A Study of Value Patterns of Adolescents in Relation to Intelligence and Socio – Economic Status

Satinder Dhillon,

Assistant Professor, L.L.R.M. College of Education, Dhudike ,Moga (Punjab), India

Abstract

The present investigation was undertaken with an aim to study value patterns of adolescents in relation to their level of intelligence and socio-economic status. For this purpose 200 senior secondary school adolescents from Moga district of Punjab state were taken as a sample. The tools used were Value Test by R. K. Ojha (2005), Socio Economic Status Scale by Meenakshi (1985) and Group Intelligence Test, "Standard Progressive Matrices" by Raven (1961). Results showed significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of male and female adolescents. Further results revealed that differences exist in the value patterns of urban and rural adolescents. Urban and rural adolescents differ significantly on economic and political values while for the theoretical, aesthetic, social, and religious values differences are statistically non-significant. No significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their intelligence level was found. As regard to socio economic status, no significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their level of socio economic status was found out.

_____

Value Patterns

Values are supreme essence of civilized society, which distinguish men from animals. The entire super structure of our society is based on it. Men desire and prefer many things like money, power, food, happiness, security, wealth, adventure and peace. These are their values. Thus value refers to those things that human being desire, like or prefer.

Different meanings of value have been given in different disciplines. Literally, value means precious, dear, worthwhile, valuable etc. The biological meaning of value is a thing or activity, which helps in the furtherance of our life. The ethical meaning of value is those things or activities which help in making our soul perfect. The philosophical meaning of value signifies neither a thing nor an individual but a thought or a point of view. As such, everything which is useful to an individual becomes valuable to him.

According to Allport, "Anything that yield satisfaction or provides as a mean for such satisfaction is designated as value".

Broudy (1961) defined values as, "Value is a more general name for worthiness to be chosen and these are situations where we have a problem as to what is right".

According to Murphy, Murphy and Comb, "values has been described as maintenance of self toward the attainment of goal".

The term value in the present study is to mean a pattern of preferences or generalized attitudes with (mostly) real independent existence indicating the desirability of behavior in terms of social, aesthetic and psychological needs.

Intelligence

The term intelligence was framed by Cicero to translate a Greek word used by Aristotle to include all cognitive capacity. The cognitive capacity was called intelligence and it was thought for to be inherited and innate and general in nature. The dictionary meaning of intelligence is that it is the capacity to accumulate knowledge and put it into use.

In general, intelligence is the

1. Ability to adjust.
2. Ability to learn.
3. Ability to carry on abstract thinking.

Socio Economic Status

The term socio-economic status includes many factors in the life of an individual. It may refer to the individuals past and involves study over a period of time concerning the socio-economic conditions of his home including such factor as social, economic or educational which influences the development of the child for the time being or permanently.

Status is a prestige position or rank with in a group. It may be formally imposed by a group that is organizationally imposed through titles or amenities. In social sciences two type of status are described namely-ascribed status and achieved status. When an individual enjoys a particular amount of prestige from his family or the group to which he belongs is stated as ascribed status. If an individual acquires some position during his life time and derives the prestige from that position then he is holding the achieved status, it refers to the social and economic position. A person who has high position in the community and has good income and lives in a well furnished house of a good quality is said to have a good socio-economic status.

So socio economic status is a position that an individual or family holds with reference to prevailing standard of cultural possession, effective income, material possession and participation in group activities of the community. Thus socio-economic status is obviously a blending of two status that is socio status and economic status though none of the two can exist without each other. Social status is the position of individual with in the social relationships where as Economic status refers to the financial conditions and facilities possessed by the parents.

Good (1959) defines socio economic status as level indicative of both social and economic development of an individual or a "Group".

Haws and Haws (1982) states that socio-economic status is the background or working of one or more person in the society on the basis of birth, social class and financial situation.

Review of related literature :

Nakum (1991) investigated the existing value patterns of secondary teacher trainees . The major findings of the study were that all the trainees scored a higher mean score on family, hedonistic and health value, medium in democratic, religious power and social values, but lower in economic, aesthetic and knowledge values. On social and democratic values, female trainees scored significantly higher than male trainees, urban trainees scored significantly higher than rural trainees. The independent effect of socio economic status was found significant on democratic and aesthetic values. Gaur (2000) found that there was significant relationship in aesthetic and political values and insignificant

relationship in theoretical, economic, social and religious values. Manpinder (2003) reported that boys and girls differ significantly on value pattern, and also socio-economic status level had significant impact on value patterns of adolescents. High socio economic status adolescents preffered theoretical, political and religious values where as low socio economic status went for economic, aesthetic and social values. Baljeet (2004) conducted a study entitled, "Effect of emotional quotient on intelligence and achievement of 9th class students" and found that there was significant relationship between emotional quotient and intelligence quotient in relation to academic achievement. Gurubasappa (2009) conducted a study on intelligence and self concept as correlates of academic achievement of secondary school adolescents and the results revealed that the highly intelligent adolescents and adolescents with better self concept achieve high in school i.e. the academic achievement of adolescents is certainly influenced by psychological factors like intelligence and self concept.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
1. To study the value patterns of male and female adolescents.
2. To study the value patterns of urban and rural adolescents.
3. To study the value patterns of adolescents in relation to their intelligence level.
4. To study the value patterns of adolescents in relation to their socio economic status.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY
1. There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of male and female adolescents.
2. There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of urban and rural adolescents.
3. There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their intelligence level.
4. There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their level of socio economic status.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED
Statistical techniques like mean, S.D. and t- ratio were used.

SAMPLE OF THE STUDY
The random sampling technique was employed in the present study to provide an unbiased cross section of the large group. The research investigation was carried out on 200 senior secondary school adolescents of Moga district of Punjab state (India).

TOOLS USED
1. Value Test by R.K Ojha (2005).
2. Group Intelligence Test, "Standard Progressive Matrices" by Raven (1961).
3. Socio Economic Status Scale by Meenakshi (1985).

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
1.There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of male and female adolescents.

Table 1
Mean scores, S.D and 't' value for value patterns of male and female adolescents

Value Patterns	Male N=100		Female N=100		SE$_D$	't' value	Inference
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Theoretical	40.91	4.27	41.51	4.40	0.60	1	Not Significant
Economic	38.39	4.99	38.56	5.54	0.73	0.25	Not Significant
Aesthetic	32.76	8.33	30.61	6.80	1.07	2.01	*Significant
Social	42.26	8.17	45.31	7.37	1.2	2.54	*Significant
Political	43.73	5.51	41.95	4.90	0.73	2.43	*Significant
Religious	42.23	6.74	43.31	5.79	0.88	2.02	*Significant

* Significant at 0.05 level of confidence.

Table 1 shows that the 't' value for theoretical and economic values are 1 and 0.25 respectively which are non-significant at both levels (0.05 and 0.01) of confidence. The 't' value for aesthetic, social, political and religious values are 2.01, 2.54, 2.43 and 2.02 respectively which are significant at 0.05 level of confidence.

Thus it is analyzed that 't' ratio for four values that is aesthetic(32.76), social (42.26), political(43.73) and religious(42.23) for male and female adolescents is significant where as for two values theoretical(41.51) and economic(38.56) values, it is non-significant. Thus male and female adolescents differ significantly on aesthetic, social, political and religious values while for the theoretical and economic values the difference is non- significant. Hence hypothesis stands accepted in case of aesthetic, social, political and religious values while it is unsafe in case of theoretical and economic values.

2. There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of urban and rural adolescents.

Table 2
Mean scores, S.D and 't' value for value patterns of urban and rural adolescents

Value Patterns	Urban N=100		Rural N=100		SE$_D$	't' value	Inference
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Theoretical	40.93	4.38	41.51	4.32	0.60	0.96	Not Significant
Economic	37.66	4.71	39.31	5.69	0.73	2.26	*Significant
Aesthetic	31.42	7.24	32	8.13	1.08	0.53	Not Significant
Social	43.94	6.19	43.61	9.37	1.25	0.26	Not Significant
Political	44.20	4.65	41.55	5.58	0.72	3.69	**Significant
Religious	42.52	6.07	42.95	0.48	0.88	0.48	Not Significant

* Significant at 0.05 level of confidence.
** Significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level of confidence.

Table 2 clearly shows that mean scores for social (43.94) and political (44.20) value is in favor of urban adolescents as compared to rural adolescents [social (43.61) and political (41.55)], which indicates that urban adolescents are more interested in social values and their behaviour is guided by political thoughts and activities. More over

results reported in table reveals that the mean scores for economic value (41.51) is in favor of rural adolescents as compared to urban adolescents [Economic(40.93)].

The 't' ratio for two values that is economic (2.26) and political (3.69), is significant where as for four values (theoretical, aesthetic, social and religious values) it is non significant.

From the above discussion, it is clear that urban and rural adolescents differ significantly on economic and political values. While for the theoretical, aesthetic, social, and religious values differences are statistically non-significant. Thus it is concluded that hypothesis stands accepted in case of economic and political values while it is unsafe in case of theoretical, aesthetic, social, and religious values.

3.There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their intelligence level.

Table 3
Mean scores, S.D and 't' value for of value patterns of high and average intelligent adolescents

Value Patterns	High intelligent group N = 41		Average intelligent group N = 127		SE$_D$	't' value	Inference
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Theoretical value	42.33	4.07	41	4.24	0.54	1.82	Not Significant
Economic value	39.43	5.67	37.64	4.58	0.96	1.86	Not Significant
Aesthetic value	32.16	7.83	30.42	6.63	1.35	1.28	Not Significant
Social value	43.3	10.86	44.46	7.04	1.91	0.60	Not Significant
Political value	40.76	4.80	43.59	5.42	0.88	3.21	*Significant
Religious value	42.4	5.64	43.27	5.94	1.01	0.86	Not Significant

* Significant of 0.05 and 0.01 level of confidence.

Theoretical values

A careful glance at the results in table 3 reveals the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and average intelligence level for theoretical value is 42.33 and 41 resp.'t' value (1.82) shows that adolescents belonging to high and average intelligence level do not differ significantly in their theoretical values.

Economic values

Table 3 shows the mean scores of adolescents having high and average intelligence level for economic are 39.43 and 37.64 respectively. Further 't' value (1.86) is non-significant which shows that adolescents belonging to high and average intelligence level do not differ significantly regarding their economic values.

Aesthetic values

Table 3 shows the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and average intelligence level in aesthetic value is 32.16 and 30.42 respectively. The value of 't' (1.28) shows that adolescents do not differ significantly in their aesthetic values.

Social values

Results entered in table 3 reveals that the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and average intelligence level in social values is 43.3 and 44.46 respectively. Further 't' value (0.60) shows that adolescents belonging to high and average intelligence level do not differ significantly in their social values.

Political values

Table 3 reveals the mean scores of adolescents having high and average intelligence level in political values are 40.76 and 43.59 respectively. t- value of 3.21 shows that adolescents belonging to high and average intelligence level differ significantly.

Religious value

Results set in table 3 reveals that the mean scores of adolescents, having high and average intelligence level in religious values, are 42.4 and 43.27 respectively and 't' value (1.01) shows that adolescents do not differ significantly.

Table 4
Mean scores, S.D and 't' value for value patterns of average and low intelligent adolescents

Value Pattern	Average intelligent group N = 127		Low intelligent group N = 32		SE$_D$	't' value	Inference
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Theoretical value	41	4.24	41.06	4.87	0.93	0.064	Not Significant
Economic value	37.64	4.58	38.62	5.72	1,08	0.90	Not Significant
Aesthetic value	30.42	6.63	33.62	8.34	1.58	2.02	*Significant
Social value	44.46	7.04	43.37	4.89	1.06	1.02	Not Significant
Political value	43.59	5.42	44.18	4.02	0.85	0.69	Not Significant
Religious value	43.27	5.94	40.93	6.69	1.28	1.82	Not Significant

*significant at 0.05 level of confidence.

Theoretical values

Mean scores of adolescents belonging to average and low intelligence level for theoretical value is 41 and 41.06 resp. 't' value (0.064) indicates that theoretical values and intelligence appear to bear no meaningful relationship with each other.

Economic values

Mean scores of adolescents having average and low intelligence level for economic are 37.64 and 38.62 respectively and 't' value (0.90) is not significant which shows that adolescents belonging to average and low intelligence level do not differ significantly.

Aesthetic values

Mean scores of adolescents belonging to average and low intelligence level in aesthetic value is 30.42 and 33.62 respectively. The value of 't' value 2.02 shows that adolescents differ significantly in their aesthetic value.

Social values

The mean scores of adolescents belonging to average and low intelligence level in social values is 44.46 and 43.37 respectively and 't' value (1.02) shows that adolescents do not differ significantly in their social value.

Political values

The mean scores of adolescents having average and low intelligence level are 43.59 and 44.18 . The value of 't'(0.69) shows that adolescents do not differ significantly in their political values.

Religious value

Mean scores of adolescents, having average and low intelligence level in religious values, are 43.27 and 40.93 respectively. Further 't' value (1.82) shows that adolescents belonging to average and low intelligence level do not differ significantly.

Table 5

Mean scores, S.D and 't' value of value patterns of high and low intelligent adolescents

Value Pattern	High intelligent group N = 41		Low intelligent group N = 32		SE$_D$	't' value	Inference
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Theoretical value	42.33	4.07	41.06	4.87	1.06	1.19	Not Significant
Economic value	39.43	5.67	38.62	5.72	1.34	0.60	Not Significant
Aesthetic value	32.16	7.83	33.62	8.34	1.91	0.76	Not Significant
Social value	43.3	10.86	43.37	4.89	1.9	0.03	Not Significant
Political value	40.76	4.80	44.18	4.02	1.02	3.35	*Significant
Religious value	42.4	5.64	40.93	6.69	1.46	1.02	Not Significant

* Significant at both levels (0.05 and 0.01) of confidence.

Theoretical values

Result in table 5 reveals that the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and low intelligence level for theoretical value are 42.33 and 41.06 respectively which is in favour of high intelligent group. Further 't' value (1.19) shows that adolescents do not differ significantly in their theoretical values.

Economic values

Table 5 shows that the mean scores of adolescents having high and low intelligence level for economic value are 39.43 and 38.62 respectively. Further 't' value

(0.60) is not significant which shows that adolescents belonging to high and low intelligence level do not differ significantly regarding their economic values.

Aesthetic values

Table 5 shows that mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and low intelligence level in aesthetic value is 32.16 and 33.62 respectively. The value of 't' (0.76) shows that adolescents belonging to high and low intelligence level do not differ significantly in their aesthetic value.

Social values

Results entered in table 5 reveals the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and low intelligence level for social values is 43.3 and 43.37 respectively. Further 't' value (0.03) indicates that social values and intelligence appear to bear no meaningful relationship with each other.

Political values

Table 5 reveals the mean scores of adolescents having high and low intelligence level in political values are 40.76 and 44.18 respectively. 't' value (3.35) shows that adolescents belonging to high and low intelligence level differ significantly in their political value.

Religious value

Results in table 5 reveals the mean scores of adolescents having high and low intelligence level in religious values are 42.4 and 40.93 respectively. Further 't' value (1.02) shows that adolescents belonging to high and low intelligence level do not differ significantly.

Thus from table 3, 4 and 5 we have jointly concluded that there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns (theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social and religious values) of adolescents with respect to high and average intelligence level.

Thus the hypothesis that there is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their intelligence level stands rejected save in case of political value (high and average intelligent group, and high and low intelligent group) and aesthetic value (average and low intelligent group).

4.There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their level of socio economic status.

Table 6

Mean scores, S.D and 't' value of value patterns of adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status

Value Pattern	High Socio Economic Status level N = 47		Low Socio Economic Status level N = 36		SE$_D$	't' value	Inference
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Theoretical value	42.92	4.56	40.93	5.02	1.06	0.009	Not Significant
Economic value	38.76	5.76	38.86	5.84	1.64	0.06	Not Significant
Aesthetic	33.56	8.74	34.53	7.78	1.81	0.53	Not

						Significant
value						
Social value	41.56	9.88	43.2	5.01	1.66	0.98	Not Significant
Political value	43.28	6.18	44	4.08	1.12	0.64	Not Significant
Religious value	42.08	7.48	40.4	6.56	1.54	1.09	Not Significant

Theoretical value

A careful glance at the results in table 6 reveals that the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status for theoretical value is 42.92 and 40.93 respectively which is in favour of high socio economic status level. Further 't' value (0.009) shows that adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status level do not differ significantly in their theoretical values.

Economic value

Table 6 shows that the mean scores of adolescents having high and low socio economic status for economic values are 38.76 and 38.86 respectively. Further 't' value (0.06) indicates that economic values and socio economic status appear to bear no meaningful relationship with each other.

Aesthetic value

Table shows that the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status for aesthetic value is 33.56 and 34.53 respectively. The value of 't' value (0.53) shows that adolescents do not differ significantly in their aesthetic value.

Social value

A careful glance of the result entered in table 6 reveals that the mean scores of adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status for social values are 41.56 and 43.2 respectively. Further 't' value (0.98) which shows that adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status level do not differ significantly regarding their social values.

Political value

Table 6 reveals that the mean scores of adolescents having high and low socio economic status for political values are 43.28 and 44 respectively and 't' value of 0.64 shows that adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status level do not differ significantly in their political value.

Religious value

A close glance at the results set in table 6 reveals that the mean scores of adolescents having high and low socio economic status in religious values are 42.08 and 40.4 respectively. Further 't' value (1.09) shows that adolescents belonging to high and low socio economic status level do not differ significantly.

Thus it is clear from table 6 that adolescents belonging to above and below socio economic status level do not differ significantly with respect to six values that are theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social ,political and religious values.

Thus the hypothesis stating 'There is significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their socio economic status' stands rejected

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of male and female adolescents was found. Both male and female adolescents prefer theoretical, social, political and religious values while aesthetic value is least preferred by both the sexes.

2. Results revealed that differences exist in the value patterns of urban and rural adolescents. Urban and rural adolescents differ significantly on economic and political values. While for the theoretical, aesthetic, social, and religious values differences are statistically non-significant. Thus the hypothesis stands accepted in case of economic and political values while it is unsafe in case of theoretical, aesthetic, social, and religious values.

3. No significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their intelligence level was found. Results revealed that high and low intelligent adolescents do not differ significantly for theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social and religious values whereas they differ significantly for political value. It is concluded that the intelligent adolescents prefer theoretical, social and religious values whereas low intelligent adolescents prefer social and political values the most.

4. No significant difference in the mean scores of value patterns of adolescents in relation to their level of socio economic status is found out. Results reveal that adolescents do not differ significantly for all the six values (theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious values) in relation to their level of socio economic status. Thus it is concluded that socio economic status does not bear any relationship with value patterns of adolescents.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The results of the present study indicates that there is variation in the value patterns of adolescents. Further it is found that they also differ in their value patterns on the basis of their intelligence but this difference is statistically not much significant. So keeping in view the findings of the present study, it has been pointed out that the present investigation will be of immense help and will equip the teachers, guidance workers, school counselors and parents with the knowledge of relationship of these three important variables to select proper strategies and techniques for proper orientation and inculcation of values among the adolescents.

Moreover its results will be useful for the teachers in structuring right type of curriculum and framing proper policies for the inculcation of right values among the adolescents and to evaluate the achievements of the students on the basis of these variables. Knowing that adolescents have different preferred value patterns will help in developing appropriate learning approaches and explore opportunities so that they will be able to make the educational experience more productive. So the present investigation will be able to pine deep into the factors responsible for developing values among the adolescents and providing them suitable opportunities to develop them.

References

Allport, G. B. (1931). P. F test of personal value. *Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 14.

Broudy, H. S. (1961). *Values in the education enterprise in building a philosophy of education*. New Delhi : Prentice Hall of India.

Gaur, R. S (2000). *A study of values and perceptions of high school students of the state of Rajasthan and their relation to learning* (Ph. D Thesis). Rajasthan University: Rajasthan.

Good, C. V. (1959). *Dictionary of Education*. New York: Mc Graw Hill Book Company.

Gurubasappa, H.D (2009) . *Intelligence and self concept as correlates of academic achievement of secondary school adolescents* (M.Ed dissertation).KurukshetraUniversity: Kurukshetra

Haws, G. R. & Haws, H. S. (1982). *The concise dictionary of education.* New York : Van Nortrend Reinhbld Company.

Kaur, M. (2003). *The impact of socio economic status and cultural background in the value pattern of adolescents* (M.Ed dissertation*).* Guru Nanak Dev University: Amritsar.

Kaur, B. (2004). *Effect of emotional quotient on intelligence and achievement of 9th Class students* (M.Ed Dissertation*)* .Panjab University : Chandigarh.

Murphy, G ; Murphy, L. B. & Comb, N. (1937). *Experimental sociology.* New York : Heper and Brother.

Nakum, G. G. (1991). *Value pattern of students teachers in relation to their intelligence and emotional maturity* (M.Ed dissertation). Guru Nanak Dev University: Amritsar.

Ojha, R. K. (2005). *Manual of Value Test.* Agra : National Psychological Corporation.