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Abstract

The study was conducted on comparative study of Environmental awareness and values among male and female secondary school teachers trainees of rural and urban areas of Himachal Pradesh. The study was conducted on 100 male and female teachers teaching in govt and private schools of Kangra District. It was observed there is no difference between values of school teachers teaching in govt. and private school on six values areas.

Introduction

Transmission of human values is to be made feasible by the pivotal role played by the teacher in the arena. Teacher is the right person to develop awareness and sensitivity of duties and values amongst the children. An efficient teacher aims at enlightening the minds and values amongst the children. An efficient teacher aims at enlightening the minds and illumining the hearts of individual. Teachers are the strong pillar of nation. It is in the hands of teachers to mould the personality of the students by inculcation of values.

Values are important for bringing desirable changes in an individual. The national policy on education (1986) calls for an emphasis on development of science and technology and the “cultivation of personal and social values”. So that “the educational system produces young men and women of character and ability committed to national services”.

The Education commissions headed by Dr. Radhakrishnan and Dr. Kothari recommended that values such as truth, peace, non-violence, right conduct and love be induced as core values in our Educational System (1948,1966) Sri Prakasa commites(1959) made valuable recommendations for strengthening moral, ethical and spiritual values. The need to cultivate the Value of a human and composite culture for integrated development of the youth through specialized institution or by refashioning the education system has been recognized in the national policy on
education (1986) and program of action (1992)

Howsoever one may land the role of teachers acting as missionaries, torchbearers and architects of nation, the individuals to work as teachers have to be chosen from same society of which they are themselves a part. Their personarities, values and character to an extent also would reflect the traits of that they society, from which they are chosen.

It is essential that certain national values are also imbibed by the young student. They should be acquainted with the history of India’s freedom struggle, culture heritage constitutional obligation and the features comprising our national identity. The teacher is the key person who cans inculcate all the required values in small children inspite of many odds. This task would become easier if the teacher through his personal character and action sets an example before his students.

**Review of Related Literature**

Rani (2000) studied “The approaches of value education and the role of the school in the value-education of India”. Main findings of the study were: values were regarded as standard and pattern of choice which one feels important and developed as positive convection that guides a person and serves as the authority in the name of which choices were made and action were taken for getting satisfaction, fulfillment and meaning. A value is just like other development a state of mind, a mental disposition, an attitude or an emotional state of mind towards some idea or tradition carrying positive and negative changes within itself.

Kumar (2006) conduct a study entitled “A comparative study of Environmental awareness and values among female secondary school teaches trainees of rural and urban areas of “Himachal pradesh” any found that the rural and urban female teaches trainees have almost the same kind of perception as far as religions values, aesthetic value and health value was concerned. Rural female teacher trained on the basis of mean score show more inclination toward values as compared to urban counter parts emitted. There exists positive co-relation between environmental awareness and social value as well as health value.

Sharma (2006) conducted a study entitled “A comparative study of value orientation of Pre-service and in –service secondary school teachers of District Hamirpur of “Himachal Pradesh”. The main findings were that the in-service secondary male teachers do not differ significantly on religious value, social value democratic value, aesthetic value, economic value, knowledge value, domestic value, power Value family prestige value and health value. On the basis of mean scores, in service secondary school male teachers have more belief in health value as compared to pre-service secondary school female teachers. In service secondary school male teachers and pre-service secondary school female teachers do not differ significantly on religious value, social value, economic value, power value and family prestige value.
**Objectives of the study:**
1. To study the value of school teachers on six value areas.
2. To compare the value of school teachers.
3. To compare the value of school teachers teaching in govt. and private schools on six value areas.

**Hypotheses of the study:**
1. There is no significant difference between values of male and female school teachers in respect of.
   a. Theoretical value.
   b. Economic value.
   c. Aesthetic value.
   d. Social value.
   e. Political value.
   f. Religious value.
2. There is no significant difference between value of school teachers teaching in govt. and private school in respect of.
   a. Theoretical value.
   b. Economic value.
   c. Aesthetic value.
   d. Social value.
   e. Political value.
   f. Religious value.

**Sample of the study:** Random sampling Technique was used only 100 male and female teachers teaching in Govt. and private schools of Kangra District were selected for study.

**Tools of the study:** Teacher values inventory (TVI) 1994 by H.L Singh and Dr. S.P Ahluwalia was used to collect data regarding values. Data related to gender and school management style was also collected.

**Analysis Interpretation and Discussion**

**Values of school Teachers:**
The first objective of the study the values of school teachers in respect of six value areas.

**Table 1:** Mean and S.D of The School Teachers On Six Value Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical value</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.9(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economical value</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>10.7(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic value</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>9(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>9.2(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political value</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>9.5(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious value</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>9.1(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Note: Figure In () Shows Value Wise Ranking)*
The mean and the standard deviation of six value areas of scores of teacher were calculated and their relative value wise ranking was also found out as given in table 1. Teachers score first rank in respect of economic of value and this is undesirable trend among the teacher. They score second rank in political value, third rank in social value. The fourth rank is scored by the religious value. The fifth rank is scored by the aesthetic value. Theoretical value comes on the last and scores the sixth rank because the theoretical type is extreme intellectualists, the pure scientist devoted to the study and advancement of knowledge for its on sake. But in modern times teaching profession does not attract intellectuals. The teachers are in this profession out of compulsion and not by choice. So this value is least developed amongst teacher and generally teachers are of average I.Q.

The next objective of the study is to identify and compare the values of male and female school teacher in respect to six values areas.

Among various groups and means and standard deviation of the value scores of the men and women teachers were calculated for all the six values and their proper ranking was also found out as given in table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical Value</strong></td>
<td>88.73</td>
<td>84.86</td>
<td>8.9(4)</td>
<td>7.1(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economical values</strong></td>
<td>87.63</td>
<td>89.35</td>
<td>8.7(6)</td>
<td>10.6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic value</strong></td>
<td>88.19</td>
<td>89.28</td>
<td>8.9(3)</td>
<td>9.2(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social value</strong></td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td>89.27</td>
<td>10.5(2)</td>
<td>7.7(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political value</strong></td>
<td>87.15</td>
<td>87.06</td>
<td>8.8(5)</td>
<td>9.4(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious value</strong></td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>11(1)</td>
<td>8(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note:- figure in () shows value wise ranking)

It may be seen from the table 2 that women teachers get the first rank in respect of economic value because women in the ancient times used to mange household and then required to leave with in the four walls of the house as they were economically dependent on their husband .But now the image of women is radically changing and they have been economically independent. Women give due importance to the money matters and materials gain than male teachers. They give much importance to economic value because in modern times women generally feel that it is the problem to be solved by men, women have to think first about economic sufficiency than other
things. Female teachers score the last rank in respect to theoretical value because it attracts to intellectuals only.

On religious value quite surprisingly the male teacher score first rank. It implies that male teachers are more God fearing. They act more according to the ethical codes and prefer to live simpler life. Male teachers score the sixth rank in respect of economic value. Agreement between male and female school teachers is found in the third rank only i.e. aesthetic value.

In case of women the mean of economic value(89.35) is higher than the mean of economic value for men(87.63). The mean of theoretical value for men(88.73) is higher than the mean of theoretical value for women (84.86). Thus in respect of the aforesaid value, the men are better than the women teacher. The higher mean in men is for social value (89.09). Male are more social in comparison to female teachers. They are deeply interested in the welfare of others. They seem to be more interested in social service and social welfare activities. In the case of men it is desirable because the teachers are expected to serve the society and carry out the social obligation to the full.

Except in the case of theoretical value, the difference between the men and the women teachers is not significant at .05 levels. Therefore, null hypotheses (1 b), (1 c), (1 d), (1 e) and (1 f) are retained and null hypothesis (1 a) is rejected.

The next objective of the study is to find out and compare the value of government and private (self financed) school in respect of six value areas.

**Table 3.** Comparisons between mean and S.D. of Teachers teaching in Govt. and private schools (self financed) on six value areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of values</th>
<th>Govt. Schools</th>
<th>Private Schools</th>
<th>Govt. Schools</th>
<th>Private Schools</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>87.25</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>9.4(3)</td>
<td>6.8(6)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>Insignificant at both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td>9.2(4)</td>
<td>11.1(5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Level(.05 And .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>89.85</td>
<td>89.39</td>
<td>7.2(6)</td>
<td>10.5(2)</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>89.38</td>
<td>9.9(1)</td>
<td>7.8(5)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>87.69</td>
<td>9.5(2)</td>
<td>9(3)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>86.05</td>
<td>86.75</td>
<td>8.2(5)</td>
<td>8.8(4)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note:-Figure in() shows value wise ranking)

It may be seen from table 3 that teachers teaching in government schools get the first rank in social value. The highest mean of teachers teaching in govt. schools is for social value(89.38). It is desirable because teachers teaching in government schools are inclined to various social activities which are for the welfare of human society. Various activities concerned with social welfare are carried out in government schools by the teachers. Various seminars are arranged and social surveys are conducted by them. They take themselves to be social leaders for the betterment of society.
In the teachers teaching in private (self financed) schools, the mean of aesthetic value are the highest one. It means that they are much concerned with the beautification of the campus so they give much importance to the aesthetic value. These schools are private managements are not provided with any sort of grant by government. They scale for admission fee, monthly fee and other charge is larger than government schools. So to increase the strength of schools they give much importance to beautification of campus.

The mean of aesthetic value (89.85) of teachers teaching in government schools is higher than mean of aesthetic value of teachers teaching in private (self financed) schools (89.39). But there is not a far difference between both the means of aesthetic value and we can say that both the teacher teaching in government and private schools prefer to the aesthetic value to same extent.

Thus, the result are found out that difference of mean between teachers teaching in government and private schools is insignificant both at .05 and .01 levels of significance. Therefore, null hypotheses (2a), (2b), (2c), (2d), (2e) and (2f) all are retained.
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