



A study of values and scholastic achievement of science and social science college students of district Budgam

Dr. Shabir Ahmad Bhat

Assistant Professor, School of Education & Behavioural Sciences, University of Kashmir, Jammu Kashmir, India

Abstract

The present study conducts the values and scholastic achievement of science and social science college students in District Budgam (J&K). The sample of the present study was 60 college students in which 30 science students and 30 social science students. For collection of data, value orientation scale by N.Y. Reddy and Religious Attitude Scale for College Students by R. Krishnaraj and P.S. Balasubramanian was administered to the sample subjects. The study found that there is a significant difference between science and social science students on Theoretical; Economics, Social and Values Orientation dimensions of values and also significant was found on their scholastic achievement.

Keywords: values, scholastic achievement, science and social science, college students

Introduction

Education with this aim in view is essential in order to be a better man, to have a richer life and to have a more integrated personality. Education is the manifestation of divine perfection already existing in man. It is the realization of the self. We must never ignore what one could call the self-discovering and the self-fulfilling aspect of education. This would relate to the enrichment of personality. Thus education has a great cultural value, which cannot be overestimated in terms of anything. It may be regarded as the panacea on way to a social, economic and moral change. Then only it would achieve its purpose fully.

Values and vision involve doing the right thing for the right reason. One may have sight but one must have vision. The 'learning teachers' are better placed than the learned ones. The indifferent teachers fail to go upstream—a dead fish only swims down. He who walks in another's tracks leaves no footprints. Education is the apprenticeship in life.

A teacher affects eternity. His work never stops. "A great oak is only a little nut that held its ground". A teacher is not only a facilitator but a guide, a philosopher and a mentor. The students look up to him. Let us give them what they deserve, the very best of us. Let us live up to their expectations. There has to be an all-round effort to combine academic excellence with the inner enfoldment of the student's personality. It is imperative to work for the total fulfillment of a vision of perfect and ideal education. Children are our future. If we sit down and analyse how the future could be remolded and recast, it is certainly through the children of today, the leaders of tomorrow, to face, lead and guide the world of future.

It is to be born in mind that this education needs to be practical and realistically achievable, in consonance with the academic framework of the school. A judicious combination of academics, culture and value education (transformation) will be an ideal approach. This would indeed give the child's personality an added dimension, both in his inner values of life and also in outer objective success, making him proficient to meet the challenges of life, and the values inculcated would mould him to become a better person in the society. Later within this two-fold impress, he reaches and revels in his

vision to evolve into a person of standing, lasting character and achievement. The parents and the teachers have to work in close contact and coordination, the school has to be an extension of the home

The word "value" was first used by the German Philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche in 1880. He used the word, "value" in plural to denote moral beliefs and attitudes that were personal and subjective because he believed in what, "Darwin's origin of species" taught him about the survival of the fittest." Edward Spranger (1982) a German Sociologist, tried to develop an outline of values for the classification of people in relation to their personality and value orientation. In India Mukerjee (1964) also explained the orientation of values among individuals on the basis of their cultural and social orientation. He remarks that, human value is enduring long term goals that have emerged in man's evolution, directing and regulating his behaviour adaptation. Endowed with a limited number of varieties of inborn behaviour patterns, he can however use his large sensitive and complex brain with its capacity for conceptualization, abstraction and symbolization for denying and stabilizing, transmitting a vast range and order of values and goals.

Values shape the personality of an individual. They enhance inner side of his potential. They help him to live harmoniously and graciously with his fellowmen. They act as the conscience of the community which when kindled with torch of learning would make him realize the responsibilities he owes to the society. Values are judgments regarding what is valuable or important in life, and they vary greatly from one culture to another. People who are operating at a survival level will value food, shelter and clothing. Those with high security needs, on the other hand, may value job security, status, money etc. From its value system, a culture sets norms, i.e. acceptable standards of behaviour.

One of the most important outcomes of any educational set up is achievement of the students. Depending on the level of achievement individuals are characterized as high achievers, average and low achievers. Taylor (1964) states that the value the student places upon his own worth effects his scholastic achievement. Achievement in an educational institution may

be taken to mean any desirable learning that is observed in the student. Scholastic achievement of pupils refers to the knowledge attained and skills developed in the school subjects. According to Mehta, 1969, the scholastic achievement includes both curricular and co-curricular performance of the pupil's. It indicates the learning outcome of the pupils. In classrooms, pupils perform their potentials efficiently, as a result of it, learning takes place. The learning outcome changes the behavior pattern of pupils through different subjects. The pupils may be at different levels of achievement in different areas and subjects. Therefore, achievement is the learning outcome of pupil in classrooms. The effectiveness of any educational system is gauged to the extent the students involved in the system achieve, whether it is in cognitive, co native or psychomotor domain. In general terms, achievement refers to the scholastic or scholastic achievement of the student at the end of an educational programmer. To maximize the achievement within a given set up, is therefore, the goal of every educationist.

Objectives

The following objectives were formulated for the present study

1. To study the values of Science and Social Science College Students.
2. To study the Scholastic achievement of Science and Social Science College Students of District Budgam.
3. To compare Science and Social Science College Students on values.
4. To compare Male and Female College Students on Scholastic achievement.

Hypotheses

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. There is no significant difference between science and social science college students on values.
2. There is no significant difference between science and social science college students on scholastic achievement.

Definition of terms and variables

1. Value's

For the purpose of present study values refer to the scores obtained by subjects on N. Y. Reddy's Indian adaptation value scale. It has six types of values such as theoretical values, economic values, social values, aesthetic values, political values and religious values.

2. Scholastic achievement

Scholastic achievement of science and social science college students refers to knowledge attained and skills developed in

the school subjects. So, scholastic achievement means the achievement of students in academic subjects. For this purpose, the aggregate marks obtained by the subjects in previous two examinations.

3. College students

College students for the present study refer to the students who are on rolls in various faculties of the colleges.

Sample

The sample for the present study consists of 60 college students, (30 science students and 30 social science students). The sample was drawn from the various colleges of District Budgam and the sample subjects were drawn on randomly basis. N.Y. Reddy Indian Adaptation Value scale was administered to assess the values from the sample subjects.

The breakup of the sample is as follows

Table 1

District	Science Students	Social Science Students	Total
Srinagar	30	30	60

Description of tool

For the collection of the relevant data, the investigator used the following tool from the selected subjects.

1. N.Y. Reddy Indian Adaptation Value scale was administered to assess the values from the sample subjects.
2. Scholastic achievement of the students was collected by giving them self-constructed information blank in which they had to give the aggregate marks of previous two classes for their respected colleges.

Analysis and interpretation of the data

Table 2: Showing mean difference between Science and Social Science Students on dimension of "Theoretical" of value orientation scale

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
Science Students	43.25	5.73	2.83	Significant 0.01 level
Social Science Students	41.66	6.90		

The perusal of the above table reveals that there is significant difference between science and social science students on dimension of Theoretical of value orientation scale. The significance level is 0.01 level between these two groups. However, the mean difference favours the science students which reveals that science students have high theoretical as compared to their counterparts.

Table 3: Showing mean difference between Science and Social Science Students on dimension of "Economic" of value orientation scale

d	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
Science Students	44.54	7.09	2.06	Significant at 0.05 level
Social Science Students	43.26	6.87		

The perusal of the above table reveals that there is significant difference between science and social science students on dimension of Economic of value orientation scale. The significance level is 0.05 level between these two groups.

However, the mean difference favours the science students which reveals that science students have good economics as compared to their counterparts.

Table 4: Showing mean difference between Science and Social Science Students on dimension of “Aesthetic” of value orientation scale

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
Science Students	43.92	6.93	0.98	Insignificant
Social Science Students	43.35	5.89		

The perusal of the above table reveals that there is no significant difference between science and social science students on dimension of Aesthetic of value orientation scale. The table reveals that both the groups are similar on Aesthetic values.

Table 5: Showing mean difference between Science and Social Science Students on dimension of “Social” of value orientation scale

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
Science Students	41.66	6.90	2.83	Significant 0.01 level
Social Science Students	43.25	5.73		

The perusal of the above table reveals that there is significant difference between science and social science students on dimension of Social of value orientation scale. The significance level is 0.01 level between these two groups. However, the mean difference favours the science students which reveals that science students have socially well as compared to their counterparts.

Table 6: Showing significance of mean difference between Science and Social Science Students on dimension of “Political” of value orientation scale

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
Science Students	38.67	6.30	0.27	Insignificant
Social Science Students	38.82	5.85		

The perusal of the above table reveals that there is no significant difference between science and social science students on dimension of Political of value orientation scale. The table reveals that both the groups are similar on Political values.

Table 7: Showing significance of mean difference between Science and Social Science Students on dimension of “Religious” of value orientation scale

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
Science Students	42.75	7.33	0.41	Insignificant
Social Science Students	42.51	5.56		

The perusal of the above table reveals that there is no significant difference between science and social science students on dimension of Religious of value orientation scale. The table reveals that both the groups are similar on Religious values.

Thus from the confirmation of the results from the above table the hypotheses No. 1 (Chapter 1) which reads as, “There is no significant difference between science and social science college students on values.” Partially rejected.

Table 8: Showing mean difference between Science and Social Science Students on Scholastic achievement

Group	Mean	SD	t-value	Level of Significance
Science Students	248.65	19.99	4.11	Significant 0.01 level
Social Science Students	239.55	13.75		

The perusal of the above table reveals that there is significant difference between science and social science students on scholastic achievement. The significance level is 0.01 level between these two groups. However, the mean difference favours the science students which reveals that science students have better scholastic achievement as compared to their counterparts.

Thus from the confirmation of the results from the above table the hypotheses No. 2 (Chapter 1) which reads as, “There is no significant difference between science and social science college students on scholastic achievement.” stands rejected.

Conclusion

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of data, the following conclusions have been drawn:

1. There is a significant difference between science and social science students on Theoretical dimension of value orientation.
2. There is a significant difference between science and social science students on Economics dimension of value orientation.
3. There is no significant difference between science and social science students on Aesthetic dimension of value orientation.
4. There is a significant difference between science and social science students on Social dimension of value orientation.
5. There is no significant difference between science and social science students on Political dimension of value orientation.
6. There is no significant difference between science and social science students on Religious dimension of value orientation.
7. There is a significant difference between science and social science college students on Values Orientation.
8. There is a significant difference between science and social science college students on Scholastic achievement.

References

1. Adelson. Handbook of adolescent psychology: Wiley and sons; Inc USA, 1979.
2. Ali Sayeed Firoj. A study of religiosity and values, Journal of Psychological Research. 1995; 39:3. Delhi: NCERT.
3. Allport GW. Pattern and growth in personality: New York; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
4. Allport GW. Manual of study of values: Boston Houghton; Mifflin, 1966.
5. American Academy of Pediatrics. Periodic survey of Fellows: caring for your baby and young child; birth to age 5. Bantan, 2004.

6. Buch MB. Fourth survey of research in education NCERT New Delhi, 1983-88.
7. Bulus, Ibrahim. Value Orientation of Nigerians: Implications for quality assurance in public examinations, Negerian Academy of Education Citation: JONAED. 2008; 4(1):15-31.
8. Chand Jagdish. Value education: Journal of Value education, vol.3 no. 1 New Delhi NCERT, 2003.
9. Chitakra MG. Education and human values, A.P.H. Publishing corporation 5- Ansari road New Delhi, 2003, 59.
10. Dash BN. Encyclopaedia of Education; Dominant Publishers New Delhi Value inculcation among college Students, The Educational Review. 2007; 46:2. New Delhi; NCERT.
11. Dharmendra. A study of value pattern among college youth of Rohilkhand region; with special reference to Sense of responsibility, Indian Educational Abstracts; New Delhi: NCERT, 1995.
12. Ganie MY. Value orientation and adjustment problems of rural and urban postgraduate students of the university of Kashmir, unpublished M.Phil dissertation University of Kashmir Sgr, 1987.
13. Garrett HE, Woodworth RS. Statistics in Psychology and Education: vakil, Feffer, and Simons Ltd.
14. Garrison George. Personality: New York Mc. Graw Hill, 1968.
15. Ghosh BN. A textbook of value education: Dominant Publishers and distributors New Delhi, A textbook of value education: Dominant Publishers and distributors New Delhi.
16. Goel Swami Pyari. Feeling of security, family attachment and Value of adolescent girls in relation to their educational achievement, Indian Journal of Psychometry and Education: New Delhi; NCERT, 2003, 33.
17. Grinder RE. Studies in adolescence: Mc. Millan Company Collier and Ltd London, 1969.
18. Guilford. Personality: New York, Mc Graw Hill book, 1959.
19. Gupta Ranjana. A study of the values and moral Judgment of Adolescents of two Representative centers of Western and Eastern Uttar Pradesh, *Sapra Publications*, Uttar Pradesh, 1989.
20. Kundu CL. Personality Development: A critique of Indian Studies Haryana Vishal Publications, University Campus Kurukshetra, 1977.
21. Madhu Greval. Relationship between study habits and academic achievement of undergraduate home sciece final year students. Indian Educational Review. 1990; 25(3):71-74.
22. Maheshwari NA. Value orientation in teacher education, Resource paper N.C.T.E, 2001.
23. Manju Mehta. Adolescent psychology: Pointer Publishers Jaipur India, 2000
24. Venkataiah N, Sandhya N. Research in value education: APH publishers Publishing Corporation New Delhi: Corporation Ansari Road Darya Gunj, 1998.
25. Narayan V, Reddy K. Man, education and value: B.K. Publishing Corporation New Delhi, 1979.
26. Padmanaban. A study of the values of high school Pupils in Relation to certain selected Variables, Fifth Survey of Educational Research, 1992, 1.
27. Passi. Value education: National Psychological Cooperation; New Delhi, 1991.
28. Rauf Abdur. Textbook of Educational Psychology: New Delhi Light and life Publications, 1976.
29. Reddy NY. Values and attitudes of Indian youth: New Deli Light and Life Publishers, 1980.
30. Royce Sadler D. Grade integrity and the representation of scholastic achievement. Studies in Higher Education. 2009; 34(7):807-826.
31. Ruhela SP. Human values and education: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd New Delhi; NCERT, 1986.
32. Wolman Benjamin B. Handbook of general psychology Englewood Cliffs New Jersey; USA, 1973.