

# A Study of Values of Secondary School Students in Relation to Their Socio-Economic Status and Modernization

Archana Mittal

Janta Inter College Majri, Gummawala Distt., Haridwar, India

\*Corresponding author: archanamittal82@gmail.com

## Abstract

The future of any nation depends on its children. Values play an important role in shaping the character and personality of the children. The present study attempts to study the values of secondary school students in relation to their socio-economic status and modernization. The main purpose of the study is to compare the values of secondary school boys and girls, rural and urban students and government and non-government secondary school students. In this study normative survey method was employed. All secondary school students of district Haridwar constituted the population of the study. Two-stage random sampling technique was used to select a total number of 320 secondary school students from the government and non-government secondary schools of district Haridwar. Mean, S.D., 't' test were used for the statistical analysis. The findings revealed that all the secondary school students had average level of values. They preferred social values most while religious value was least preferred by the students. Secondary school boys had higher religious, aesthetic, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values while secondary school girls had higher economic value. Secondary school students of rural and urban area were found to differ significantly in religious, social, economic, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values. There was found a significant difference in the hedonistic, family prestige and health values of government and non-government secondary school students. Socio-economic status had a significant effect on the religious, social, family prestige and health values of the students while the modernization did not put any significant influence on the values of the students.

**Keywords:** Values, Secondary School Students, Socio-Economic Status and Modernization.

India is a country of values. Values are guiding stars which guide the path of the human being to choose the right alternative. Value means something which has a price, something precious, dear and

worthwhile; hence something one is ready to suffer and sacrifice for. Values are a set of principles or standards of behavior (*Dhinakaran, V. and Sivakumar, R., 2014*). According to *Davidov, Schmidt and Schwartz (2008)* values are defined “*as deeply rooted, abstract motivations that guide, justify or explain attitudes, norms, opinions and actions*”. In the words of *Surinder (2012)*, “*value is an intrinsic truth. It is an essential norm and governs the moral universe of man*”.

Values play the supreme role in the making of the individual, society as well as a nation. Behavior and conduct of an individual largely depends on his values. Values shape his character and personality. Signifying the role of values *Kaur, J. and Kaur, H. (2013)* stated that values are those principles which guide human behavior and put meaning to his existence. Values form the central pole around which people organize their desire and ambitions and fashion their idioms of life. Values affect the feelings, emotions, thoughts, and attitude and in this way influence the decisions and behavior of the individual. Values play an important role in the motivation of a person’s behavior (*Indira, K., 2009*).

Students, especially secondary school students fall in that period of age which is characterized with lots of conflicts. At such time, they should be taught what is right and good for them. This can be done through the inculcation of values. On the other hand, the world is facing the threatening consequences of terrorism and corruption. Modernization and technological advancements seem to deteriorate the values in the children. Students seem to lack values and drift away from the traditional values of our country. The need of hour is to inculcate the values in the students to conserve the moral heritage of India and to make progress in the global village as well.

### **Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study is to compare the values of secondary school students in relation to their gender, area, type of school, socio-economic status and modernization.

### **Objectives of the study**

Following objectives have been framed to achieve the purpose of the study:

1. To study the values of secondary school students.
2. To compare the values of secondary school students in relation to their gender.
3. To compare the values of secondary school students in relation to their area.
4. To compare the values of secondary school students in relation to type of school.
5. To compare the values of secondary school students in relation to their socio-economic status.
6. To compare the values of secondary school students in relation to their modernization.

### **Hypotheses of the study**

Following hypotheses have been formulated in order to achieve the objectives of the study:

1. There is no significant difference in the values of secondary school students in relation to their gender.
2. There is no significant difference in the values of secondary school students in relation to their area.
3. There is no significant difference in the values of secondary school students in relation to type of school.
4. There is no significant difference in the values of secondary school students in relation to their socio-economic status.
5. There is no significant difference in the values of secondary school students in relation to their modernization.

### **Delimitations of the study**

The present study is delimited as follows:

1. The study is confined to the district Haridwar of Uttarakhand.
2. The study is delimited to the secondary school students only.
3. The study includes both boys and girls.
4. The students of government and non-government secondary schools have been included in the present study.

### **Methodology**

The present study is dealing with the investigation of values of secondary school students in relation to gender, area, type of school, socio-economic status and modernization. The researcher has employed normative survey method. It attempts to describe and interpret practices, processes, trends, effects, attitudes and beliefs etc. of the present phenomenon. Hence, this method has been found to be most suitable for present study.

### **Population of the study**

All secondary school students of district Haridwar constituted the population of the present study.

### **Sample and sampling procedure**

Two-stage random sampling technique has been adopted to select the representative sample from the population. In the first stage, the investigator obtained a list of all the government and non-government secondary schools of district Haridwar. The investigator selected 5 government and 5 non-government

secondary schools randomly. In the second stage, 32 students from each secondary school were selected randomly. In this way a total number of 320 secondary school students were selected. The sample framework is given in the table below:

**Table 1: Sampling Framework**

Area	Type of School	Gender	Selected Sample	Total Sample
Rural	Government	Boys	40	80
		Girls	40	
	Non-Government	Boys	40	80
		Girls	40	
Urban	Government	Boys	40	80
		Girls	40	
	Non-Government	Boys	40	80
		Girls	40	
Total			320	320

**Variables**

The present study involves two kinds of variables, which are stated as under:

➤ **Dependent Variable**

In the present study, the dependent variable is values, which is measured by Personal Value Questionnaire developed by Dr. (Mrs.) G.P. Sherry and Dr. R.P. Verma.

➤ **Independent Variable**

Socio-economic status and modernization are the two independent variables of the study. Socio-economic status has been measured by Socio-Economic Status Scale developed by Rajiv Lochan Bharadwaj. Modernization has been measured by Comprehensive Modernization Inventory developed by Dr. S.P. Ahluwalia and Dr. A.K. Kalia.

**Tools used**

The following tools have been used in the present study:

1. Personal Value Questionnaire developed by Dr. (Mrs.) G.P. Sherry and Dr. R.P. Verma.
2. Socio-Economic Status Scale developed by Rajiv Lochan Bharadwaj.
3. Comprehensive Modernization Inventory developed by Dr. S.P. Ahluwalia and Dr. A.K. Kalia.

**Statistical analysis**

Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ test have been used for the statistical analysis.

## Results and discussion

**Table 1: Mean and S.D. of the Values of Secondary School Students**

	Variable	N	Mean	S.D.
Values of Secondary School Students	Religious Value	320	47.89	11.47
	Social Value	320	53.49	11.80
	Democratic Value	320	49.63	9.92
	Aesthetic Value	320	49.79	10.74
	Economic Value	320	50.72	9.56
	Knowledge Value	320	49.92	9.68
	Hedonistic Value	320	51.92	10.63
	Power Value	320	50.95	11.09
	Family Prestige Value	320	50.55	10.40
	Health Value	320	49.93	10.28

The above table shows the mean and S.D. of the ten values of the secondary school students. The mean score of religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values are 47.89, 53.49, 49.63, 49.79, 50.72, 49.92, 51.92, 50.95, 50.55 and 49.93 respectively. These mean scores indicate that secondary school students have average level of all the ten values. It is clear from the above table that secondary school students have highest social value while they have least religious value. On the other hand, they have shown equal level of democratic, aesthetic, knowledge and health value. In case of economic, power and family prestige value, they have shown almost similar level.

It is evident that secondary school students preferred social values most which is followed by hedonistic, power, economic, family prestige, health, knowledge, aesthetic, democratic and religious value. Religious value is least preferred by secondary school students.

**Table 2: Comparison of the Values of Secondary School Students in relation to their Gender**

Values	Boys (N=160)		Girls (N=160)		't' Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	50.56	9.76	45.22	12.45	4.264**
Social Value	52.60	12.20	54.38	11.40	1.347
Democratic Value	48.65	10.59	50.60	9.17	1.760
Aesthetic Value	50.88	10.56	47.71	10.88	1.985*
Economic Value	49.81	9.27	52.69	9.81	2.053*
Knowledge Value	49.77	10.35	50.07	9.03	0.273
Hedonistic Value	53.17	10.96	50.67	10.21	2.110*
Power Value	53.32	11.47	48.59	10.25	3.889**
Family Prestige Value	52.69	11.39	48.45	9.24	2.003*
Health Value	52.84	10.36	47.09	9.39	5.272**

\*\* = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance

\* = Significant at 0.05 Level of Significance

The above table presents the t-values to compare the ten values of secondary school students in relation to their gender. The obtained t-values for religious ( $t = 4.264$ ), power ( $t = 3.889$ ) and health value ( $t = 5.272$ ) have been found significant at 0.01 level of significance at df 318. It shows that there is a highly significant difference in the religious, power and health value of secondary school boys and girls. The mean values show that secondary school boys have higher religious, power and health value as compared to secondary school girls.

The t-values for aesthetic ( $t = 1.985$ ), economic ( $t = 2.053$ ), hedonistic ( $t = 2.110$ ) and family prestige value ( $t = 2.003$ ) have been found significant at 0.05 level of significance at df 318. It shows that secondary school boys and girls differ significantly in their aesthetic, economic, hedonistic and family prestige value. The mean values show that secondary school boys have more aesthetic, hedonistic and family prestige value as compared to secondary school girls while secondary school girls have higher economic value.

On the other hand, the t-values for social ( $t = 1.347$ ), democratic ( $t = 1.760$ ) and knowledge value ( $t = 0.273$ ) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the social, democratic and knowledge value of secondary school boys and girls.

**Table 3: Comparison of the Values of Secondary School Students in relation to their Area**

Values	Rural (N=160)		Urban (N=160)		't' Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	49.65	10.02	46.13	12.57	2.768**
Social Value	55.39	12.31	51.58	11.02	2.916**
Democratic Value	49.13	10.06	50.13	9.82	0.895
Aesthetic Value	50.22	10.55	49.37	10.97	0.708
Economic Value	49.50	9.69	51.94	9.33	2.293*
Knowledge Value	49.75	9.71	50.09	9.72	0.310
Hedonistic Value	50.14	10.30	53.71	10.73	3.032**
Power Value	53.45	11.37	48.45	10.29	4.126**
Family Prestige Value	52.24	11.08	48.86	9.46	2.939**
Health Value	51.63	10.62	48.23	9.69	2.984**

\*\* = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance

\* = Significant at 0.05 Level of Significance

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of secondary school students in relation to their area. The obtained t-values for religious ( $t = 2.768$ ), social ( $t = 2.916$ ), hedonistic ( $t = 3.032$ ), power ( $t = 4.126$ ), family prestige ( $t = 2.939$ ) and health value ( $t = 2.984$ ) have been found significant at 0.01 level of significance at df 318. It shows that there is a highly significant difference in the religious, social, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health value of secondary school students of

rural and urban area. The mean values show that secondary school students of rural area have higher religious, social, power, family prestige and health value as compared to secondary school students of urban area while the students of urban area have more hedonistic value than their rural counterparts.

The t-value for economic value ( $t = 2.293$ ) has been found significant at 0.05 level of significance at df 318. It shows that secondary school students of rural and urban area differ significantly in their economic value. The mean values show that secondary school students of urban area have higher economic value as compared to secondary school students of rural area.

On the other hand, the t-values for democratic ( $t = 0.895$ ), aesthetic ( $t = 0.708$ ) and knowledge value ( $t = 0.310$ ) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the democratic, aesthetic and knowledge value of secondary school students of rural and urban area.

**Table 4: Comparison of the Values of Secondary School Students in relation to Type of School**

Values	Government (N=160)		Non-Government (N=160)		‘t’ Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	47.75	11.01	48.02	11.97	0.197
Social Value	53.68	12.07	53.29	10.91	0.298
Democratic Value	48.53	9.58	50.66	10.21	1.875
Aesthetic Value	49.16	10.42	50.43	11.08	1.063
Economic Value	51.29	9.16	50.15	9.96	1.068
Knowledge Value	48.92	9.07	50.92	10.23	1.855
Hedonistic Value	50.37	9.26	53.47	11.70	2.630**
Power Value	49.89	10.42	52.01	11.70	1.711
Family Prestige Value	53.35	10.34	47.75	9.76	4.974**
Health Value	51.49	10.72	48.37	9.62	2.737**

\*\* = *Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance*

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of secondary school students in relation to type of school. The obtained t-values for hedonistic ( $t = 2.630$ ), family prestige ( $t = 4.974$ ) and health value ( $t = 2.737$ ) have been found significant at 0.01 level of significance at df 318. It shows that there is a highly significant difference in the hedonistic, family prestige and health value of government and non-government secondary school students. The mean values show that non-government secondary school students have higher hedonistic values as compared to their government counterparts while government secondary school students have higher family prestige and health value as compared to non-government secondary school students.

The t-value for religious ( $t = 0.197$ ), social ( $t = 0.298$ ), democratic ( $t = 1.875$ ), aesthetic ( $t = 1.063$ ), economic ( $t = 1.068$ ), knowledge ( $t = 1.855$ ) and power value ( $t = 1.711$ ) have not been found significant

even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge and power values of government and non-government secondary school students.

**Table 5: Comparison of the Values of Secondary School Students of High and Low Socio-Economic Status**

Values	High SES (N=82)		Low SES (N=72)		‘t’ Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	51.01	10.74	44.94	13.07	3.159**
Social Value	57.41	11.72	52.66	12.47	2.435*
Democratic Value	50.38	9.74	47.58	10.08	1.753
Aesthetic Value	50.29	11.06	48.66	10.53	0.928
Economic Value	50.03	10.23	49.93	10.44	0.060
Knowledge Value	51.59	9.48	49.87	10.79	1.054
Hedonistic Value	51.98	10.53	52.01	9.63	0.022
Power Value	52.38	11.78	51.80	10.75	0.322
Family Prestige Value	49.10	10.82	53.20	10.15	1.996*
Health Value	54.07	10.94	46.99	8.67	4.401**

\*\* = *Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance*

\* = *Significant at 0.05 Level of Significance*

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of secondary school students of high and low socio-economic status. The obtained t-values for religious (t = 3.159) and health value (t = 4.401) have been found significant at 0.01 level of significance at df 152. It shows that there is a highly significant difference in the religious and health value of secondary school students of high and low socio-economic status. The mean values show that secondary school students of high socio-economic status have higher religious and health value as compared to secondary school students of low socio-economic status.

The t-value for social (t = 2.435) and family prestige value (t = 1.996) have been found significant at 0.05 level of significance at df 152. It shows that secondary school students of high and low socio-economic status differ significantly in social and family prestige value. The mean values show that secondary school students of high socio-economic status have higher social value while secondary school students of low socio-economic status have higher family prestige value.

On the other hand, the t-values for democratic (t = 1.753), aesthetic (t = 0.928), economic (t = 0.060), knowledge (t = 1.054), hedonistic (t = 0.022) and power value (t = 0.322) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the democratic,

aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic and power value of secondary school students of high and low socio-economic status.

**Table 6: Comparison of the Values of Secondary School Students of High and Average Socio-Economic Status**

Values	High SES (N=82)		Average SES (N=166)		‘t’ Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	51.01	10.74	47.62	10.78	2.330*
Social Value	57.41	11.72	51.90	11.20	3.587**
Democratic Value	50.38	9.74	50.15	9.91	0.175
Aesthetic Value	50.29	11.06	50.05	10.73	0.167
Economic Value	50.03	10.23	51.14	8.82	1.093
Knowledge Value	51.59	9.48	49.12	9.25	1.968*
Hedonistic Value	51.98	10.53	51.86	11.17	0.079
Power Value	52.38	11.78	49.88	10.88	1.660
Family Prestige Value	49.01	10.82	50.56	10.27	1.102
Health Value	54.07	10.94	49.16	10.04	3.511**

\*\* = Significant at 0.01 Level of Significance

\* = Significant at 0.05 Level of Significance

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of secondary school students of high and average socio-economic status. The obtained t-values for social (t = 3.587) and health value (t = 3.511) have been found significant at 0.01 level of significance at df 246. It shows that there is a highly significant difference in the social and health value of secondary school students of high and average socio-economic status. The mean values show that secondary school students of high socio-economic status have higher social and health value as compared to secondary school students of average socio-economic status.

The t-value for religious (t = 2.330) and knowledge value (t = 1.968) have been found significant at 0.05 level of significance at df 246. It shows that secondary school students of high and average socio-economic status differ significantly in religious and knowledge value. The mean values show that secondary school students of high socio-economic status have higher religious and knowledge value as compared to secondary school students of average socio-economic status.

On the other hand, the t-values for democratic (t = 0.175), aesthetic (t = 0.167), economic (t = 1.093), hedonistic (t = 0.079), power (t = 1.660) and family prestige value (t = 1.102) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the democratic, aesthetic, economic, hedonistic, power and family prestige value of secondary school students of high and average socio-economic status.

**Table 7: Comparison of the Values of Secondary School Students of Average and Low Socio-Economic Status**

Values	Average SES (N=166)		Low SES (N=72)		‘t’ Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	47.62	10.78	44.94	13.07	1.646
Social Value	51.90	11.20	52.66	12.47	0.463
Democratic Value	50.15	9.91	47.58	10.08	1.828
Aesthetic Value	50.04	10.73	48.66	10.53	0.914
Economic Value	51.40	8.82	49.93	10.44	1.119
Knowledge Value	49.11	9.25	49.87	10.79	0.549
Hedonistic Value	51.86	11.71	52.01	9.63	0.101
Power Value	49.88	10.88	51.80	10.78	1.253
Family Prestige Value	50.56	10.27	52.28	10.15	1.191
Health Value	49.16	10.04	46.99	8.67	1.589

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of secondary school students of average and low socio-economic status. The obtained t-values for religious (t = 1.646), social (t = 0.463), democratic (t = 1.828), aesthetic (t = 0.914), economic (t = 1.119), knowledge (t = 0.549), hedonistic (t = 0.101), power (t = 1.253), family prestige (t = 1.191) and health value (t = 1.589) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health value of secondary school students of average and low socio-economic status.

**Table 8: Comparison of the Values of High and Low Modernized Students**

Values	High Modernized (N=101)		Low Modernized (N=11)		‘t’ Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	49.65	10.94	46.70	11.86	0.842
Social Value	52.96	14.09	56.32	10.93	0.765
Democratic Value	48.97	8.81	44.83	8.40	1.485
Aesthetic Value	50.27	10.11	51.61	7.03	0.427
Economic Value	51.87	10.32	49.29	3.56	0.819
Knowledge Value	50.77	9.83	52.25	8.03	0.480
Hedonistic Value	54.29	10.15	48.46	8.18	1.996*
Power Value	51.61	11.00	51.07	9.08	0.156
Family Prestige Value	51.19	10.94	55.60	12.17	1.256
Health Value	51.20	10.98	48.91	6.94	0.673

\* = Significant at 0.05 Level of Significance

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of high and low modernized students. The obtained t-value for hedonistic value ( $t = 1.996$ ) has been found significant at 0.01 level of significance at df 110. It shows that high and low modernized students differ significantly in hedonistic value. The mean values suggest that highly modernized students have higher hedonistic values as compared to low modernized students.

On the other hand, t-values for religious ( $t = 0.842$ ), social ( $t = 0.765$ ), democratic ( $t = 1.485$ ), aesthetic ( $t = 0.427$ ), economic ( $t = 0.819$ ), knowledge ( $t = 0.480$ ), power ( $t = 0.156$ ), family prestige ( $t = 1.256$ ) and health value ( $t = 0.673$ ) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, power, family prestige and health value of high and low modernized students.

**Table 9: Comparison of the Values of High and Average Modernized Students**

Values	High Modernized (N=101)		Average Modernized (N=208)		‘t’ Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	49.65	10.94	47.09	11.68	1.840
Social Value	52.96	14.09	53.59	10.63	0.442
Democratic Value	48.97	8.81	50.21	10.46	1.018
Aesthetic Value	50.27	10.11	49.47	11.23	0.606
Economic Value	51.87	10.32	50.24	9.39	1.382
Knowledge Value	50.77	9.83	49.38	9.71	1.176
Hedonistic Value	54.29	10.15	51.49	10.94	1.386
Power Value	51.61	11.00	50.63	11.29	0.724
Family Prestige Value	51.19	10.94	49.98	10.02	0.965
Health Value	51.20	10.98	49.39	10.07	1.450

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of high and average modernized students. The obtained t-value for religious ( $t = 1.840$ ), social ( $t = 0.442$ ), democratic ( $t = 1.018$ ), aesthetic ( $t = 0.606$ ), economic ( $t = 1.382$ ), knowledge ( $t = 1.176$ ), hedonistic ( $t = 1.386$ ), power ( $t = 0.724$ ), family prestige ( $t = 0.965$ ) and health value ( $t = 1.450$ ) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health value of high and average modernized students.

The above table shows the t-values to compare the ten values of average and low modernized students. The obtained t-value for religious ( $t = 0.109$ ), social ( $t = 0.826$ ), democratic ( $t = 1.672$ ), aesthetic ( $t = 0.625$ ), economic ( $t = 0.333$ ), knowledge ( $t = 0.962$ ), hedonistic ( $t = 1.205$ ), power ( $t = 0.128$ ), family prestige ( $t = 1.794$ ) and health value ( $t = 0.148$ ) have not been found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant difference in the religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health value of average and low modernized students.

Table 10: Comparison of the Values of Average and Low Modernized Students

Values	Average Modernized (N=208)		Low Modernized (N=11)		‘t’ Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Religious Value	47.09	11.68	46.70	11.86	0.109
Social Value	53.59	10.63	56.32	10.93	0.826
Democratic Value	50.21	10.46	44.83	8.40	1.672
Aesthetic Value	49.47	11.23	51.61	7.03	0.625
Economic Value	50.24	9.39	49.29	3.56	0.333
Knowledge Value	49.38	9.71	52.25	8.03	0.962
Hedonistic Value	51.49	10.94	48.46	8.18	1.205
Power Value	50.63	11.29	51.07	9.08	0.128
Family Prestige Value	49.98	10.02	55.60	12.17	1.794
Health Value	49.39	10.07	48.91	6.94	0.148

### Conclusions

On the basis of the above interpretation, following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Secondary school students have average level of all the values. They preferred social value highest while religious value was preferred least.
2. Significant difference has been found in the religious, aesthetic, economic, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values of the secondary school boys and girls. Secondary school boys have higher religious, aesthetic, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values while secondary school girls have higher economic value.
3. Secondary school students of rural and urban area have been found to differ significantly in religious, social, economic, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values. Rural students have higher religious, social, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values whereas urban students have higher economic value.
4. There has been found a significant difference in the hedonistic, family prestige and health values of government and non-government secondary school students. Government secondary school students have higher family prestige and health values while non-government secondary school students have higher hedonistic values.
5. Significant difference has been found in the religious, social, family prestige and health values of the secondary school students of high and low socio-economic status. Students of high socio-economic status have higher religious, social and health values while the students of low socio-economic status have higher family prestige value.

6. Secondary school students of high and average socio-economic status have been found to differ significantly in religious, social, knowledge and health values. Students of high socio-economic status have higher religious, social, knowledge and health values.
7. No significant difference has been found in the values of secondary school students of average and low socio-economic status.
8. High and low modernized students have been found to differ in hedonistic value only. Highly modernized students have higher hedonistic value.
9. Significant difference has not been found in the values of high and average modernized students as well as average and low modernized students.

### **Educational implications**

The findings of this study may definitely contribute in the society. As values are the guiding principles of our life, it becomes necessary to pay proper attention towards the inculcation of the values in the children since birth. Parents should be a good model for their children for the practices of the values. In this study, it was observed that students possess average level of all the values. They should be provided such curriculum which contains the teachings of idealistic, humanistic, democratic philosophers. Besides this, essence of all the religions should be provided to the students in the form of moral values so that they may not become religious fantasists. Value education and moral education should be imparted to the students at each level, even at higher level. The school should balance the traditional and modern values so that students can adapt themselves according to the need of the times as well as be connected with their own traditional values. Parents, teachers and counselors should pay their attention to those factors which may create value conflict in the students.

### **References**

- Ahluwalia, S.P. and Kalia, A.K. 2010. Comprehensive Modernization Inventory, *National Psychological Corporation*, Agra
- Bharadwaj, R.L. 2011. Socio-Economic Status Scale, *National Psychological Corporation*, Agra
- Bhatnagar, R.P. 2008. *Readings in Methodology of Research in Education*. R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut
- Creswell, J.W. 2011. *Educational Research: Planning Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. PHI Learning Private Limited, New Delhi
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P. and Schwartz, S. H. 2008. Bringing Values Back In: The Adequacy of the European Social Survey to Measure Values in 20 Countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(3): 420-445
- Dhinakaran, V. and Sivakumar, R. 2014. A Study on Cultural Values, Morality and Professional Ethics of High School Teachers. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, 3(2): 101-105
- Gupta, S.P. 2002. *Modern Measurement and Evaluation*. Sharda Pustak Bhawan, Allahabad
- Indira, K. 2009. Effect of Value Pattern on Achievement in Physics of Secondary School Pupils. *GCTE Journal of Research and Extension in Education*, 4 (2): 41-46
- Kaur, J. and Kaur, H. 2013. Personal Values of College Girls in relation to Type of College and Educational Level of their Mothers. *The Sadbhavana Research Journal of Human Development*, 3(1): 14-29

- Kerlinger, F.N. 1986. *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., First Indian Reprint
- Sharma, R.A. 2002. *Advanced Statistics in Education and Psychology*. R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut
- Sharma, R.A. 2004. *Essentials of Measurement in Education and Psychology*. R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut
- Sherry, G.P. and Verma, R.P. 2012. Personal Value Questionnaire, *National Psychological Corporation*, Agra
- Surinder (2012). An Analytical Study of Moral Values of Senior Secondary School Students of Jhunjhunu District. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 2(9): 1-5