

EVALUATIVE STUDY OF VALUE ORIENTATION OF POST GRADUATE STUDENTS OF UNIVERSITY OF KASHMIR.**1. Rizwan Roomi. 2. Dr. Tasleema jan**

1. Lecturer, School of Education and Behavioural Sciences, University of Kashmir.

2. Associate Professor, School of Education and Behavioural Sciences, University of Kashmir.

Introduction

Value crisis is a global phenomenon of our times. Rapid scientific growth and technological advancements resulting in industrialization have threatened our age-old moral standards. This atmosphere of valuelessness is leading to disintegration, though we notice at the same time best of progress in certain other fields. Nietzsche rightly remarked, "When a tree grows up to heaven, its roots reach down to hell". We must realize that this process of value deterioration will prove disastrous and lead to disintegration of the society. It is the right time therefore for us to rise to action and make conscious efforts to reverse the trend and lead to the right direction.

Since time immemorial it has been recognized that education is necessarily a process of inculcating values to help the learner to lead a good life that is satisfying to the individual in accordance with the cherished values and ideals of the society. Philosophers, spiritual leaders and educationists have emphasised the role of education for character development, bringing out the latent potentialities and inherent qualities and developing integrated personality for the well-being of the individual and the society at large, highlighting the need for value orientation of education. The first step in the direction of changing the world is to take the needed steps for radical change in the human consciousness. One of the most important means to achieve this end is value orientation of education. This will help human beings to conduct themselves in the more desirable directions, and to shape their life patterns by strengthening their beliefs and by integrating facts, ideas, attitudes and actions. This will also help to clarify their aims in life as well as the process to achieve them. In the modern context of our commitment to secularism and other such related Constitutional provisions, value education is considered much wider so as to transcend the boundaries of religions and encompass ethical, social, aesthetic, cultural and spiritual values. This broadened concept has many implications for value education programmes at the school stage.

Unfortunately, value education has received merely lip service so far, though without an effective value-oriented education the country will face crisis of character, adversely affecting the quality of life and relationship, in turn leading to tensions and strife's. The economy and development of the country also stand to lose. With a view to equipping children of today, who will be the citizens of tomorrow, education has to be reoriented and revamped altogether. What a sculptor is to a block of marble, education is to the human soul. The philosopher, the saint, the hero, the wise and the good or the great, very often lie hidden and concealed in the sand of anonymity, which a proper education might have brought to life. The fact that all good education is, in essence a process of developing the human personality in all its dimensions, is undisputed and universally accepted. Good education is inconceivable if it fails to inculcate values which are essential to good life and social well being. Great thinkers of recorded history have

devoted much attention to understand the significance of character and values in life and the role of various agencies of education in promoting these values.

Statement of The Problem

The problem selected for the purpose of the present investigation reads as under:

“An Evaluative Study of Value Orientation of Post Graduate Students of University of Kashmir.”

Objectives

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. To compare Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts and faculty of Education on different values
2. To compare Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science and Faculty of Education on different values
3. To compare Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Social Science and Faculty of Education.
4. To compare Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science and Social Science on different value
5. To compare Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Science on different value

Methodology and Procedure

Selection of The Sample

The sample selected for the current investigation consisted of 480 P G Students selected from various faculties of university of Kashmir, Hazratbal Srinagar. Random sampling strategy was followed to draw the sample for the study. The list of these faculties is as under:

S.No	Name of the faculties	Sample Taken
1.	Faculty of Science	120
2.	Faculty of Arts	120
3.	Faculty of Social Science	120
4.	Faculty of Education	120
Total		480

Tool Used

Value Orientation Scale constructed by N.Y. Reddy was administered on sample subjects for the purpose of data collection.

Statistical Treatment

In order to accomplish the objectives of the present study and also with the purpose of testing the hypothesis, the data collected through Value Orientation Scale was pooled together and statistically analyzed by applying mean, S.D. and t-test.

Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1.0 Showing significance of mean difference between Post Graduate students of faculty of Arts (N=120) and Post Graduate students of faculty of Education (N=120) on six values of value orientation scale.

S. No	Dimension	Faculty	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
01	Theoretical	PGSFA	34.68	5.65	6.16	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	38.87	5.03		
02	Economic	PGSFA	36.10	5.39	3.49	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	38.23	4.18		
03	Aesthetic	PGSFA	43.54	6.34	3.66	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	40.83	5.29		
04	Social	PGSFA	42.05	4.44	2.71	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	40.12	6.49		
05	Political	PGSFA	33.08	3.53	12.37	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	40.75	5.97		
06	Religious	PGSFA	45.55	5.71	7.50	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	40.74	4.37		

- PGSFA: Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts
- PGSFE: Post Graduate Students of faculty of Education

Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts and Post Graduate Students of faculty of Education have been compared in order to find out the significance of difference between mean score on six values of value orientation scale.

A perusal of the table clearly indicates that there is significant difference between Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts and Post Graduate Students of faculty of Education on theoretical value (t-value 6.16 $P > 0.01$) and economic value (t-value 3.49 $P > 0.01$). The result plotted in this table indicates that the Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts and Post Graduate University Education Students (PGUES) differ significantly on aesthetic value (t-value 3.66 $P > 0.01$) and social value (t-value 2.71 $P > 0.01$).

The table further reveals that the two groups differ significantly in case of political value 12.37 $P > 0.01$) and religion value (7.50 $P > 0.01$). Thus, the difference between the Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts and Post Graduate Students of faculty of Education have been found to be significant on the total score of the value orientation scale (t-value 2.10 $P > 0.05$).

Table 1.1: Showing significance of mean difference between Post Graduate Students of faculty of science (N=120) and Post Graduate students of faculty of Education (N=120) on six values of value orientation scale.

S. No	Dimension	Faculty	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
01	Theoretical	PGSFS	38.90	4.63	0.49	Insignificant
		PGSFE	38.87	5.03		
02	Economic	PGSFS	34.73	6.13	5.22	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	38.23	4.18		
03	Aesthetic	PGSFS	43.65	7.65	3.35	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	40.83	5.29		
04	Social	PGSFS	40.95	5.97	1.03	Insignificant
		PGSFE	40.12	6.49		
05	Political	PGSFS	34.56	3.15	10.31	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	40.75	5.97		
06	Religious	PGSFS	40.74	6.07	3.91	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFE	43.36	4.37		

- PGSFS: Post Graduate Students of faculty of Science
- PGSFE: Post Graduate Students of faculty of education

Data displayed in table 1.1 gives an account of means, SD's and t-value of Post Graduate Students of faculty of Science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of education on six values of value orientation scale.

A perusal of above table clearly indicates that Post Graduate Students of faculty of Science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of education do not differ significantly on theoretical (t-value 0.49) and social value (t-value 1.03).

A quick glance of table 1.4 reveals that on economic value (t-value 5.22 $P > 0.01$) and aesthetic value (t-value 3.35 $P > 0.01$) the two groups show significant difference. The table further reveals that there is significant difference between the Post Graduate Students of faculty of Science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of education on political value (t-value 10.31 $P > 0.01$) and religious value (t-value 3.91 $P > 0.01$). On the total score of value orientation scale, the difference has been found insignificant (t-value 1.73).

Table 1.2: Showing significance of mean difference between Post Graduate Students of faculty of social science (N=120) and Post Graduate students of faculty of Education (N=120) on six values of value orientation scale.

S. No	Dimension	Faculty	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
01	Theoretical	PGSFSS	40.44	5.83	2.24	Significant at 0.05.
		PGSFE	38.87	5.03		
02	Economic	PGSFSS	40.69	6.19	3.67	Significant at 0.01.
		PGSFE	38.23	4.18		
03	Aesthetic	PGSFSS	40.50	5.99	0.45	Insignificant.
		PGSFE	40.83	5.29		
04	Social	PGSFSS	45.47	5.12	7.22	Significant at 0.01.
		PGSFE	40.12	6.49		
05	Political	PGSFSS	41.28	6.82	0.65	Insignificant
		PGSFE	40.75	5.97		
06	Religious	PGSFSS	40.74	4.37	0.82	Insignificant
		PGSFE	40.26	4.84		

- PGSFSS: Post Graduate students of faculty of Social Science
- PGSFE: Post Graduate students of faculty of Education

Data displayed in table 1.3 gives an account of mean's, SD's and t-value of Post Graduate students of faculty of Social Science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of Education on six values of value orientation scale.

A perusal of above table clearly indicates that the Post Graduate students of faculty of Social Science and Post Graduate students of faculty of Education differ significantly on theoretical value (t-value 2.24 $P > 0.05$) and economic value (t-value 3.67 $P > 0.01$).

A quick glance of this table reveals that on aesthetic value (t-value 0.45), political value (t-value 0.65) and religious value (t-value 0.82), the two groups show insignificant difference. The table further reveals that there is significant difference between Post Graduate students of faculty of Social Science and Post Graduate students of faculty of Education on social value (t-value 7.22). Thus, on the total score of value orientation scale, the difference has been significant (t-value 4.11 $P > 0.01$).

Table 1.3: Showing significance of mean difference between Post Graduate Students of faculty of science (N=120) and Post Graduate Students of faculty of social science (N=120) on six values of value orientation scale.

S. No	Dimension	Faculty	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
01	Theoretical	PGSFS	38.90	4.63	2.29	Significant at 0.05 level
		PGSFSS	40.44	5.83		
02	Economic	PGSFS	34.73	6.13	7.64	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFSS	40.69	6.19		
03	Aesthetic	PGSFS	40.50	5.99	3.62	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFSS	43.65	7.65		
04	Social	PGSFS	40.95	5.97	6.45	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFSS	45.47	5.12		
05	Political	PGSFS	34.56	3.15	10.1	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFSS	41.28	6.82		
06	Religious	PGSFS	40.74	4.37	0.82	Insignificant
		PGSFSS	40.26	4.84		

- PGSFS: Post Graduate Students of faculty of science
- PGUSSS: Post Graduate Students of faculty of Social Science

Table 1.3 gives the comparison of Post Graduate Students of faculty of science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of social science on six values of value orientation scale.

A perusal of the table clearly indicates that there is significant difference Post Graduate Students of faculty of science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of Social Science on theoretical value (t-value 2.29 $P > 0.05$), economic value (t-value 7.64 $P > 0.01$) and aesthetic value (t-value 3.62 $P > 0.01$).

The result plotted in this table clearly indicates that Post Graduate Students of faculty of science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of Social Science differ significantly on social value (t-value 6.45 $P > 0.01$) and political value (t-value 10.1 $P > 0.01$).

The table further reveals that there is no significant difference between Post Graduate Students of faculty of science and Post Graduate Students of faculty of Social Science on religious value (t-value 0.82). Thus on the total score of value orientation scale, the difference has been significant (t value 4.45 $P > 0.01$).

Table 1.4: Showing significance of mean difference between Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts (N=120) and Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science (N=120) on six values of value orientation scale.

S. No	Dimension	Faculty	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
01	Theoretical	PGSFA	34.68	5.65	6.49	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFS	38.90	4.63		
02	Economic	PGSFA	36.10	5.39	1.85	Insignificant
		PGSFS	34.73	6.13		
03	Aesthetic	PGSFA	43.54	6.34	0.12	Insignificant
		PGSFS	43.65	7.65		
04	Social	PGSFA	42.05	4.44	1.64	Insignificant
		PGSFS	40.95	5.97		
05	Political	PGSFA	33.08	3.53	3.52	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFS	34.56	3.15		
06	Religious	PGSFA	45.55	5.71	3.84	Significant at 0.01 level
		PGSFS	43.36	6.07		

- PGSFA: Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts
- PGSFS: Post Graduate Students of faculty of science

Table 1.4 gives the comparison of two groups of students i.e., Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts and Post Graduate Students of faculty of science on six values of value orientation scale.

A quick glance of above table clearly indicates that the Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts and Post Graduate Students of faculty of science differ significantly on theoretical value (t-value 6.49 $P > 0.01$). The table reveals that the Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts and differ significantly on political value (t-value 3.52 $P > 0.01$) and religious value (t-value 3.84 $P > 0.01$). The table further reveals that there is no significant difference between Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts and Post Graduate Students of faculty of science on aesthetic value (t-value 0.12) economic value (t-value 1.85) and social value (t-value 1.64). The two groups however, do not differ significantly on total score (t-value 0.22).

Major Findings

1. Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts are having more aesthetic, social and religious value as compared to Post Graduate students of Faculty of Education.
2. It has been found that Post Graduate Students of faculty of Education are having more theoretical value, economic value and political in comparison to Post Graduate students of faculty of Arts.
3. No significant difference has been found between Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science and Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Education on theoretical value and social value.
4. Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Education Students have high economic value, political value and religious value in comparison to Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science.
5. Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science have shown greater mean score and thus possess high aesthetic value in comparison to Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Education.

6. Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Social Science have high theoretical, economic and social value as compared to Post Graduate students of Faculty of Education.
7. No significant difference has been found between Post Graduate Students of Faculty of social Science and Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Education on aesthetic, political and religious value.
8. Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Social Science have high theoretical, economic, Aesthetic social and political value as compared to Post Graduate students of Faculty of Science.
9. No significant difference has been found between Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science and Post Graduate Students of Faculty of social Science on political and value.
10. Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science have more theoretical value and political value in comparison to Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts. On the contrary Post Graduate Students of faculty of Arts are having more religious value as compared to Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science.
11. No significant difference has been found between Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Science and Post Graduate Students of Faculty of Arts on Economic, Aesthetic and Social value.

Educational Implications

1. Value education should be provided to students from primary to University level so that society will function in constructive direction.
2. Various seminars, workshops, conferences should be organized in institutions of excellence to bring awareness regarding different social, political and religious values.
3. A Value Orientation Cell (VOC) should be established in different educational institutions which will direct and guide students from time to time regarding the inculcation of different values. This cell will also help them in developing a desirable attitude towards society.
4. Teachers should inculcate values among students by relating topics to different religions.
5. Value education should be introduced as a core paper for social science students at University level and as an optional paper for science students.

References

- Banui Kuotsu (1992) A study of the value of college students in Nagaland in relation to their self-concept, Fifth survey of Educational Research, New Delhi: NCERT.
- Behets, Daniel et al., (2004) Value Orientations of Elementary and Secondary Physical Teachers in Flanders, Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sports, Vol. 75, pp 156-164.
- Best J.W and Khan, J.V (1995) Research in Education, Practice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
- Buch M.B. (1983-88) Fourth survey of research in education, New Delhi: NCERT.
- Buch M.B. (1999) Fifth survey of Research in education, New Delhi: NCERT.
- Buch, M.B. (Ed.) (1986) Third Survey of Research in Education, New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training.
- Chand Jagdish (2003) Value education: Journal of Value education, vol.3 no. 1 New Delhi NCERT.
- Chitakra M.G. (2003) Education and human values, A.P.H. Publishing corporation 5- Ansari road New Delhi (P-59).

- Ganie M.Y. (1987) Value orientation and adjustment problems of rural and urban post-graduate students of the university of Kashmir, unpublished M.Phil dissertation University of Kashmir Sgr.
- Garret Henry E. (1969) Statistics in Psychology and Education, Mumbai, Vakils, Feffer and Simhs Pvt. Ltd, Ballard Estate.
- Garret, H.E.(1989) Statics in psychology and education, Hyderabad- International book bureau.
- Ghosh B.N. (2005) A textbook of value education: Dominant Publishers and distributors New Delhi.
- Gupta P.L. (2003) Role of teachers in development of value among students, Insight Journal of Education, University of Kashmir, No 1, vol. 9 (pp-66-67).
- Kalra R.M. (2003) Value oriented education in schools theory and practice, Shipora publications New Delhi (p-1-3)
- Kapoor Archana (1995) Value changes in secondary school students: An experiment study Indian Education Abstracts; issue (1) New Delhi.
- Kerlinger Fred N. (1973) Foundation of Behavioural Research, New York, Holt., Rine chart and Winstan Inc.
- N.C.E.R.T. (2004) Encyclopedia of Indian education, New Delhi.
- N.Y.Reddy (1979) Manual of value orientation, published by Agra Psychological Research Cell (APRC) Agra.
- Seetharm R.A. (2001) Value Oriented Education, Ramakrishna institute of moral and spiritual education, Mysore.
- Singh R.P. (1993) A study of value pattern of urban and rural adolescent Students, Journal of Psycho-Cultural Dimension, vol. 9 (1) New Delhi.
- Sridhar Y.N. (2001) Value development, Resource paper NC.T.E.
- Thornton Clarence H. (2004) Value Orientation: A study of black college students, College Student Journal Publisher, U.S.A., Vol 38.