



ENGLISH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES OF RURAL STUDENTS

Dr.D.Ponmozhi¹, T.Manoranjeetham,²

1.Principal & Professor in Education, O.P.R. Memorial College of Education, Vadalur, Tamilnadu, India.

2. M. Ed Student, O.P.R. Memorial College of Education, Vadalur, Tamilnadu, India.

ABSTRACT

The current investigation aims to explore the English learning challenges faced by rural Cuddalore District high school pupils. 152 samples were drawn utilizing the random sampling technique from a variety of rural Cuddalore District schools. The normative survey method was used in this investigation. Evaluating the degree of English learning difficulties among high school students is one of the study's key goals. The English Learning Difficulties Scale (2017), developed and standardized by Dr. D. Ponmozhi and A. Thenmozhi was used by the investigator for this purpose. Linguistic challenges, remedial challenges, teaching challenges, parenting challenges, and psychological challenges are the five components of this 28-item assessment. There is a 5-point rating system for every component. The English Learning Difficulties scale's internal validity was determined to be 0.94 and its reliability to be 0.88 using Cronbach's Alpha. Descriptive, deferential, correlational, and regression analyses were carried out using SPSSIBM23. The rural high school students English Learning Difficulties are High (85-112). The School type, Age, Fathers qualification and parental income have significant relationship with English Learning Difficulties of rural high school students. The prediction model two of the ten predictors and was reached in two steps with 8 variables removed. The model was statistically significant, $F(2, 149) = 7.497, p < .001$, and accounted for approximately 9% of the variance of English Learning Difficulties ($R^2 = 0.091$ Adjusted $R^2 = 0.079$). Inspection of the structure coefficient suggests that, the School type and Fathers Qualification were relatively strong indicators of English Learning Difficulties of rural high school children. The Teaching Challenges and Psychological Challenges were relatively strong factors of English Learning Difficulties of rural high school children.

Key words: English Learning Difficulties, rural high school children.

INTRODUCTION

English is a language used throughout the world. English is becoming more and more in demand every day. Its necessity defies expression in words or sentences. Without English, we could not imagine ourselves. The English language plays a crucial part in the development of a nation's educational system. Thus, it is important to prepare the syllabus, lesson plans, exam structure, and script evaluation so that the next generation may take up the ultra-modern policy implementation project. Many young learners can improve their English language proficiency if they begin at the secondary level. Additionally, learning obstacles with English will be eliminated for both teachers and pupils.

NEED OF THE STUDY

The most typical problems that students run across when learning English as a second or foreign language can be found through research. These could involve problems with understanding, vocabulary acquisition, grammar, or pronunciation. Not every student has the same difficulties. Individual variations in

learning preferences, cognitive capacities, and linguistic backgrounds can all have an impact on how English is learned. Research can assist uncover these variances. Researchers can better address the requirements of various learners by developing and improving teaching techniques and materials through the study of learning challenges. This could entail developing technology-enhanced learning tools, modifying instructional methodologies, or generating tailored treatments. Research can help create assessment instruments that are more accurate in identifying learning challenges in English language learners. This can assist teachers in identifying certain areas of weakness and adjusting their lesson plans accordingly.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To evaluate the total Englishlearning difficulties of rural students.
2. To measure the Englishlearning difficulties of rural students and their relationship with subsamples.
3. To predict English learning difficulties of rural students
4. To identify the dominant Englishlearning difficulties of rural students.

HYPOTHESIS:

1. The total Englishlearning difficulties of rural students are high.
2. There is no significant relation between Englishlearning difficulties of rural students and their relationship with subsamples.
3. There is no significant predictor of Englishlearning difficulties of rural students
4. There are no significant dominant Englishlearning difficulties of rural students.

METHODOLOGY:

In this study, a normative survey method is employed.152 pupils from several rural schools in the Cuddalore district were selected using random sample techniques.The English Learning Difficulties Scale (2017), developed and standardized by D. Ponmozhi and A. Thenmozhi, was used in this study. This 28-item scale has five dimensions: Linguistic challenges, remedial challenges, Teaching challenges, parenting challenges, and psychological challenges. Each component has a 5-point rating system.The English Learning Difficulties scale's internal validity was determined to be 0.94 and its reliability to be 0.88 using Cronbach's Alpha. Descriptive, deferential, correlational, and regression analyses were carried out using SPSSIBM23.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

One of the important objectives of the study is to assess the level of English Learning Difficulties of high school students. For that, the investigator employed the English Learning Difficulties Scale (2017) constructed and standardized byD. Ponmozhi and A. Thenmozhi. This 28-item scale has five dimensions: Linguistic challenges, remedial challenges, Teaching challenges, parenting challenges, and psychological challenges. Each component has a 5-point rating system. The maximum score for this test is 140. For that school students were divided into Very Low, Low, Moderate, High and Very high level of English learning difficulties. In order to divide the sample into above stated categories investigator adopted the following method. The categorization was done by dividing the baseline normal curve into 5 units, each unit being Very Low (0-28), Low (29-56), Moderate (57-84), High (85-112) and Very high level (113-140).

ANALYSIS OF THE LEVEL OF ENGLISH LEARNING DIFFICULTIESOF RURAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

| S.No | Self-concept | Score | N | Percentage |
|------|--------------|---------|-----|------------|
| 1 | Very Low | 0-28 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Low | 29-56 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Moderate | 57-84 | 24 | 16 |
| 4 | High | 85-112 | 100 | 66 |
| 5 | Very high | 113-140 | 28 | 18 |

The above table 1 shows that 16 % of rural high school students English Learning Difficulties score is moderate (57-84), 66% of rural high school students English Learning Difficulties score is is High (85-112) and 18% rural high school students English Learning Difficulties score is very high(113-140). Thus, rural high school students English Learning Difficulties score is High.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEVEL OF ENGLISH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES SCORE OF ENTIRE AND SUBSAMPLES

Evaluating the degree of rural high school students English Learning Difficulties for both the full sample and selected sub-samples is one of the study's key goals. For both full and sub samples, the mean Standard deviation values have been computed. which comprise the students enrolled in education colleges were considered as the population and sample. Sub-samples were considered for School type, Gender, Age, Medium, Mothers Qualification, Fathers Qualification, Parental Occupation, Parental Income, No of Family Members and Family Type.

| Variable | N | Mean | STD |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| ENGLISH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES | 152 | 99.38 | 13.73 |

The above table 2 shows the mean score and standard deviation of rural high school students **English Learning Difficulties** are found to be **99.38** and **13.73** respectively. **It is concluded that the rural high school students English Learning Difficulties are High (85-112).**

| S.No | Variable | N | Mean | STD | t/f | Result | |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------|------|---------------|-------|-------------|----|
| 1 | School Type | Government | 50 | 104.46 | 14.89 | 5.39 | NS |
| | | Aided | 51 | 96.80 | 11.51 | | |
| | | Private | 51 | 96.98 | 13.48 | | |
| 2 | Gender | Male | 26 | 96.62 | 14.23 | 0.22 | NS |
| | | Female | 126 | 99.95 | 13.62 | | |
| 3 | Age | 13 | 25 | 106.32 | 16.31 | 3.18 | S |
| | | 14 | 38 | 98.34 | 14.15 | | |
| | | 15 | 87 | 97.61 | 12.24 | | |
| | | 16 | 2 | 109.50 | 9.19 | | |
| 4 | Medium Of Instruction | English | 76 | 98.82 | 13.26 | 0.61 | NS |
| | | Tamil | 76 | 99.95 | 14.25 | | |
| 5 | Mothers Qualification | Illiterate | 25 | 104.92 | 11.21 | 2.54 | NS |
| | | School Level | 123 | 98.22 | 13.97 | | |
| | | College Level | 4 | 100.50 | 15.59 | | |
| 6 | Fathers Qualification | Illiterate | 23 | 104.09 | 12.33 | 3.33 | S |
| | | School Level | 110 | 99.45 | 14.06 | | |
| | | College Level | 19 | 93.26 | 11.45 | | |
| 7 | Parental Occupation | Daily Wages | 84 | 98.95 | 13.73 | 1.50 | NS |
| | | Self-Employment | 29 | 99.83 | 13.93 | | |
| | | Business | 28 | 102.82 | 13.98 | | |
| | | Government Job | 11 | 92.73 | 14.15 | | |
| 8 | Parental | 10000 | 27 | 104.11 | 8.17 | 2.77 | S |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---------------|----|--------|-------|-------------|-----------|
| | Monthly Income | 20000 | 44 | 100.09 | 15.00 | | |
| | | 30000 | 38 | 99.34 | 13.04 | | |
| | | 40000 | 17 | 98.88 | 14.53 | | |
| | | 50000 | 26 | 93.65 | 14.33 | | |
| 9 | No Of Family Members | 3 | 11 | 98.45 | 10.46 | 0.54 | NS |
| | | 4 | 88 | 99.24 | 14.98 | | |
| | | 6 | 43 | 100.93 | 14.03 | | |
| | | 8 | 10 | 95.00 | 13.72 | | |
| 10 | Type Of Family | Nuclear | 87 | 99.64 | 9.94 | 0.27 | NS |
| | | Joint | 55 | 99.53 | 14.38 | | |
| | | Single Parent | 10 | 96.30 | 12.81 | | |

From the above table- 3, it is interpreted that,

The obtained f-value suggests that there is significant variation between the school type and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (5.39) is significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the stated null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is significant variation between the Government, Aided and Self-financing school students in their Total English Learning Difficulties.

The calculated t-value suggests that there is no discernible difference between the male and female rural high school students in Total English learning difficulties. Considering the t-value (.216) that was computed is not significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the stated null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, it can be said that there is no difference between male and female rural high school students in the Total English learning difficulties.

The obtained f-value suggests that there is significant variation between the age and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (3.18) is significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the stated null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, the various aged students differ in their Total English Learning Difficulties.

The calculated t-value suggests that there is no discernible difference between the Tamil and English medium rural high school students in Total English learning difficulties. Considering the t-value (.613) that was computed is not significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the stated null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, it can be said that there is no difference between the Tamil and English medium rural high school students in the Total English learning difficulties.

The obtained f-value suggests that there is no significant variation between the age and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (2.54) is not significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the stated null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the students with various mother's qualification have same Total English Learning Difficulties.

The obtained f-value suggests that there is significant variation between the father's qualification and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (3.33) is significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the stated null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, the students with various father's qualification have different Total English Learning Difficulties.

The obtained f-value suggests that there is no significant variation between the parental occupation and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (1.50) is not significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the stated null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the students with various parental occupation have same Total English Learning Difficulties.

The obtained f-value suggests that there is significant variation between the parental income and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (2.77) is significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the stated null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the students with various parental income have different Total English Learning Difficulties.

The obtained f-value suggests that there is no significant variation between the Number of family members and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (0.54) is not significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the stated null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the students with various Number of family members have same Total English Learning Difficulties.

The obtained f-value suggests that there is no significant variation between the family type and Total English Learning Difficulties. Considering that the computed f-value (0.27) is not significant at the 5% level. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the stated null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the students with various family type have same Total English Learning Difficulties.

| Model | B | Std. Error | Beta | Pearson r | Sr ² | Structure Coefficient |
|-------------------------------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| (Constant) | 117.427 | 4.920 | | | | |
| School Type | -3.725 | 1.311 | -.222 | .222 | 0.051 | 4.44 |
| Fathers Qualifications | -5.356 | 2.036 | -.205 | .302 | 0.044 | 6.83 |

Note. The dependent variable **Total English Learning Difficulties**
R²=0.091, Adjusted R²=0.079, Sr² is squared semi-partial correlation F(2, 149)= 7.497

Table 4 shows Type of school, Age, Gender, Medium, Mother Qualification, Father Qualification, Parental occupation, Parental income, Family members, Family Type and Total English Learning Difficulties were used in a stepwise multiple regression analysis to predict Total English Learning Difficulties of the rural school students. The correlation of variables is shown in table.4.14. As can be seen correlations with School type, Fathers Qualification, Parental Income and Total English Learning Difficulties were statistically significant.

The prediction model contained two of the ten predictors and was reached in two steps with 8 variables removed. The model was statistically significant, $F(2, 149) = 7.497, p < .001$, and accounted for approximately 9% of the variance of English Learning Difficulties ($R^2 = 0.091$ Adjusted $R^2 = 0.079$). English Learning Difficulties is primarily predicted by School type and Fathers Qualification. The raw and standardized regression coefficient of predictors together with their correlation with English Learning Difficulties, their squared semi-partial correlations, and their structure coefficients are shown in table-4. The gender and age received the strongest weight in model. With the sizeable correlations between the predictors, the unique variance explained by each of the variables indexed by the squared semi-partial correlation was relatively low: The School type and Fathers Qualification uniquely accounted for approximately 4% and 7% of the English Learning Difficulties. Inspection of the structure coefficient suggests that, the School type and Fathers Qualification were relatively strong indicators of English Learning Difficulties of rural high school children.

| Model | B | Std. Error | Beta | Pearson r | Sr ² | Structure Coefficient |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| (Constant) | 3.375E-14 | .000 | | | | |
| Psychological Challenges | 1.000 | .000 | .356 | .251 | 1.000 | .251 |
| Parenting Challenges | 1.000 | .000 | .265 | .219 | 1.000 | .219 |
| Linguistic Challenges | 1.000 | .000 | .241 | .213 | 1.000 | .213 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|
| Teaching Challenges | 1.000 | .000 | .343 | .285 | 1.000 | .285 |
| Remedial Challenges | 1.000 | .000 | .320 | .221 | 1.000 | .221 |
| Note. The dependent variable Total English Learning Difficulties $R^2=1.000$, Adjusted $R^2=1.000$, Sr^2 is squared semi-partial correlation. $F(5, 146)= 717.56$ | | | | | | |

Table 5 shows Linguistic Challenges, Remedial Challenges, Teaching Challenges, Parenting Challenges, Psychological Challenges and Total English Learning Difficulties were used in a stepwise multiple regression analysis to find dominant Total English Learning Difficulties of the rural school students.

The dominant factor model contained five of the five factors and was reached in two five with 0 variables removed. The model was statistically significant, $F(5, 146)= 717.56, p < .001$, and accounted for approximately 100% of the variance of English Learning Difficulties ($R^2=0.091$ Adjusted $R^2= 0.079$). English Learning Difficulties is primarily predicted by Psychological Challenges followed by Parenting Challenges, Linguistic Challenges, Teaching Challenges and Remedial Challenges. The raw and standardized regression coefficient of predictors together with their correlation with English Learning Difficulties, their squared semi-partial correlations, and their structure coefficients are shown in table-5. The Teaching Challenges and Psychological Challenges received the strongest weight in model. With the sizeable correlations between the predictors, the unique variance explained by each of the variables indexed by the squared semi-partial correlation was relatively low. The Psychological Challenges followed by Parenting Challenges, Linguistic Challenges, Teaching Challenges and Remedial Challenges uniquely accounted for approximately 25%, 21%, 21%, 28% and 22% of the English Learning Difficulties. Inspection of the structure coefficient suggests that, the Teaching Challenges and Psychological Challenges were relatively strong indicators of English Learning Difficulties of rural high school children.

CONCLUSION

Cuddalore district rural high school pupils struggle greatly with studying English. Students in government schools who are 16 years old, attend Tamil-medium schools, are female, have illiterate parents, are business owners, and live in nuclear families with an annual income of Rs 10,000 exhibit significant challenges in learning English. The type of school and the father's educational background were reasonably good predictors of the English language learning challenges faced by rural high school students. The main causes of rural high school pupils' difficulties learning English are psychological and pedagogical challenges. **Therefore, educational administrators need to focus on enhancing instruction and lowering psychological anxiety by providing a great deal of training to kids attending rural schools.**

REFERENCES

1. **Aizawa, I. (2023).** A comparative study of Japanese and English medium instruction: the driving factors behind academic success. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2184476>
2. **Aizawa, I. (2023).** A comparative study of Japanese and English medium instruction: the driving factors behind academic success, *Journal Of Multilingual And Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2184476>.
3. **Aizawa, I. (2024).** Tracking the first-year experience in English medium instruction: A pre-post study of transitional challenges, English for Specific Purposes, 73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2023.09.002>

4. **Andika, A. (2024).** English Learning Challenges: An Exploratory Mixed-Method Study For Low-Level Students, *Journal on Education*, 6(2), <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i2.5163>.
5. **Curle,S., Yuksel,D., Aizawa,I., Thompson,G.&Rakhshandehroo,M.(2024).**Academic success in English Medium Instruction programmes in Turkey: Exploring the effect of gender, motivation, and English language proficiency, *International Journal of Educational Research*,123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102288>.
6. **Feng,Z.(2024).**English Teachers' Attitudes Toward China English,*World Journal of English Language*,14(2). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n2p128>
7. **Han R, Alibakhshi G, Lu L,&Labbafi A (2024)..** Digital communication activities and EFL learners' willingness to communicate and engagement: Exploring the intermediate language learners' perceptions. *Heliyon*. 2024 Jan 29;10(3):e25213. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e25213. PMID: 38333790; PMCID: PMC10850894.
8. **Piscayanti,K.S., Mujiyanto,J., Yuliasri,I.&Astuti,P.(2024).**Representation of Voice: A Narrative Inquiry of Indonesian EFL Learners in Poetry Writing Experience, *World Journal of English Language*,14(2). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n2p1>
9. **Ponmozhi ,D. &Thenmozhi,A.(2017).** Difficulties Faced By the Rural Students in Learning English at High School Level, *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*,22(6).13. PP 31-34. DOI: 10.9790/0837-2206133134.
10. **Qin Y, & Irshad A.(2024).** Research on the evaluation method of English textbook readability based on the TextCNN model and its application in teaching design. *PeerJComput Sci*. 2024 Feb 29;10:e1895. doi: 10.7717/peerj-cs.1895. PMID: 38435600; PMCID: PMC10909215.
11. **Romero, R. D., Cortezano, G. P., Manaig, K. A., Yazon, A. D., & Tesoro, J. F. B. . (2023).** A Phenomenological Investigation of Senior High School Learners with Low English Language Proficiency. *Journal of English As A Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.31098/jefltr.v3i1.1148>
12. **Rose, H., Curle, S., Aizawa, I., & Thompson, G. (2020).** What drives success in English medium taught courses? The interplay between language proficiency, academic skills, and motivation. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(11), 2149–2161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1590690>
13. **Sriati, Usman., Wahyudin, Wahyudin. (2023).** Reading comprehension difficulties encountered by the first-grade students of senior high school. *e-Journal of ELTS (English Language Teaching Society)*, 11(1):53-61. doi: 10.22487/elts.v11i1.3698.
14. **Sunayana Sharma & Prashant Shrivastava, (2022).** Difficulties Faced By The Rural Students In Learning English: A Case Study Of Rural Students, *International Journal of Scientific Research & Growth (IJSRG)*, 6(6).
15. **Suryanto, Zahra EkaSari(2021).**Difficulties and Strategies in Learning English: An Analysis of Students From English and Non-English Education Department in Indonesia, *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Sustainable Innovation 2020–Social, Humanity, and Education (ICoSIHESS 2020). DOI: [10.2991/assehr.k.210120.140](https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210120.140)How to use a DOI?
16. **Tukan, Fransiska. (2024).** The Difficulties And Strategies Of EFL Students In Improving Their English Skills. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*. 8. 101-113. [10.24071/ijiet.v8i1.3375](https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v8i1.3375).
17. **Wang H, Wang Y, Li S.(2023).** Unpacking the relationships between emotions and achievement of EFL learners in China: Engagement as a mediator. *Front Psychol*. 2023 Feb 20;14:1098916. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1098916. PMID: 36891212; PMCID: PMC9986489.
18. **Wang M, Wang H, & Shi Y.(2022).** The role of English as a foreign language learners' grit and foreign language anxiety in their willingness to communicate: Theoretical perspectives. *Front Psychol*. 2022 Sep 14;13:1002562. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1002562. PMID: 36186361; PMCID: PMC9516278.
19. **Wang S, Chen Y, & Wan Y.(2022).** English as a Foreign Language Learners' Academic Achievement: Does Creativity and Self-Efficacy Matter? *Front Psychol*. 2022 Apr 6;13:877679. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.877679. PMID: 35465491; PMCID: PMC9019161.

20. **Wang Z.(2022).** The Effect of EFL Teacher Apprehension and Teacher Burnout on Learners' Academic Achievement. *Front Psychol.* 2022 Jan 20;12:839452. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.839452. PMID: 35126272; PMCID: PMC8811293.
21. **Ying, Y. , Siang, W. and Mohamad, M. (2021)** The Challenges of Learning English Skills and the Integration of Social Media and Video Conferencing Tools to Help ESL Learners Coping with the Challenges during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Literature Review. *Creative Education*, **12**, 1503-1516. doi: [10.4236/ce.2021.127115](https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.127115).
22. **Zhang Q.(2022).** The Role of Teachers' Interpersonal Behaviors in Learners' Academic Achievements. *Front Psychol.* 2022 Jun 17;13:921832. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.921832. PMID: 35783768; PMCID: PMC9247453.
23. **Zong,Y.(2024).**An Analysis of the Availability of L1 in English Teaching in Primary Schools in Mainland China,*World Journal of EnglishLanguage*,14(2). <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n2p10>

