan Municipality.

2.4 Data Collection Tool

Student Resistance Behaviors Scale Teacher Form is a 5-point Likert scale and consists of 25 items. It is a measurement instrument that can be applied in determining the presence and frequency of student resistance behaviors that teachers encounter in school, during lessons, breaks, or classes. As a result of the findings obtained from the factor and reliability analysis, the Student Resistance Behaviors Scale consisted of four factors that are; “Resistance to the Teacher Authority”, “Hostile Attitudes towards the Teacher”, “Continuous Anger” and “Passive Resistance” (Sarı 2018).

2.5 Statistical Analysis

Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) values of kurtosis and skewness coefficients were determined for the normality distribution of the data. Per the findings obtained, parametric tests were used. In analyzing the data, a t-test test was completed for pairwise comparisons, and One-Way ANOVA tests were completed for multiple comparisons. A Tukey test was performed to determine where the difference was in the group.

Accordingly, value range score evaluation is defined as “Very low” between 1.00-1.80; “Low” between 1.80 and 2.60; “Medium” from 2.60 to 3.40; “High” from 3.40 to 4.20; and “very high” between 4.20-5.00. The scale is a five-point Likert scale and accordingly, 4/5 = 0.80. In evaluating the statistical analysis results, significance is accepted as 0.05.

3. Findings

Table 1. Information on frequency and percentage distribution of Physical Education and Sports (BES) Teachers in the sample

Variables	Sub-Dimensions	f	%
Gender	Female	43	27.4
	Male	114	72.6
School Type	Middle School	84	53.5
	High School	53	33.8
	Private School	20	12.7
Seniority	1-5 Years	38	24.2
	6-10 Years	38	24.2
	11-15 Years	26	16.6
	16-20 Years	55	35.0

The arithmetic means and standard deviations on the scores obtained by PES teachers in the SRBS-T scales are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive analysis results of PES Teachers' scores in SRBS-T

Scale	Scale Dimensions	N	X	Ss
SRBS-T	Resistance to the Teacher Authority	157	2.47	.64
	Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher	157	1.88	.59
	Always Being Angry	157	2.26	.64
	Passive Resistance	157	2.27	.65
	Scale Total	157	2.21	.53

In Table 2, it is seen that the PES Teachers' mean scores of SRBS-T vary between 1.88 and 2.47.

The results of the t-test in SRBS-T scores of the PES Teachers' by gender are given in Table 3.

Table 3. t-Test results of PES teachers' SRBS-T scores by gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	X	Ss	t	P
Resistance to the Teacher Authority	Female	43	2.45	.70	-.30	.359
	Male	114	2.48	.61		
Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher	Female	43	1.77	.60	-1.53	.942
	Male	114	1.93	.58		
Always Being Angry	Female	43	2.40	.65	1.66	.939
	Male	114	2.20	.64		
Passive Resistance	Female	43	2.20	.67	-.89	.934
	Male	114	2.30	.64		

As seen in Table 3, there is no significant difference between genders in the sub-scales of SRBS-T and total scores.

The results of the Tukey test completed for SRBS-T scores of PES teachers by school type are given in Table 4.

Table 4. One Way-ANOVA results of PES teachers' SRBS-T scores by school type

Dimensions	School Type	N	X	Ss	df	F	P	Significant Difference (Tukey)
Resistance to the Teacher Authority	Middle School	84	2.51	.60	2	3.04	.051	-
	High School	53	2.53	.68				
	Private School	20	2.15	.62				
Hostile Attitude	Middle School	84	1.79	.53	2	7.99	.000	2>1; 2>3
	High School	53	2.13	.61				
	Private School	20	1.63	.58				
Always Being Angry	Middle School	84	2.25	.66	2	.48	.616	-
	High School	53	2.31	.65				
	Private School	20	2.15	.58				
Passive Resistance	Middle School	84	2.24	.60	2	2.53	.083	-
	High School	53	2.41	.70				
	Private School	20	2.05	.70				

In Table 4, there are significant differences between the means of sub-dimensions of the SRBS-T. In pairwise comparisons completed with One Way ANOVA, it was determined that

High School PES teachers scored significantly higher than other school teachers in the sub-dimension of “Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher”.

The results of the Tukey test by years of seniority of the PES Teachers’ SRBS-T scores are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. One Way ANOVA Test results of PES teachers’ SRBS-T scores by seniority

Dimensions	Seniority	N	X	Ss	df	F	P	Significant Difference (Tukey)
Resistance to the Teacher Authority	Between 1-5 years	38	2.25	.57	3	2.12	.100	-
	Between 6-10 years	38	2.55	.68				
	Between 11-15 years	26	2.54	.67				
	Between 16-20 years	55	2.54	.61				
Hostile Attitude	Between 1-5 years	38	1.55	.46	3	6.10	.001	4>2; 4>3; 4>1
	Between 6-10 years	38	1.95	.67				
	Between 11-15 years	26	1.91	.51				
	Between 16-20 years	55	2.05	.57				
Always Being Angry	Between 1-5 years	38	2.22	.62	3	.80	.493	-
	Between 6-10 years	38	2.38	.75				
	Between 11-15 years	26	2.13	.60				
	Between 16-20 years	55	2.26	.60				
Passive Resistance	Between 1-5 years	38	2.01	.60	3	3.25	.023	3>2; 3>4; 3>1
	Between 6-10 years	38	2.40	.77				
	Between 11-15 years	26	2.44	.55				
	Between 16-20 years	55	2.29	.59				

As shown in Table 5, according to the Tukey test analysis, there are significant differences in the mean scores of SRBS-T sub-dimensions of PES teachers. In the pairwise comparisons performed with One Way Nova, the “Hostile Attitudes towards the Teacher” sub-dimension were found to be significantly different in teachers with 16-20 years of seniority from other teachers. In the “passive resistance” dimension, teachers with 11-15 years of seniority had significantly higher scores than other teachers.

4. Discussion

This study aims to identify the perceptions of examination of student resistance behaviors towards physical education and sports teachers in the teaching-learning process. In this study, although there was no variable indicating the socio-economic level, considering that the

private school teachers work in socio-economically high-level schools, the differences in the low socio-economic levels of resistance behaviors stated in the literature are not similar to this study (Yüksel & Şahin 2005; Canoğulları, 2019).

In this study showed that there is no significant difference between genders in the sub-scales of SRBS-T and total scores. On the other hand, Sarı and Yolcu (2020) determined that students might have found female teachers less authoritarian and thence show more resistance behaviors, In addition the hostile attitudes towards the teacher sub-scale showed higher mean scores for male teachers. Generally these findings might be associated with the traditional gender roles for example a sense of motherhood. Moreover, students might have found male teachers more domineering, thus secretly felt rage and fury against them. In this study on physical education and sports teachers' perceptions on student resistance behavior in the school environment, the lowest average score was found in the "Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher" dimension. High School PES teachers scored significantly higher than other school teachers in the sub-dimension of "Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher". Similar findings emerged in the study conducted by Sarı (2017). The teachers who participated in Sarı's study also stated that the resistance behaviors they encountered most frequently in their classrooms were resisting the authority of the teacher, ignoring what they said, and hostile attitudes towards the teacher and their friends. Other side, there are significant differences in the mean scores of SRBS-T sub-dimensions of PES teachers "Hostile Attitudes towards the Teacher" sub-dimension were found to be significantly different in teachers with 16-20 years of seniority from other teachers. In the "passive resistance" dimension, teachers with 11-15 years of seniority had significantly higher scores than other teachers. Students might have found female teachers less authoritative and thus demonstrated more resistance behaviors. On the other hand, students might have found male teachers more authoritative, thus secretly felt anger and hatred against them. As a result, they might have demonstrated more hostile behaviors towards male teachers (Sarı & Yolcu 2020). This study shows similar findings with the study of Canoğulları (2019). When the findings in the study are analyzed, we can say that PES teachers face little resistance behaviors. Yildiz (2019) determined that the level of students' resistance is manifested low in their study conducted with students. It can be said that the lowest mean is in the "Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher" dimension, and when it is analyzed in terms of school type, high school teachers get the highest score in the "Hostile Attitudes towards Teacher" dimension which is due to high school students' distancing from the play-age and their attitude towards physical education lessons. When PES teachers were examined by gender, there was no significant difference ($p > .05$).

5. Conclusions

According to this finding, teachers with high seniority experience more student resistance behavior than teachers with low seniority. It can be thought that teachers who are new to the profession do not want to engage in conflict with students or ignore such behaviors due to their attitude towards the administration, their attitude towards parents, or because of their low experience. In the same way, it can be said that PES teachers with high-seniority are more strict which causes conflicts.

6. Recommendations

- ✓ Further research with different students in different schools (such as Imam Hatip high school-Anatolian high school-sports high school-vocational high school) can be conducted.
- ✓ In the study, the level of resistance behavior was seen in high schools. Teachers who work in high-schools can be supported through various projects.
- ✓ When faced with student resistance behaviors, it is thought that teachers' consideration of the resistance behaviors of the students in the classroom environment and not being indifferent will be important in determining the cause of the resistance behaviors, and thus, decrease the resistance behavior.

References

- Aydın, Ö., & Şahin, S. (2016). İlk Ve Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Değişime Dirençleri. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(3), 5053-5068. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v13i3.3938>
- Canoğulları, E., & Sarı, M. (2019). Öğretmenlerin okullarındaki öğrenci direnç davranışlarına ilişkin algılarının incelenmesi. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 5(2), 219-232. <https://doi.org/10.24289/ijsser.541120>
- Çapri, B., Balcı, A., & Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2010). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi istenmeyen davranışlara ilişkin görüşlerinin karşılaştırılması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 89-102.
- Erickson, F. (1984). School literacy, reasoning, and civility: An anthropologist's perspective. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 542-546. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543054004525>
- Gjesfjeld, C. D. (2014). Meeting Student Resistance with Empathic Teaching in the College Classroom. *Gausius*, 2, 1-8. Retrieved from <https://gausius.weebly.com/gjesfjeld--empathic-teaching.html>
- Goodboy, A. K., & Bolkan S. (2011). Leadership in the college classroom: The use of charismatic leadership as a deterrent to student resistance strategies. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 2(46), 4-10.
- Gordon, T. (1993). In E. Aksay & B. Özkan (Eds.), *Etkili Öğretmenlik Eğitimi, Birinci Basım*. İstanbul: YAPA Yayınları.
- Karasar, N. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler* (p. 30). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Koyuncu, B. (2017). Lise Öğrencilerinin Problem Çözme Becerilerinin Derslere Yönelik Direnç Davranışlarının Yordanması. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 8(29), 1071-1090.
- Pehlivan, Z. (2012). Beden Eğitimi Derslerinde İstenmeyen Öğrenci Davranışları, Öğretmenlerin Sözlü Dönüt Biçimi Ve Dönüt Biçiminin Öğrenci Başarı Güdüsüne Etkisi. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 23(3), 144-158.

- Sarı, M. (2017). *Öğretmen algılarına göre ilkökul öğrencilerinde direnç davranışları: Sessizce planlanan meydan okuyuşlar* (Vol. 1, pp. 644-645). Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Kongresi'nde sunulan sözlü bildiri, Ekim 26-28, 2017, Marmaris, Muğla.
- Sarı, M. (2018). Öğrencilerin Direnç Davranışlarının Varlığını ve Sıklığını Ölçmek İçin Bir Öğretmen Ölçeği Geliştirme. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(2), 226-234. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060203>
- Sarı, M., & Yolcu, E. (2020). Öğrencilerin Direnç Davranışları: Türkçe İlköğretim Öğretmenleri Neyle Karşılaşıyor? *Acta Educationis Generalis*, 10(2), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.2478/atd-2020-0008>
- Sever, D., & Güven, M. (2014). İlköğretim fen ve teknoloji dersinde araştırma temelli öğrenme yaklaşımının öğrenci dirençlerine etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 14(4), 1583-1605.
- Şirin, T., & Cebeci, B. (2017). İlköğretim Kurumlarında Öğrencilerin İstenmeyen Davranışlarına Dair Öğretmen Tutumlarının Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Uluslararası Güncel Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 13-33.
- Tanhan, F., & Şentürk, E. (2011). Sınıf İçi İstenmeyen Öğrenci Davranışlarına Yönelik Öğretmen Tutumları Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4(35), 44-51.
- Tertemiz, N. (2000). Sınıf yönetimi ve disiplin. In L. Küçükahmet (Ed.), *Sınıf Yönetimi* (pp. 67-89). Ankara, Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Türkan, A., & Gözde, S.-G. (2016). Pedagojik Formasyon Öğrencilerinin Öğretme-Öğrenme Süreçlerine Direnme Davranışları ve Ahlaki Olgunlukları. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(12A), 16-21.
- Ünlü, H., & Aydos, L. (2008). Beden eğitimi dersinde sınıf yönetimi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(1). Retrieved from <http://www.insanbilimleri.com>
- Yıldız, E., & Sarı, M. (2019). Öğretmen Gözünden Öğrenci Direncine Bakış: Görüşleri, Stratejileri ve Önerileri. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies*, 6(2), 128-149 <https://doi.org/10.33710/sduijes.604519>
- Yüksel, S. (2006). The role of hidden curricula on the resistance behavior of undergraduate students in psychological counselling and guidance at a Turkish university. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7(1), 94-107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03036788>
- Yüksel, S., & Şahin, E. (2005). Alt Sosyo-Ekonomik Düzeyden Gelen Lise Öğrencilerinin Öğrenme-Öğretme Faaliyetlerine İlişkin Direnç Davranışları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 30(138). Retrieved from <http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/view/4994>
- Yüksel, S. (2004). Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Öğretme-Öğrenme Süreçlerine Yönelik Direnç Davranışları. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3), 341-354.
- Yüksel, S. (2003). Öğrencilerin Öğretme-Öğrenme Sürecine Yönelik Direnç Davranışları.

Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17(1), 235-251.

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).