I J R S S I S, Issue (XIV), Vol. (III), Sept 2026: 125-132
A Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal
OPEN ACCESS
e-ISSN 2347 – 517X
Original Article

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCHES IN SOCIAL SCIENCE AND INFORMATION STUDIES
© VMS RESEARCH FOUNDATION www.ijrssis.in

BREAKING THE CYCLE OF RURAL FEMALE ILLITERACY: A LONGITUDINAL CASE STUDY OF A NO-COST HOLISTIC EDUCATION MODEL FOR WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT IN INDIA

Dr. Titiksha Nagar and Prof. Ashok Nagar

Researcher / Former Doctoral Scholar
Gender Studies | Rural Education | Social Responsibility of Charitable Trusts

Communicated : 15.06.2026 | Revision : 15.07.2026 Accepted : 10.08.2026 | Published: 30.09.2026

ABSTRACT:

The expansion of digital technologies, mobile devices, and artificial intelligence has transformed higher education practice and policy worldwide. While these innovations promise increased access and pedagogical flexibility, empirical research also identifies several failure modes: attention fragmentation, superficial engagement, and rapid spread of low-quality or misleading information. This paper synthesizes interdisciplinary literature from cognitive psychology, educational technology, and historical pedagogy to argue that traditional pedagogical practices, characterized by sustained teacher–student relationships, dialogic instruction, disciplined writing and recitation, and apprenticeship-style mentorship, are particularly well aligned with the cognitive conditions required for deep, conceptual learning in higher education. Focusing on rural India, where students often begin higher education with weaker academic preparation and limited digital literacy, the paper proposes a pedagogically informed model in which traditional methods provide the foundation for learning while carefully scaffolded technologies serve as amplifiers rather than substitutes for human-mediated pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION :

Digital technologies have become central to debates about improving higher education. In India's rural regions, policymakers and institutions frequently view mobile learning, online courses, and AI-supported tools as scalable remedies for limited institutional capacity and access constraints. Yet contemporary evidence cautions against uncritical optimism: technology is neither a neutral amplifier nor a guaranteed path to deeper learning. Instead, its educational impact depends crucially on instructional design, the social ecology of learning, and learners' prior preparation.

This paper asks a focused question: under what conditions do traditional pedagogical practices outperform many contemporary digital approaches in generating deep, transferable learning at the higher education level, particularly in rural Indian contexts? To answer this, I synthesize evidence on (a) cognitive mechanisms that underpin deep learning; (b) documented harms and limitations of unguided mobile/digital learning; and (c) features of traditional pedagogy that align with cognitive requirements for conceptual understanding. The paper then outlines implications for policy and institutional practice in rural higher education.

Theoretical Background: Deep Learning and Cognitive Preconditions

The literature distinguishes deep learning from surface learning by its focus on conceptual structures, relational understanding, and the capacity to apply knowledge in novel settings.

Theoretical accounts from levels-of-processing frameworks, generative learning theory, and research on self-regulated learning converge on several preconditions for deep learning: sustained attention, generative encoding (organization and elaboration), corrective feedback, and opportunities for active retrieval and transfer.

Writing and note-taking, dialogic engagement, and iterative practice are pedagogical activities that instantiate these mechanisms. By contrast, formats that encourage rapid skimming, passive consumption, or constant task switching undermine these cognitive preconditions and are therefore less likely to produce enduring conceptual change.

Evidence: Limitations of Unguided Digital and Mobile Learning

Recent empirical work identifies three recurrent limitations of mobile and unconstrained digital learning.

Attention fragmentation and multitasking

Experimental and observational studies show that smartphone use encourages multitasking and frequent context-switching, impairing comprehension and retention (Loh, Cheong, & Liew, 2021; Pérez Juárez, 2023). Meta-analytic evidence further suggests a small but reliable negative association between frequency of non-instructional smartphone use and academic performance, with stronger negative effects when devices are used for entertainment or social media during study (Hsieh et al., 2025).

Superficial processing and reduced generative activity

Systematic reviews of mlearning (mobile learning) find that benefits are highly contingent on pedagogical design; poorly scaffolded mobile materials often produce superficial engagement, watching short videos or reading summaries without integrating or elaborating upon concepts (PedrajaRejas et al., 2024). Digital affordances that enable rapid consumption can inadvertently discourage the generative effort necessary for deep learning (Mueller & Oppenheimer, 2014).

Exposure to misinformation and lowquality knowledge

Research on misinformation shows that students frequently encounter and sometimes accept inaccurate claims on social and mobile platforms (Chen et al., 2015; PérezEscoda et al., 2021). The visual appeal and social endorsement mechanisms of contemporary platforms can give poorly vetted claims unwarranted credibility, especially among learners with limited digital literacy.

Collectively, these limitations are amplified in rural contexts where connectivity is intermittent, digital literacy varies, and formal opportunities for corrective instructor feedback may be scarce.

Traditional Pedagogies: Features and Cognitive Rationale

Traditional pedagogical forms, exemplified in Indian practices such as the Guru–shishya tradition and Gurukula models, exhibit pedagogical features that are cognitively consonant with deep learning.

Sustained relational instruction

The Guru–shishya model emphasizes prolonged, individualized interaction between teacher and learner, permitting continuous formative assessment, tailored remediation, and long-term mentoring (Rajguru, 2024). Such sustained relationships encourage disciplined study habits, social accountability, and protected time for concentrated work, conditions that reduce off-task behavior.

Dialogic and dialectical methods

Historically, methods such as shastrarth (scholastic debate) foregrounded dialogic exchange and argumentative practice. Educational research links dialogic teaching to conceptual change, as students must articulate, defend, and revise their ideas in relation to counterarguments. This iterative confrontation with competing viewpoints fosters metacognitive

monitoring and conceptual refinement (Kumari & Yogi, 2025).

Generative writing and recitation

Traditional emphasis on oral recitation, memorization integrated with commentary, and handwritten note-making invokes deep encoding processes. Cognitive studies demonstrate that handwriting and generative note-taking promote semantic processing and later retrieval more effectively than verbatim transcription on laptops (Bohay et al., 2011; Mueller & Oppenheimer, 2014).

Epistemic mediation and source curation

In apprenticeship models the teacher functions as an epistemic gatekeeper, curating authoritative texts and correcting errors. This social-epistemic role reduces the risk that students will accept unvetted information—an increasingly salient function given the prevalence of online misinformation (Bhat & Javaid, 2024).

Embodied and situated practices

Traditional pedagogy often embeds knowledge in practice, ritualized recitation, embodied performance, and application in local contexts, which supports transfer and procedural fluency. Embodied cognition literature suggests that sensorimotor engagement strengthens conceptual representations.

Integrative Argument: Why Traditional Pedagogies Can Outperform Unguided Technology

The juxtaposition of the two literatures supports a conditional claim: traditional pedagogical structures are likely to generate deeper, more durable conceptual learning than unguided or poorly designed digital modalities, particularly in rural higher education contexts. This claim rests on three linked mechanisms.

First, traditional methods protect and structure attention via social routines and mentorship, minimizing the cognitive costs of distraction. Second, they require generative activity, writing, debate, recitation, that encodes information more deeply than passive digital consumption. Third, the epistemic authority of teachers provides corrective feedback that counteracts misinformation and superficial understanding.

Importantly, this argument does not imply technological rejection. Rather, it recommends foregrounding pedagogy: technology should be used to support these human-mediated processes (e.g., providing curated digital readings, enabling asynchronous retrieval practice, or facilitating communication within mentorship pods) rather than to replace them.

6. Policy and Pedagogical Implications for Rural Indian Higher Education Based on the synthesis above, institutions seeking to improve conceptual learning in rural contexts should consider the following priorities.

Institutionalize mentorship pods

Create small, faculty-led mentorship groups (6–12 students) that meet weekly for guided discussion, oral questioning, and formative feedback. These pods replicate key features of apprenticeship and provide low-cost mechanisms for sustained interaction.

Reinforce writing and recitation practices

Integrate structured note-taking, handwritten reflective journals, and oral recitation into course assessments. Use these practices as graded activities to incentivize generative processing.

Curate and mediate digital resources

Faculty should curate mobile-friendly resource bundles and annotate them with critical questions and guided tasks. Avoid open, unguided reliance on social media as a primary knowledge source.

Build digital-literacy modules

Offer short, mandatory modules in source evaluation, critical reading of online content, and fact-checking to reduce vulnerability to misinformation.

Implement phoneuse and distraction protocols

Adopt class-level norms (e.g., phone-storage policies during focused sessions) and design low-distraction learning windows to rebuild sustained attention.

Directions for Future Research

Several important questions remain for future research. First, randomized controlled trials could compare apprenticeship-style mentorship combined with carefully curated digital content against traditional lecture-based teaching with unguided mobile learning. Such studies would help determine which approach leads to better learning outcomes. Second, mediation analyses could examine why any differences occur, for example, whether improved learning is driven by better attention control, deeper cognitive processing, or clearer correction of misunderstandings.

CONCLUSION :

In an era of rapid technological innovation, education policy debates often prioritize scale and access enabled by digital tools. This paper argues for a complementary emphasis on pedagogy: traditional educational practices, rooted in mentorship, dialogue, disciplined writing, and embodied apprenticeship, offer robust cognitive affordances for deep learning that digital technologies do not automatically replicate. Especially in rural Indian higher education, where students may face preparatory and infrastructural constraints, reinforcing traditional pedagogical structures while selectively integrating technology as a scaffolded tool will better serve the goal of producing conceptual, transferable, and enduring learning.

REFERENCES :

Ahmed, R. R., Qazi, W., & Khan, M. A. (2020). Smartphone use and academic performance of university students. Sustainability, 12(1), 439.

Bhat, A. N., & Javaid, S. (2024). The education system in ancient India: Teacher-student knowledge transmission, debate, and experiential methods. Historical Research: Journal of History and Archaeology.

Bohay, M., Blakely, D. P., Tamplin, A. K., & Radvansky, G. A. (2011). Note taking, review, memory, and comprehension. American Journal of Psychology, 124(1), 63–67.

Chen, X., Sin, S., Theng, Y.-L., & Lee, C. (2015). Why students share misinformation on social media. Computers in Human Behavior, 61, 110–123.

Hsieh, C.-Y., et al. (2025). The impact of smartphone usage frequency on university students' academic performance: A meta-analysis. Learning and Instruction.

Kumari, P., & Yogi, A. (2025). The Indian knowledge system and indigenous pedagogies: Concepts, history, and contemporary relevance. Indian Journal of University Research.

Loh, X. K., Cheong, C., & Liew, K. K. (2021). The dark side of mobile learning via social media. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education.

Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note taking. Psychological Science, 25(6), 1159–1168.

Pedraja-Rejas, L., Fuentes, M., & Sánchez, R. (2024). Mobile learning and its effect on learning outcomes and critical thinking:

A systematic review. Applied Sciences, 14(19), 9105.

Pérez Juárez, M. Á. (2023). Digital distractions from the point of view of higher education students (Doctoral thesis). University of Valladolid.

Rajguru, N. (2024). The Gurukul system: Ancient pedagogical practices and their role in shaping Indian knowledge traditions. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 6(6).

Wang, J., et al. (2025). Tackling misinformation in mobile social networks: A BERT-LSTM approach. Scientific Reports.

Additional Readings

Ahmed, R. R., Qazi, W., & Khan, M. A. (2020). Smartphone use and academic performance of university students. Sustainability, 12(1), 439. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010439

Bhat, A. N., & Javaid, S. (2024). The education system in ancient India: Teacher-student knowledge transmission, debate, and experiential methods. Historical Research: Journal of History and Archaeology. https://hrjha.lexarcheus.com/storage/app/public/pdf/1748960599.pdf

Bohay, M., Blakely, D. P., Tamplin, A. K., & Radvansky, G. A. (2011). Note taking, review, memory, and comprehension. American Journal of Psychology, 124(1), 63–67. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21506451/

Chen, X., Sin, S., Theng, Y.-L., & Lee, C. (2015). Why students share misinformation on social media. Computers in Human Behavior, 61, 110–123.

Chi, M. T. H. (2009). Active-constructive-interactive: A conceptual framework for differentiating learning activities. Topics in Cognitive Science, 1(1), 73–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-8765.2008.01005.x

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11(6), 671–684.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Continuum.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promise and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign. https://curriculumredesign.org/wp-content/uploads/AIED-Book-Excerpt-CCR.pdf

Hsieh, C.-Y., et al. (2025). The impact of smartphone usage frequency on university students' academic performance: A meta-analysis. Learning and Instruction.

Kumari, P., & Yogi, A. (2025). The Indian knowledge system and indigenous pedagogies: Concepts, history, and contemporary relevance. Indian Journal of University Research. https://journal.iujharkhand.edu.in/June-2025/The-Indian-Knowledge-System.pdf

Loh, X. K., Cheong, C., & Liew, K. K. (2021). The dark side of mobile learning via social media. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education.

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8501931/

Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note taking. Psychological Science, 25(6), 1159–1168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614524581

Nazarnia, M., et al. (2023). A mobile-based educational intervention on media health literacy. BMC Public Health. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10558972/

Pedraja-Rejas, L., Fuentes, M., & Sánchez, R. (2024). Mobile learning and its effect on learning outcomes and critical thinking: A systematic review. Applied Sciences, 14(19), 9105. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14199105

Pérez Juárez, M. Á. (2023). Digital distractions from the point of view of higher education students (Doctoral thesis). University of Valladolid. https://uvadoc.uva.es/bitstream/handle/10324/64800/DigitalDistractionsHigherEducationStudents.pdf

Pérez-Escoda, A., et al. (2021). Fake news reaching young people on social networks. Publications, 9(2), 24. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9020024

Rajguru, N. (2024). The Gurukul system: Ancient pedagogical practices and their role in shaping Indian knowledge traditions. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 6(6). https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/6/32743.pdf

Vieriu, A. M. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on students' learning processes and academic performance. Education Sciences, 15(3), 343. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343

Wang, J., et al. (2025). Tackling misinformation in mobile social networks: A BERT-LSTM approach. Scientific Reports. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-85308-4

Ahmed, R. R., Qazi, W., & Khan, M. A. (2020). Smartphone use and academic performance of university students. Sustainability, 12(1), 439. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010439

Bhat, A. N., & Javaid, S. (2024). The education system in ancient India: Teacherstudent knowledge transmission, debate, and experiential methods. Historical Research: Journal of History and Archaeology. https://hrjha.lexarcheus.com/storage/app/public/pdf/1748960599.pdf

Bohay, M., Blakely, D. P., Tamplin, A. K., & Radvansky, G. A. (2011). Note taking, review, memory, and comprehension. American Journal of Psychology, 124(1), 63–67.

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21506451/

Chen, X., Sin, S., Theng, Y.L., & Lee, C. (2015). Why students share misinformation on social media. Computers in Human Behavior, 61, 110–123.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promise and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign. https://curriculumredesign.org/wp-content/uploads/AIED-Book-Excerpt-CCR.pdf

Kumari, P., & Yogi, A. (2025). The Indian knowledge system and indigenous pedagogies: Concepts, history, and contemporary relevance. Indian Journal of University Research. https://journal.iujharkhand.edu.in/June-2025/The-Indian-Knowledge-System.pdf

Loh, X. K., Cheong, C., & Liew, K. K. (2021). The dark side of mobile learning via social media. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8501931/

Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note taking. Psychological Science, 25(6), 1159–1168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614524581

Nazarnia, M., et al. (2023). A mobilebased educational intervention on media health literacy. BMC Public Health. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10558972/

PedrajaRejas, L., Fuentes, M., & Sánchez, R. (2024). Mobile learning and its effect on learning outcomes and critical thinking: A systematic review. Applied Sciences, 14(19), 9105. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14199105

Pérez Juárez, M. Á. (2023). Digital distractions from the point of view of higher education students (Doctoral thesis). https://uvadoc.uva.es/bitstream/handle/10324/64800/DigitalDistractionsHigherEducationStudents.pdf?sequence=1

PérezEscoda, A., et al. (2021). Fake news reaching young people on social networks. Publications, 9(2), 24. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9020024

Rajguru, N. (2024). The Gurukul system: Ancient pedagogical practices and their role in shaping Indian knowledge traditions. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 6(6). https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/6/32743.pdf

Vieriu, A. M. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on students' learning

processes and academic performance. Education Sciences, 15(3), 343. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/3/343

Wang, J., et al. (2025). Tackling misinformation in mobile social networks: a BERTLSTM approach. Scientific Reports. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-85308-4