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Abstract

The purpose of present research work is to compare value and adjustment problems of high achievers and low achievers. The attitudes toward values such as theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious and adjustments like social adjustment, health and emotional adjustment, school adjustment, home adjustment using the School Attitude Assessment Survey and determine whether high achievers really differed from low achievers on these factors, and to ascertain which factors were the best predictors of student’s status as either a high achiever or a low achiever. There is much diversity in behaviour which is due to the difference in values.
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Introduction

The purpose of present research work is to compare value and adjustment problems of high achievers and low achievers. The attitudes toward values such as theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious and adjustments like social adjustment, health and emotional adjustment, school adjustment, home adjustment using the School Attitude Assessment Survey and determine whether high achievers really differed from low achievers on these factors, and to ascertain which factors were the best predictors of student’s status as either a high achiever or a low achiever. It can be assumed without any reservation that the value do reflect themselves through all our activities and whatever is chosen or preferred by us is well in accordance with our choices, likes and dislikes etc. The philosophy of life includes our aims, ideals and manner of thinking the principles by which we guide our behaviour and conduct our affairs. The values of different individuals are not the same. There is much diversity in behaviour which is due to the difference in values. Values which are so important for an individual need to be investigated scientifically.
To make the secondary and higher secondary education more effective it is necessary to investigate in to the value-system of students which constitutes the new generation. The present study may be worthwhile because it will throw light on these aspects of secondary education. The result of this study may help the guidance workers and counselors for guiding and helping the high and low achieving students. The administrators may also be helped by the knowledge of value system and adjustment problem of high and low achievers arriving at more firm, solid and sound decisions in dealing with many day to day problems.

**OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:**
Keeping in view the scope and broad objective of the study, the specific objectives of the study are as under:
1) To determine the nature of the values of High and Low achievers.
2) The compare the values of High and Low achievers.
3) To ascertain the pattern of the Adjustment of High and Low achievers.
4) To compare the Adjustment of High and Low achievers.

**HYPOTHESES:**
In this study the null Hypotheses have been tested both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.
1. High achievers and low achievers do not differ significantly in respect of values.
2. There is no significant difference in the adjustment of high achievers and low achievers.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**
Descriptive survey method provides the opportunities in describing, studying and interpreting what exists today and in concerned with conditions, relationship, practices, beliefs, attitudes that prevails, the processes and trends that are developing.

In this study the sample was selected 100 students from two senior secondary schools in North Delhi by using random sampling technique. The two respective schools got the scores of final examination of XIth class student held by the CBSE, New Delhi. The student securing more than sixty percent marks were labeled as “high achievers” and the students who secured less than forty percent marks were labeled as “low achievers.” The co-efficient of reliability was determined by split half method and Kuder-Richardson formula. The raw scores on the ‘study of values’ and ‘adjustment inventory’ were tabulated separately into frequency distributions. Descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviation and ‘t’ ratios were applied on the scores of values and adjustment. **Mittals Adjustment** inventory is intended to provide separate measures of adjustment in four areas such as Home Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Health & Emotional Adjustment and School adjustment. The respondents are required to score their responses in three categories ‘Yes’ ‘?’ or ‘No’. The inventory is none timed. A study of values by All port-Vernon (Hindi adaptation
by R.P. Ozha) were administered to high achievers and low achievers

**TABLE-1.1 Mean, S. D. Ranks and ‘t’ scores of high achievers and low achievers on values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>High Achievers (N=50)</th>
<th>Low Achievers (N=50)</th>
<th>High achievers Vs. Low achievers 't'</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>33.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>38.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>39.82</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>41.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>42.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>47.52</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>39.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>45.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .01 level

Table 1.1 depicts the means, S. D ranks and ‘t’ scores of high achievers and low achievers on six values. The mean score of high achievers on theoretical value (M = 39.43 ± 4.5) is higher than the mean score of low achievers (M = 33.19 ± 72) ‘t’ score being 9.31, which is statistically significant at .01 level of confidence. The study shows that high achievers are more theoretical as compared to low achievers. On social value the mean scores of high achievers (M = 43.14 ± 6.58) is higher than the mean score of low achievers (M = 38.86 ± 6.09), which is significant beyond .01 level. No significant difference was observed on religious value at any level. On economic value the mean score of low achievers (M = 42.08 ± 7.11) is higher than the mean score of high achievers (M = 47.52 ± 6.91) on political value is more than the mean score of low achievers (M = 39.88 ± 6.05) which is significant at .01 level. On aesthetic value the mean score of low achievers (M = 45.16 ± 7.05) is greater than the mean score of high statistically significant at .01 level of confidence. The table 1.1 shows that high achievers and low achievers differ from one another on one or more values. The difference between high achievers and low achievers was found significant on theoretical (.01 level), economic (.01 level), aesthetic (.01 level), social (.01 level), aesthetic (.01 level), social (.01 level) and political (.01 level) respectively.

**TABLE-1.2 Mean, S. D. Ranks and ‘t’ scores of high achievers and low achievers on Adjustment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>High Achievers (N=50)</th>
<th>Low Achievers (N=50)</th>
<th>'t'</th>
<th>High achievers Vs. Low achievers Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Soc. Adj.</td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heal. &amp;Emo. Adj.</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>36.78</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sch. Adj.</td>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>38.06</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Home Adj.</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .01 level** Significant at .05 level
Table 1.2 shows the means, S.D. Ranks and ‘t’ scores of high achievers and low achievers on four areas of adjustment. The mean score of high achievers on social adjustment (M = 40.55 ± 3.02) is higher than the mean score of low achievers (M = 40.49 ± 3.09) ‘t’ score being 0.12 which is not significant at any level. On health & emotional adjustment the mean score of high achievers (M = 37.98 ± 3.56) is higher than the mean score of low achievers (M = 36.78 ± 4.06) which is significant beyond 0.05 level. On school adjustment the mean score of high achievers (M = 40.62 ± 4.03) is higher than the mean score of low achievers (M = 38.06 ± 4.05), the ‘t’ ratio is 4.57 which is statistically significant at 0.01 level. On home adjustment no significant difference was observed between high achievers and low achievers. The study shows that low achievers have more adjustment problems on the area of health & emotional and school adjustment. It might be due to their factor that low achievers score low in academic subjects. Lack of health & emotional and school adjustment may probably be responsible for their low achievement.

CONCLUSIONS
On the basis of above analysis the following conclusions have been observed.
1. High achievers are more theoretical and social in comparison to low achievers. They have dominant interest in knowledge, learning and believe more in kindness, charity and love.
2. High achievers and low achievers are similar as far as religious value is concerned.
3. Low achievers are more economic in comparison to high achievers. They believe more in materialistic life than high achievers.
4. High achievers are more political in their approach in comparison to low achievers.
5. Low achievers are superior on aesthetic value in comparison to high achievers.
6. High achievers and low achievers are similar as far as social and home adjustment is concerned.
7. High achievers are superior on school adjustment in comparison to low achievers, whereas, low achievers have more adjustment problems on school adjustment scale.
8. Low achievers have more adjustment problems on health and emotional area in comparison to high achievers. High achievers were found adjusted on health and emotional area than low achievers.

SUGGESTIONS
The following suggestions may be offered in view of the conclusions drawn in the present investigation.
1. Special classes need to be arranged for low achievers.
2. The Government should open study homes providing reading facilities for low achievers to develop multifarious interests.
3. Proper arrangement for guidance and counseling be made for low achievers and their specific needs should be attended to.
4. Proper guidance and library facilities are the dire need of the hour for the low achievers.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY**

The present study was conducted on certain limitations such as small sample, urban sample only. The study, therefore, cannot claim to have comprehensiveness. Its conclusions may not be universally valid. The results could have been more dependable and better from large sample and rural areas have been included for comparison. In the absence of availability of standardized achievement it is suggested that adequate achievement tests may be applied to identify high achievers and low achievers.

**References**


