



# VALUES AMONG THE STUDENTS IN RELATION TO GENDER, LOCALITY, AND PARENT'S MONTHLY INCOME

**Dr. Yugendar Nathi,**

Lecturer,

Department of Education,

Shadan College of Education, O.U., Hyderabad, India.

**Abstract:** In this modern society, education continues to be regarded as a good source of development of both individual and societies. Education plays an important role in the socio-economic development as well as in the ethical development of individuals. Value education has a paramount role to play in establishing a society that is intellectual, tolerant, humane, socially cohesive and ethically righteous. If knowledge is left without being tempered by values and morals, the power generated by such knowledge would only be disastrous and catastrophic in its effects. Education in values is an integral component of the program of education. Values are integral to the process of education. Education is a process of bringing about 'desirable' changes in the way one thinks, feels and acts in accordance with one's concept of the good life. In this sense, education necessarily involves the transmission of values. Values are the beacons, the guiding ideals, which in the educational process seek their fulfilment and consummation. Value education is a life-long process; thus, values and education have similar meanings, both of which encourage man toward a predetermined end. This paper deals about the values among the students in relation to gender, locality, and parent's monthly income.

**Key words:** Education, Values, students, gender, locality, parent's monthly income, society, life, well-being etc.

## I.INTRODUCTION

Education is essentially a lifelong process of inculcating values to equip the learner to lead a good, happy and meaningful life. Many educationists, philosophers, spiritual leaders and thinkers of education have emphasized the role of education for 'character building', 'bringing out the latent potentialities and inherent qualities' and developing an 'integrated personality' for the well-being of the individual and the society.

Value education is not value imposition or value indoctrination. It is not a direct inculcation of certain values and morals. It is a process of helping the pupils to think freely and critically on values, to act responsibly and with courage and conviction.

Values means something that is precious, dear, worthwhile, valuable and estimable and hence worthy of possession. Value is a standard. A value may be described as an emotional attitude, which motivates a person directly or indirectly to act in the most desirable way preferred by him or her. Values are defined as 'beliefs upon which man acts by preferences.

The Oxford Dictionary (2010) define value as something of great worth or importance or standard or principle that is valuable in life.

According to Kluckhohn (1951) value is "a conception of the desirable and not something 'merely desired'."

According to eminent sociologist Prof. R. K. Mukherjee (1955), "Values are socially approved desires and goals that are internalized through the process of conditioning, learning or socialization and aspirations."

According to Allport (1961), in simplest possible words, "a value is a belief which a man acts by preferences".

Rokeach (1973) defines values, "as an enduring belief, a specific mode of conduct or end along a continuum of relative importance."

Values have three basic elements namely, cognitive, affective and volitional. Thus, a value goes beyond the cognitive domain to an affective domain to incorporate a volitional element or disposition to act.

Values form on the basis of interests, choices, needs, desires and preferences. Values have a selective or directional quality. When preferences acquire certain definiteness, intensity and stability, these become the criteria for judgement, choices, action and grounds for decision-making in our behaviour. Values thus considered to be an enduring beliefs upon which human beings act by preferences and they promote individual and societal development and well-being.

## II. CLASSIFICATION/DIMENSIONS OF VALUES

Many philosophers, psychologists, sociologists and educationists have classified values in different ways based upon various aspects of life. Eduard Spranger (1928) evaluated personalities in terms of ideals or value orientations in his book *Types of Men*. According to him, there are six types of value orientations or dimensions. The six basic dimensions of values are (i) theoretical values, (ii) economic values, (iii) aesthetic values, (iv) social values, (v) political values, and (vi) religious values.

## III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In a study, Johi J. K. (1994) found that students given preference to different values i.e., theoretical, social, political, religious, economic, and aesthetic values respectively. Singh, S. (1994) found that there is a significant difference between socially rejected and neglected girls regarding their theoretical, aesthetical, social and economic values, but no difference was found in political and religious values. Another study by Zamen, G. S. (1997) indicated that social, moral, and religious values for the students of the rural area were consistently higher than those of the urban areas, both in the case of boys and girls. Cecillia & Cynthia (2001), Sirazul Islam (2002), Archana Mittal (2016), and Mathur Anjali and Sheikh Sarita (2018) found a significant difference in the value patterns of the college students in terms of gender, religion, locale, stream, socio-economic status. Natasha (2013) and Archana Mittal (2016) found that adolescents are given higher preference on social values, followed by political, economic, aesthetic and religious values. Boys had high religious and aesthetic values while girls had high economic values. The studies of Livingston & Thamodharan (2015) and Aman Deep Kaur (2016) found no significant difference between male and female, arts and science college students in their values and value perception. In a study, Aman Deep Kaur (2016) found a significant difference in aesthetic values and religious values of science and arts students in relation to their family income.

## IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 OBJECTIVES

1. To study the difference in values among the students in relation to their gender.
2. To know the difference in the values among the students in relation to their locality of college.
3. To understand the difference in values among the students in relation to their parents' monthly income.

### 4.2 HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to their values.
2. There is a significant difference between urban and rural college students with respect to their values.
3. There is no significant difference in values of students in relation to their parent's monthly income.

### 4.3 DELIMITATIONS

This study was confined to two districts of Telangana State i.e., Hanamkonda and Warangal.

### 4.4 SAMPLE

Stratified Random Sampling technique was used for the study. In present study, the sample was selected as follows:

**Selection of districts:** Telangana State was selected for the study. Out of 33 districts of Telangana State, two districts were chosen for the study, viz., Hanamkonda and Warangal.

**Selection of Colleges:** Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the junior colleges. A total of 20 junior colleges (10 Urban and 10 Rural) were selected for the study.

**Selection of Students:** 400 XI<sup>th</sup> standard students were selected from 20 colleges of two districts. Random sampling technique was used for the selection of students. From each junior college 10 members of boys and 10 members of girls were selected randomly by adopting lottery method by using their roll numbers.

### 4.5 VARIABLES

In this study independent variables were gender, locality of college and parent's monthly income and dependent variable was values (six values).

### 4.6 TOOLS OF DATA COLLECTION

The following tools were used for the present study:

1. Personal data sheet.
2. Study of Values Test – (SVT, 2012).

#### **Personal data sheet:**

Personal data sheet was constructed to obtain personal information of the students. It consisted of the following items: Student Name, Gender, Locality of College and Parents' Monthly Income.

#### **Study of Values Test:**

Study of Values Test was a standardized tool developed by Dr. R.K. Ojha and Dr. Mahesh Bhargava in 2012 and it was revised in 2018. It consists of six values. They were: i) Theoretical Values, ii) Economic Values, iii) Aesthetic Values, iv) Social Values, v) Political Values, and vi.) Religious Values.

### 4.7 DATA COLLECTION

After selection of the tools, the researcher approached the selected junior colleges, taken permission from the principals/management, and developed a good rapport with the principals, class teachers and students before collecting the data. Data was collected through the tools adopted for the study. Two tools i.e., Personal data sheet and Study of Values Test were administered to the 400 students from the Urban and Rural junior colleges in two districts i.e., Hanamkonda and Warangal.

#### 4.8 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

1. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for all variables.
2. Means and Standard Deviations were calculated for all variables.
3. 't' test was employed to know the effect of gender and locality of college on values among the students.
4. One way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was applied to test whether any significant difference exist between dependent variable of Values among students with respect to their parent's monthly income.

#### V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Hypothesis – 1:** "There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to their values".

To test the above hypothesis, t-test has been employed to know the differences among the boys and girl students with respect to their values. Results of the statistical analysis were presented in the following table of 1.

*Table:1 - Showing difference in Values among the students – Gender wise*

Values	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation (SD)	t-Value	Sig.	df
Theoretical Values	Boy	200	8.65	1.917	0.611	0.541	1, 398
	Girl	200	8.77	2.007			
Economic Values	Boy	200	8.70	1.941	2.152	0.032	
	Girl	200	8.27	2.099			
Aesthetic Values	Boy	200	5.42	2.289	0.176	0.861	
	Girl	200	5.38	2.265			
Social Values	Boy	200	8.67	2.072	1.024	0.307	
	Girl	200	8.87	1.828			
Political Values	Boy	200	7.16	2.067	0.305	0.760	
	Girl	200	7.10	1.861			
Religious Values	Boy	200	6.66	2.043	0.256	0.798	
	Girl	200	6.61	2.248			

##### a. Predictor: Gender

##### b. Dependent Variable: Values

t-test has been employed to know the differences among the boys and girl students with respect to their values. The result was found to be statistically significant at 0.03 level with regard to economic values. Hence, it can be inferred that boys were significantly better than girls in economic values. However, the difference in the mean scores indicates that boys were slightly better than girls in aesthetic, political and religious values. Whereas, girls were slightly better than boys in theoretical and social values.

Hence, the Hypothesis-1 stating that "There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to their values". – was rejected. The study of Mathur Anjali and Sheikh Sarita (2018), and Natasha (2013) and Archana Mittal (2016) supported the finding of the study and contradicts the hypothesis.

**Hypothesis – 2:** "There is a significant difference between urban and rural college students with respect to their values".

To test the above hypothesis, t-test has been employed to know the differences among urban and rural college students with respect to their values. Results of the statistical analysis were presented in the following table of 2.

*Table:2 - Showing difference in values among the students – locality of college wise*

Values/ Dimension	Location of College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig.	df
Theoretical Values	Urban	200	8.79	1.845	0.816	0.415	1, 398
	Rural	200	8.63	2.072			
Economic Values	Urban	200	8.38	2.041	1.059	0.290	
	Rural	200	8.59	2.020			
Aesthetic Values	Urban	200	5.30	2.268	0.879	0.380	
	Rural	200	5.50	2.282			
Social Values	Urban	200	8.97	2.054	2.056	0.040	
	Rural	200	8.57	1.831			
Political Values	Urban	200	7.25	2.061	1.222	0.222	
	Rural	200	7.01	1.861			
Religious Values	Urban	200	6.42	2.097	1.988	0.047	
	Rural	200	6.85	2.178			

**a. Predictor: Locality of college****b. Dependent Variable: Values**

t-test has been employed to know the differences between the urban and rural college students with respect to their values. The result was found to be statistically significant at 0.04 level with regard to social and religious values. Hence, it can be inferred that urban college students were significantly better than rural college students in social values, whereas rural college students were significantly better than urban college students in religious values. However, the difference in the mean scores indicates that urban college students were slightly better than rural college students in theoretical and political values, whereas rural college students were slightly better than urban college students in economic and aesthetic values,

Hence, the Hypothesis – 2 stating that “There is a significant difference between urban and rural college students with respect to their values” – was accepted. The study of Zamen, G. S. (1997), Cecillia & Cynthia (2001), Sirazul Islam (2002), Archana Mittal (2016), and Mathur Anjali and Sheikh Sarita (2018) were supported the finding of the study.

**Hypothesis – 3:** “There is no significant difference in values of students in relation to their parent’s monthly income”.

To test the above hypothesis, one way ANOVA has been employed to find out the differences among students’ values in relation to their parent’s monthly income i.e., below Rs. 20,000 (low income), Rs. 20,001 to 50,000 (middle income), and Rs. 50,001 and above (high income). Results of the statistical analysis were presented in the following table 3.

**Table:3 - Showing differences in values among the students – Parents monthly income wise**

Values/ Dimensions	Parents monthly income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F- Value	Sig.	df
Theoretical Value	Below Rs. 20,000	277	8.78	1.921	0.627	0.535	2, 397
	Rs. 20,001 to 50,000	108	8.59	2.078			
	Rs. 50,001 and above	15	8.33	1.877			
	Total	400	8.71	1.961			
Economic Value	Below Rs. 20,000	277	8.59	2.103	1.597	0.204	
	Rs. 20,001 to 50,000	108	8.29	1.845			
	Rs. 50,001 and above	15	7.87	1.846			
	Total	400	8.48	2.031			
Aesthetic Value	Below Rs. 20,000	277	5.33	2.224	0.374	0.688	
	Rs. 20,001 to 50,000	108	5.56	2.397			
	Rs. 50,001 and above	15	5.40	2.384			
	Total	400	5.40	2.274			
Social Value	Below Rs. 20,000	277	8.92	1.942	2.887	0.057	
	Rs. 20,001 to 50,000	108	8.44	1.940			
	Rs. 50,001 and above	15	8.27	2.017			
	Total	400	8.77	1.954			
Political Value	Below Rs. 20,000	277	7.12	2.046	0.242	0.785	
	Rs. 20,001 to 50,000	108	7.09	1.791			
	Rs. 50,001 and above	15	7.47	1.685			
	Total	400	7.13	1.964			
Religious Value	Below Rs. 20,000	277	6.43	1.974	4.603	0.011	
	Rs. 20,001 to 50,000	108	7.00	2.395			
	Rs. 50,001 and above	15	7.67	2.743			
	Total	400	6.63	2.146			

**a. Predictor: Parent’s monthly income****b. Dependent variable: Values**

Result was found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level with regard to social values and significant at 0.01 level with regard to religious values. Hence, it can be inferred that the students whose parent’s monthly income was below Rs. 20,000 (low income) were significantly better than other students in social values and the students whose parent’s monthly income was Rs. 50,001 and above (high income) were significantly better than other students in religious values.

Hence, the Hypothesis-3 stating that “There is no significant difference in values of students in relation to their parent’s monthly income”. – was rejected. This finding was supported by Cecillia & Cynthia (2001), Sirazul Islam (2002), Archana Mittal (2016), Mathur Anjali and Sheikh Sarita (2018), and Aman Deep Kaur (2016).

**VI. DISCUSSION**

The research aimed to study values among higher secondary students with respect to gender, locality of college and parent’s monthly income.

The findings of the study indicates that Boys were significantly better than girls in economic values. Urban college students were significantly better than rural college students in social values, whereas rural college students were significantly better than urban college students in religious values. The students whose parent’s monthly income was below Rs. 20,000 (low income) were significantly better than other students in social values and the students whose parent’s monthly income was Rs. 50,001 and above (high income) were significantly better than other students in religious values.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The study shows that Boys were significantly better in economic values, while marginally better in aesthetic, political and religious values, whereas girls were slightly better in theoretical and social values. Urban students were significantly better in social values, while slightly better in theoretical and political values, whereas rural students were significantly better in religious values and slightly better in economic and aesthetic values.

The students whose parent's monthly income was below Rs. 20,000 were significantly better in social values while comparatively better in theoretical and economic values, while the students whose parent's monthly income was Rs. 20,001 to 50,000 were slightly better in aesthetic values, whereas the students whose parent's monthly income was Rs. 50,001 and above were significantly better in religious values and slightly better in political values. Further, it was observed that lower the parent's monthly income, high are the theoretical, economic and social values among the students. Whereas, higher the parent's monthly income, better are the religious values among the students.

## VIII. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Educational planners, administrators, teachers and parents must be focused on both the boys and girls to foster the values by developing scientific and critical thinking, economic and financial literacy, introducing students to various forms of art, socio-political and religious awareness and education.
2. Administrators and teachers must focus on students of urban and rural colleges to foster values by conducting awareness programs to teachers and parents and college administrators to make the students to engage and interact with different areas of knowledge and situations which improve student's ability to develop different values.
3. Government and educational institutions must be focused on to mitigate the differences in values among the students whose parents had high income by conducting different awareness programs and establishing guidance and counselling centers.

## IX. NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Aggarwal, T.K. 1992. *A Study of Values of Adolescent Pupils in Relation to Intelligence, Creativity, Sex and Socio-Economic Status*. Ph.D. Thesis, Amritsar: G.N.D.U.
2. Allport, C.W., Vernon, Philip E. and Lindsey, G. 1960. *A Study of Values*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
3. Angira, K.K. 1995. *A Study of Values in Relation to Locale and Gender*. Indian psychological Review, Vol. 44 (5).
4. CBSE, 2012. *Value Education: A Hand Book for Teachers*, The Secretary, Central Board of Secondary Education, Delhi.
5. Cecilia, A. and Cynthia, A. 2001. *A correlational study of Value system and Sociogenic variables*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado.
6. Chacko Nisha, Mathur Anjali and Sheikh Sarita 2016. Value preferences of adolescents across gender, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, Vol. 2 (10), 15-17. [www.socialresearchjournals.com](http://www.socialresearchjournals.com)
7. Islam, Sirazul. 2002. *Value pattern of College Students in Relation to some Socio Educational Variables*. In D. R. Goel, Chhaya Goel, R. L. Madhavi (Eds.). Abstracts of Research Studies conducted by Teacher Education Institutions in India. Volume I. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodara: CASE.
8. Joshi, K. 2002. *Philosophy of Value Oriented Education: Theory and practice*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
9. Kaur, Aman Deep 2016. *Value Patterns of Science and Arts Students in relation to their Socio-Economic Status and Type of School*. The research abstract published on Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science & English Language, Online ISSN 2348-3083.
10. Kluckhohn, C. 1952. *Values and Value Orientation*. In T Parsons and E.A. Shills (Eds.): *Towards a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
11. Kothari, C. R. 1990. *Research Methodology*, Wiley Eastern Ltd., New Delhi.
12. Kurt, B. 1969. *The Concept of Value*, New York: Free Press.
13. Mangal S.K., 2012, *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Asoke K. Ghosh, PHI Learning Private Limited, New Delhi.
14. Mittal, Archana 2016. *A Study of Values of Secondary School Students in Relation to Their Socio-Economic Status and Modernization*. The research abstract published on Learning Community: 7(3), pp. 203-216.
15. Mukherji, R.K., 1961. The dimension of values. Allen and Urin Ltd. Ruskin House Museum Street, 9-18.
16. Natasha. 2013. A Comparative study of value pattern among Adolescents, *International Journal of Educational Planning & Administration*, Volume 3, Number 1 (2013), pp. 75-79. <http://www.ripublication.com/ijepa.htm>
17. Rokeach, M. 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: The Free Press.
18. Spranger, E. 1928. *Types of Men*. Translated from 5<sup>th</sup> German Edition of *Lebensformen* by Paul J. Pigors. Halls: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
19. Tripathi A.N. 2006. *Human Values*, New Age International Publishers Ltd., 2 nd edition.
20. Zamen, G.S. 1994. *A Study of Social, Religious and Moral Values of Students of Class XI and their Relationship with Moral Character and Personality Adjustment*. Ph.D. Education Thesis, Avadh University. In Buch, M.B. (Ed.): Fourth Survey of Research in Education, New Delhi, NCERT, p. 217.