



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2015; 1(11): 974-980
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 27-08-2015
Accepted: 30-09-2015

Dr. Udaivir Sharma
A/18, Staff Awas, Gurugovind
Singh Sports College, Kursi
Road, Lucknow-226026

A study of values among secondary school teachers

Udaivir Sharma

Abstract

Values play vital role in human life and teachers are the role model for school children. The purpose of this paper is to compare about the different values among Government and non-government secondary school teachers in Lucknow. The schools and teachers were selected by using random sampling method. 140 teachers were selected, i.e, 70 from government schools and 70 from non-government schools. The tool used in this study was *Personal Value Questionnaire (PVQ)* developed by *Dr. (Mrs.) G.P. Sherry* and *Dr. R.P. Verma*. No significant difference was found in most of the values in government and non-government school teachers. The significant difference was found in Democratic, Hedonistic value in both genders of teachers. Aesthetic and Economic value in female teachers was found significant. This study is important in value inculcation among secondary school teacher which is life long process and influence the society also.

Keywords: Vales, Secondary school Teachers

Introduction

Values are the integral part of human life as every human action is the reflection of an individual values. Every individual is conditioned and guided by some values or the other respective of his religion, nationality, culture or civilization. Values are regarded desirable, important and held in high by a society in which a person lives. Values reflect one's personal attitude and judgment, decisions and choices, behavior and relationships, dreams and vision. They influence our thoughts, feelings and actions. They guide us to do right things. Values are the guiding principles of life which are conducive to all round development. They give direction and firmness to life. Values are like the rails that keep the train on a track and help it move smoothly, quickly and with direction. Human values have sustained the humanity ever since advances in civilization gave rise to organized social structures. However, individual motives in the progressively rampant complexities of the society have taken precedence over the humanitarian concerns and the rapid erosion of the human values has become the order of the day, value education has been globally perceived as an answer to the challenge of strengthening moral and social fabric of societies. Schools and their educational aims in this scenario of 21st century been to be instrumental in preserving and restoring humanistic values like peace, calm, respect, social equalities etc. and the teacher has to play a very significant role in inculcating these values among the students who are the future of the society, which is only possible when teachers themselves are value based. A teacher's life is very challenging making heavy demands on his innovativeness and the seriousness with which he accept his profession. The education commission (1964-66) states- "every teacher must ensure that in teaching of his subject and dealings with his pupil's, fundamental values such as integrity and social responsibility are brought out. The teacher need not try to draw out values all the time but if he has given some thought to the values, underlying the scope of his subject as a teacher they will imperceptibly pass into his teaching and make an impact on the students."

Need of the Study

There is a great need to study the values of the teacher because value based teaching and valuable teachers are greatly needed for the development of any country. The teacher was responsible for developing the knowledge and molding the character of students. Teacher was capable of opening young minds to realize their capability and ability. They were dedicated to the task of national development and human welfare. But as a result of scientific and technological development, man has shifted his way of living from spiritual to

Correspondence
Dr. Udaivir Sharma
A/18, Staff Awas, Gurugovind
Singh Sports College, Kursi
Road, Lucknow-226026

materialistic approach. The challenge before our country and all over the world is inculcation of moral, ethical, social and spiritual values and we have become slaves of material civilization.

Unfortunately in the present Indian society the teacher stands for split personality. His/her position has highly degraded and demoralized because of several external and situational factors like caste, money, status, political influences etc. teacher behavior has become highly suspicious, corrupt and disgusting, today teachers look more for monetary benefit and power than for integrity of the profession. Teacher’s values play a significant and crucial role in shaping and molding the behavior of the child and if the teacher will have values in him, he can instill the same in the child which is the need of the present society. Success of any educational system depends much on the sincerity and qualities of its teacher, he plays many roles in order to ensure that educational goals envisaged as realized. It is rightly said that destiny of a nation is shaped in a classroom. The destiny shaping is the prime responsibility of the teacher. Teacher’s value system, their perceptions, their behavior, style and outlook probably influence students’ behavior. The national policy of education (1986) has justified value education as follows: “In our culturally plural society education foster, universal and eternal value oriented towards the unity and integration of our people. Such value oriented education should help eliminate obscurantism, religious fanaticism, violence, superstitions and fatalism.”

Objectives of the Study

To compare the religious values, social values, democratic values, aesthetic values, economic values, knowledge values, hedonistic values, power values, family prestige values and health values in government and non-government secondary school teachers

Hypothesis of the Study

1. There is no significant difference between the religious values, social values, democratic values, aesthetic values, economic values, knowledge values, hedonistic values, power values, family prestige values and health values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools.
2. There is no significant difference between the religious values, social values, democratic values, aesthetic values, economic values, knowledge values, hedonistic values, power values, family prestige values and health values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools.

Research Design

The population of this study constitutes all the secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools of Lucknow city. The schools and teachers were selected by using random sampling method. 140 teachers were selected, i.e., 70 from government schools and 70 from non-government schools. The list of teachers and schools are as follows:

Sr. No.	Name of Government Schools	Number of male teachers	Number of female teachers	Total
1	Bal Vidya Mandir Inter College	5	3	8
2	National Inter College	6	8	14
3	Government Juiblee Inter College	6	8	14
4	Islamia Inter College	8	7	15
5	M.K.S.D. Inter College	10	9	19
	Total	35	35	70
Sr. No.	Name of Non-Government Schools	Number of male teachers	Number of female teachers	Total
1	R.L.B. Senior secondary School Sector-3, Vikas Nagar	5	12	17
2	City convent School	7	9	16
3	Pioneer Inter College	6	6	12
4	Lord Jesus Inter College	8	3	11
5	Nirmala Convent Inter College	9	5	14
	Total	35	35	70

1. **Tool Used-** The tool used in this study is “Personal Value Questionnaire (PVQ)” made by Dr. (Mrs.) G.P. Sherry, ex-director of Dayalbagh, Educational Institute (Agra) and late Dr. R.P. Verma, professor of education department, B.H.U, Varanasi.
2. **Data Collection-** Data were collected from male and female teachers with the help of personal value questionnaire.
3. **Statistical Techniques Used-** The appropriate statistical techniques were used for data analyzing are as follows
 - a. Mean

- b. Standard Deviation
- c. Standard Error of the Mean
- d. t-test

Findings and Interpretation of Data

After analyzing of data, first of all total score of all the 140 secondary school teachers were taken for consideration, the mean and standard deviation of the different aspects of values like religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health, seen were as follows:

Values	No. of Teachers	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Mean	Standard Deviation
Religious	140	2	17	9.45	3.061
Social	140	4	21	13.90	3.860
Democratic	140	6	20	12.29	3.211
Aesthetic	140	3	20	10.66	3.394
Economic	140	2	25	12.88	4.573
Knowledge	140	8	25	15.61	3.498
Hedonistic	140	3	21	11.46	4.011
Power	140	2	20	12.00	3.654
Family Prestige	140	5	19	11.94	3.340
Health	140	2	17	9.48	3.490

Above table shows that Knowledge value have maximum mean therefore, 15.61, it shows that the knowledge takes first place of secondary school teachers in life. In the same way accordingly maximum value of mean, social, economic, democratic, power, family prestige, hedonistic, aesthetic, health, and religious values take place in teachers' life.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	9.26	2.454	0.415	0.814 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	8.71	3.092	0.523	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 9.26, 2.454 and 0.415 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 8.71, 3.092 and 0.523 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.814 at df =68. But calculated value 0.814 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.814<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-1 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the religious values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-

Hypothesis-1

There is no significance difference between the religious values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

government schools. Hence, religious values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-2

There is no significance difference between the religious values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	9.83	3.626	0.613	0.218 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	10.00	2.921	0.494	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 9.83, 3.626 and 0.613 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 10.00, 2.921 and 0.494 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.218 at df =68. But calculated value 0.218 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.218<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-2 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the religious values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-

government schools. Hence, religious values are same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis -3

There is no significance difference between the social values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	11.63	4.015	0.679	0.504 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	12.06	3.038	0.514	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 11.63, 4.015 and 0.679 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 12.06, 3.038 and 0.514 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.504 at df =68. But calculated value 0.504 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.504<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-3 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the social values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-

government schools. Hence, social values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers. They have same feeling for love, sympathy, charity, kindness and serving the people regarding social values.

Hypothesis-4

There is no significance difference between the social values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	15.80	2.939	0.497	0.439 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	16.11	3.056	0.517	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 15.80, 2.939 and 0.497 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 16.11, 3.056 and 0.517 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.439 at df =68. But calculated value 0.439 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.439<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-4 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the social values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-

government schools. Hence, social values are same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers. They have same feeling for love, sympathy, charity, kindness and serving the people regarding social values.

Hypothesis-5

There is no significance difference between the democratic values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	10.37	2.001	0.338	3.012 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	12.23	3.049	0.515	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 10.37, 2.001 and 0.338 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 12.23, 3.049 and 0.515 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 3.012 at df =68. But calculated value 3.012 is greater than table value 2.00 of t (3.012>2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-5 is rejected. It means there is significant difference between the democratic values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Hence, democratic values are not same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers. Here mean of non-government male secondary

school teachers is 12.23 is greater than mean of government male secondary school teachers is 10.37 (12.23>10.37). Hence, clearly non-government male school teachers are more democratic than government male school teachers due to non-government male school teachers participated in different leadership programs.

Hypothesis-6

There is no significance difference between the democratic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	14.20	3.729	0.554	2.313 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	12.38	3.248	0.557	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 14.20, 3.729 and 0.554 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 12.38, 3.248 and 0.557 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 2.313 at df =68. But calculated value 2.313 is greater than table value 2.00 of t (2.313>2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-6 is rejected. It means there is significant difference between the democratic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Hence, democratic values are not same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers. Here mean of non-government female

secondary school teachers is 12.38 is less than mean of government female secondary school teachers is 14.20 (12.38<14.20). Hence, clearly government school teachers are more democratic than non-government school teachers due to government school teachers do not discriminate with their children on the basis of caste, colour, religion, language, etc.

Hypothesis-7

There is no significance difference between the aesthetic values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	9.47	3.013	0.509	0.337 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	9.49	3.355	0.567	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 9.47, 3.013 and 0.509 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 9.49, 3.355 and 0.567 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.337 at df =68. But calculated value 0.337 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.337<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-7 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the aesthetic values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-

government schools. Hence, aesthetic values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-8

There is no significance difference between the aesthetic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	10.91	3.203	0.541	2.029 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	12.49	3.275	0.554	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 10.91, 3.203 and 0.541 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 12.49, 3.275 and 0.554 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 2.029 at df =68. But calculated value 2.029 is greater than table value 2.00 of t (2.029>2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-8 is rejected. It means there is significant difference between the aesthetic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Here mean of non-government female secondary school teachers is 12.49 is greater than mean of government female secondary school teachers is 10.91

(12.49>10.91). Hence, clearly non-government female school teachers are more aesthetic than government female school teachers due to non-government female school teachers have to participate in many activities like music, drawing, cultural activities, etc. and government female school teachers don't take any interest in such activities.

Hypothesis-9

There is no significance difference between the economic values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	14.40	4.110	0.695	1.488 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	15.74	3.407	0.576	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 14.40, 4.110 and 0.695 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 15.74, 3.407 and 0.576 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 1.488 at df =68. But calculated value 1.488 is less than table value 2.00 of t (1.488<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-9 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the economic values of male secondary school teachers of government and

non-government schools. Hence, economic values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-10

There is no significance difference between the economic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	9.66	4.505	0.761	2.084 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	11.71	3.715	0.628	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 9.66, 4.505 and 0.761 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 11.71, 3.715 and 0.628 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 2.084 at df =68. But calculated value 2.084 is greater than table value 2.00 of t (2.084>2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-10 is rejected. It means there is significant difference between the economic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Here mean of non-government female secondary school teachers is 11.71 is greater than mean of

government female secondary school teachers is 9.66 (11.71>9.66). Hence, clearly non-government female school teachers are more economic than government female school teachers due to non-government female school teachers get less money than government female school teachers.

Hypothesis-11

There is no significance difference between the knowledge values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	14.89	3.818	0.645	1.887 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	16.54	3.526	0.596	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 14.89, 3.818 and 0.645 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 16.54, 3.526 and 0.596 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 1.887 at df =68. But calculated value 1.887 is less than table value 2.00 of t (1.887<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-11 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the knowledge values of male secondary school teachers of government and

non-government schools. Hence, knowledge values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis -12

There is no significance difference between the knowledge values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	15.31	2.978	0.503	0.510 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	15.71	3.553	0.601	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 15.31, 2.798 and 0.503 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 15.71, 3.553 and 0.601 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.510 at df =68. But calculated value 0.510 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.510<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-12 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the knowledge values of female secondary school teachers of government

and non-government schools. Hence, knowledge values are same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-13

There is no significance difference between the hedonistic values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	13.26	3.898	0.659	4.070 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	9.71	3.660	0.596	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 13.26, 3.898 and 0.659 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 9.71, 3.660 and 0.596 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 4.070 at df =68. But calculated value 4.070 is greater than table value 2.00 of t (4.070>2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-13 is rejected. It means

there is significant difference between the hedonistic values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Hence, hedonistic values are not same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers. Here mean of government male secondary school teachers is 13.26 is greater than than mean of non-government male secondary school teachers is 9.71

(13.26>9.71). Hence, clearly government male school teachers are more hedonistic than non-government male school teachers due to government male school teachers have less work to do and they know their job is fix and stable.

Hypothesis-14

There is no significance difference between the hedonistic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	13.60	3.664	0.619	5.347 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	9.26	3.109	0.526	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 13.60, 3.664 and 0.619 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 9.26, 3.109 and 0.526 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 5.347 at df =68. But calculated value 5.347 is greater than table value 2.00 of t (5.347>2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-14 is rejected. It means there is significant difference between the hedonistic values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Hence, hedonistic values are not same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers. Here mean of government female secondary

school teachers is 13.26 is greater than than mean of non-government female secondary school teachers is 9.71 (13.26>9.71). Hence, clearly government female school teachers are more hedonistic than non-government female school teachers due to government female school teachers have less work to do and they know their job is fix and stable.

Hypothesis-15

There is no significance difference between the power values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	13.60	3.292	0.556	0.416 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	13.26	3.592	0.607	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 13.60, 3.292 and 0.556 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 13.26, 3.592 and 0.607 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.416 at df =68. But calculated value 0.416 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.416<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-15 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the power values of

male secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Hence, power values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-16

There is no significance difference between the power values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	10.00	3.781	0.639	1.451 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	11.14	2.724	0.460	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 10.00, 3.781 and 0.639 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 11.14, 2.724 and 0.460 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 1.451 at df =68. But calculated value 1.451 is less than table value 2.00 of t (1.451<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-16 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the power values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-

government schools. Hence, power values are same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-17

There is no significance difference between the family prestige values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	12.37	2.669	0.451	1.337 at df =68
Non-government (male)	35	11.46	3.042	0.514	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 12.37, 2.669 and 0.451 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 11.46, 3.042 and 0.514 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 1.337 at df =68. But calculated value 1.337 is less than table value 2.00 of t (1.337<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-17 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the family prestige values of male secondary school teachers of government and

non-government schools. Hence, family prestige values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-18

There is no significance difference between the family prestige values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	12.23	4.117	0.696	0.600 at df =68
Non-government (female)	35	11.69	3.419	0.578	

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 12.23, 4.117 and 0.696 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 11.69, 3.419 and 0.578 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.600 at df =68. But calculated value 0.600 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.600<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-17 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the family prestige values of female secondary school teachers of government

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (male)	35	9.86	2.830	0.478	1.784
Non-government (male)	35	11.06	2.662	0.450	at df =68

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 9.86, 2.830 and 0.478 respectively of 35 male government secondary school teachers and 11.06, 2.662 and 0.450 respectively of 35 male non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 1.784 at df =68. But calculated value 1.784 is less than table value 2.00 of t (1.784<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-19 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the health values of

Schools	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	t-value
Government (female)	35	8.63	4.596	0.777	0.246
Non-government (female)	35	8.40	3.002	0.507	at df =68

The above table shows that mean, S.D. and standard error of mean are 8.63, 4.596 and 0.777 respectively of 35 female government secondary school teachers and 8.40, 3.002 and 0.507 respectively of 35 female non-government secondary school teachers and t-value 0.246 at df =68. But calculated value 0.246 is less than table value 2.00 of t (0.246<2.00) at df =68. Hence, clearly hypothesis-20 is accepted. It means there is no significant difference between the health values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Hence, health values are same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Educational Implications of the Study

Education helps in overall development of the child. Overall development of the child can be only done with the help of teachers and this can only happen when teachers have values in themselves, i.e., they are very honest towards their profession and their students. The mental and moral values of a teacher have a strong impact upon his/her students. Values are of prime importance to the society in marking human beings, this study is also useful for the society in marking good human beings, and this study is useful for the society too.

References

- Venkataith, Sandhya NN. Research in value education, APH Publishing Corporation, 1-37, 12-36.
- Best John W. Research in Education, 4th Edition Prentice Hall of Inda Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1983.
- Kanani Madhu. Fifth Survey of Educational Research, NCERT-Publication Division, New Delhi, 1988-92; 1:402.
- Miller, Harsh. Fielding As cited in the Nature of Human Values, Free Press, New York, 1989.
- Rokeach Milton. The Nature of Human Values, Free Press, New York, 1973.

and non-government schools. Hence, family prestige values are same of female, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-19

There is no significance difference between the health values of male secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

male secondary school teachers of government and non-government schools. Hence, health values are same of male, government and non-government secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis-20

There is no significance difference between the health values of female secondary school teachers of government and non-government school.

- Russell, as cited in Education for Values, Chugh Publication, Allahabad.
- Saraf Somnath. Education in Human Values Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, Bangalore, 1999, 7-10.
- Singh LC, Singh P. Effectiveness of Value Clarifying Strategies in Value Orientation of B.Ed Students (Unpublished Research Project, NCERT), as cited by K.K. Tiwari Education for Values (Chugh Publication, Allahabad), 1986.
- Smith Brewster as cited in the Nature of Human Values, Free Press, New York, 1969.
- Roy A. Creativity Age & Value Orientation as correlates of Behavioral Deviance, Ph.D Psychology, Agra U. IV Survey of Research in Education, 1982, 505.
- Sharma Maheshwari Sr BL, Dr. VK. Surya Publication, 425-438.
- Claude A. A Study to Examine Teacher Morale in Christian Schools and Public Schools, as cited in Dissertation, Abstracts International 1997; 38(3):1225.
- Tiwari KK. Education for Values, 1st Edition, Chugh Publications, Allahabad, 1977.
- Singh Harbhajan, Ahluwalia SP. Teacher Values Inventory, National Psychological Corporation, Agra, 1980.