

VALUES OF TEACHER EDUCATORS IN GOVT. AIDED AND SELF-FINANCED COLLEGES:A STUDY

* Dr. Pawan Kumar

ABSTRACT

The present investigation aims to study the values of teacher educators in govt.-aided and self-financed Colleges. The sample for the study consisted of 100 (35 in Govt.-aided and 65 in self-financed) teacher Educators from Ludhiana and Moga District. In the present study Value Test (Ojha,1984) is used to collect data. Mean, Standard Deviation and t-value are employed for analyzing the data.

India is famous for its heritage and rich civilization. A nation that has experienced direct presence of many cultures and civilizations; the Greeks, the Persians and the British. As such, if we attribute value spheres to certain philosophical backgrounds, India has experienced a variety of philosophical schools through its history. The British dominion, with its fundamentally different values from those of earlier visitors, invaders and its modern emphasis on individual and global spheres of values, has set the Indian youth onto a different path. As such, there appears to have been three major themes emphasized by Indian value educators in the 50 years of post-independence era. One is the nostalgic view that continually emphasizes the rich Indian civilization and culture. The second is an emphasis on Gandhi's value. The third theme is the promotion of Indian national unity and secularism. The individual values hold increasing attraction for the Indian youth and India has great studies to be a part of global village.

Values are regarded as a key element in socialization process and are the subject of cultural, religious, political, educational and occupational research. Value is regarded as key element in belief systems and attitude formation and even a determinant of behaviour and key components of studies dealing with attitudes, personality and self-esteem. Values are the doors of perception through which we look at the world and interpret the experience and make it intelligible to ourselves.

A German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) is said to have used the word 'Values' first in 1880. Till then, the word 'value' was used as a singular noun, meaning the measure of something, for example- the value of labour is money or labour. It was also used as a verb, meaning to value something as esteemed. Nietzsche used the word 'Values' in plural to denote moral attitudes and beliefs which were personal and subjective. Value signifies quality and makes a thing, concept or individual important, useful and worth going in for. At empirical level, anything that satisfies wants neither a thing nor an individual, but is a concept, a thought an underlying idea, which may vary or even differ, from place to place and time to time.

Value plays an important role in the life of every human being student, teacher, doctor, engineer and teacher educators. As they adopt the rule and regulation of the society coming through the path of value. There are some other factors also like intelligence, creativity, personality etc. which help the human being in his survival in the society.

Objectives of the Study:

The objectives of the study are as follow:

1. To study the value of male and female teacher educators.
2. To study the value of Govt. aided and Self-financed college teacher educators.
3. To study the value of Govt. aided male teacher educators and self-financed male teacher educators.

* Asstt. Prof., Gobindgarh College of Education, Alour (Khanna)

4. To study the value of Govt. aided female teacher educators and self-financed female teacher educators.

Method

Sample

The population for the purpose of this study has been defined as male and female teacher educators of government-aided colleges and self-Financed Colleges of two districts i.e. Ludhiana and Moga. The number of samples is 100. Simple Random sampling

is used by the researcher for conducting the research.

Measures

In the present study Value Test by (Ojha,1984) is used.

Procedure

Data has been collected according to the variables used in the study viz. values of teacher educators. So after obtaining all the tools, they are administered on the teacher educators of government-aided and self-financed colleges.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TABLE –1 :Mean, SD &'t' value of Male& Female Teacher Educators on value

S.No	Value	Male Teacher Educators		Female Teacher Educators		't' Value	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	44.88	4.87	44.86	3.78	0.022	NS
2	Economic	42.00	4.95	42.36	4.21	0.391	NS
3	Aesthetic	35.94	5.98	36.38	5.32	0.918	NS
4	Social	42.04	3.86	41.86	3.58	0.241	NS
5	Political	41.62	4.44	42.14	3.37	0.659	NS
6	Religious	33.68	5.15	32.9	5.41	0.104	NS

From the above table, it is clear that on comparing the value of male and female teacher educators on different values, the researcher finds that there is no significant difference between male and female

teacher educators on all values. So the hypothesis no.1 has been accepted. It means teacher educators of both the groups are more or less same on the value.

TABLE –2 :Mean, SD & t-value of teacher educators of Govt. aided colleges and self-financed colleges on value

S.No	Value	Govt. aided college teacher educators		Self-financed college teacher educators		't' Value	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	44.88	4.69	44.86	4.05	0.021	NS
2	Economic	42.08	5.53	42.23	4.01	0.141	NS
3	Aesthetic	35.25	5.07	36.64	5.80	1.242	NS
4	Social	42.94	3.17	41.41	3.88	2.125	Sig. at .05 level
5	Political	42.25	3.54	41.67	4.09	0.739	NS
6	Religious	32.80	5.21	33.55	5.14	0.690	NS

From the above table, it is clear that the five value namely theoretical, economic, aesthetic, and political and religious do not differ significantly. The social value shows significant difference. The Mean value 42.94 (3.17) of teacher educator of government-aided colleges was higher than the

mean value 41.41 (3.88) of self-financed colleges teacher educators and the t-value 2.125 was significant at .01 level. It indicates that social value is high in Govt.-aided college teacher educators than that of self-financed college teacher educators. Thus hypothesis no.2 partially accepted.

TABLE – 3: Mean SD &'t' value of male teacher educators of Govt.-aided colleges and self-financed colleges on value

S.No	Value	Govt. aided college male teacher educators		Self- financed college male teacher educators		't' Value	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	45.05	5.28	44.76	4.45	0.202	NS
2	Economic	41.60	5.13	42.26	3.95	0.487	NS
3	Aesthetic	34.15	5.14	37.13	5.68	1.925	NS
4	Social	42.70	3.78	41.60	3.88	0.997	NS
5	Political	42.60	3.86	40.96	4.52	1.374	NS
6	Religious	34.60	5.57	32.26	5.28	1.295	NS

From the above table, it is clear that all six values of male teacher educators of government-aided colleges and self-financed colleges are found to have no significant difference. So the hypothesis no. 3 has

been accepted. It means that male teacher educators of both Government-aided colleges and self-financed colleges are more or less same on the value

Table No. 4: Mean, SD &'t' value of female teacher educators of Govt.-aided and self-financed colleges on value

S.No	Value	Govt.-aided college female teacher educators		Self-finance college female teacher educators		't' Value	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	44.66	4.06	44.94	3.15	0.238	NS
2	Economic	42.73	4.53	42.20	4.06	0.391	NS
3	Aesthetic	36.73	3.60	36.23	5.85	0.368	NS
4	Social	43.26	2.08	41.25	3.89	2.385	Sig. at .05 level
5	Political	41.80	2.90	42.28	3.54	0.503	NS
6	Religious	30.80	4.60	33.88	5.47	1.995	Sig. at .05 level

From the above table, it is clear that all the five values namely theoretical, economic, aesthetic, and political, religious do not differ significantly only the social value show significant difference.

The Mean value 43.26 (2.08) of female teacher educator of government-aided colleges was higher than the mean value 41.25 (3.89), of self-financed colleges and t-value 2.385 was significant at .05 level of significance.

Also the mean score 33.88(5.47) of female teacher educators of self-financed colleges was higher than the mean score 30.80 (4.60) of female teacher educators of government-aided colleges and t-value is 1.99 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance.

It indicates that the female teacher educators of government-aided colleges are more social but are less religious as to the female teacher educators of self-financed colleges.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of collection, analysis and interpretation of data given in Table No.1, it is found out by the researcher that the values of male and female teacher educators do not differ significantly. It shows that the 1st hypothesis made by researcher has been accepted.

On analyzing the Table No.2, the researcher find through his research that five values out of six i.e. theoretical, economic, aesthetic, political and religious do not show any significant difference but the social value of teacher educators of government-aided colleges is found more than that of teacher educators of self-financed colleges.

It is found on the basis of analysis and interpretation of Table No. 3 that there is no significant difference in the values of male teacher educators of government-aided colleges and self-financed colleges and accordingly 3rd hypothesis made by researcher has been accepted.

The findings on the basis of Table No.4 by the researcher is such that four values namely theoretical, economic, aesthetic and political do not show any significant difference but only two values viz. social and religious are significantly different. It is found that social and religious values are more in the

female teacher educators of government-aided colleges than those of self-financed colleges.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The present survey is delimited to teacher educators of government aided college and self-finance college of two districts only. It is suggested that the further study can be extended to various level. The researcher has taken the teacher educators as sample for study; further studies can be done for the teachers of various levels like primary level, secondary level and higher level. Due to various reasons the researcher has categorized this data into four parts as total male and female teacher educators, teacher educators of government aided college and self-finance college, male teacher educators of government aided college and self-finance college and female teacher educator of government aided college and self-finance college. But it can be further categories on the basis of experience, marital status, urban and rural etc. More studies can be done on the subjects on the basis of streams i.e. science, art and commerce. Also there variable can be studied on the subjects belonging to various caste, religion. The studies can be done taking the same variables on the basis of their academic qualifications.

The study of teachers for the moral value can be done after the categorization of hilly and plain area on the basis of language. Also the studies can be preceded on the basis of marital status of teacher educators.

REFERENCES

- Best, J. W. (1986). *Research in education*, New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India.
- Friedrich Nietzsche by Dale Wilkerson, The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ISSN 2161-0002, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/nietzch/>. 14 October 2015.
- Garrett, H. E. (2004). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Paragon International Publishers 5, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi.
- Jangira, N.K. (1985). Value clarifying stratifies.

- Journal of Indian Education*, July NCERT, New Delhi.
- Ojha, R.K. (1984). Study of Values. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Raja, M. C. & Reddy, S.V.B.(1990).Value of Patterns of Teachers. *Experiments in Education*, XVIII (6).
- Shailaja, H.M. and Vijayalakhmi, D. Saboji (2002). Values Among Teacher Educators, With Reference to Sex, Marital status and Teaching Experience. *The Educational Review*, 45 (4), 65-67.
- Sharma, R.A.(2007). *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. Meerut. International publishing house.

