



## **INQUISITIVE TEACHER**

*A Peer Reviewed Refereed Research Journal*

ONLINE ISSN-2455-5827

Volume V, Issue II, December 2018, pp. 46-52

[www.srsshodhsansthan.org](http://www.srsshodhsansthan.org)



### **Deprivation and Values**

**Dr. Narendra Kumar Singh**

Principal, RHSPG College, Singramau, Jaunpur, U.P.

#### **Abstract**

*Values are the socially accepted code of conduct in general and it affects the behavior of an individual in many ways. The present study is a descriptive research conducted on secondary students of Varanasi region. It is an attempt to study and compare various types of values (Religious, Social, Democratic, Aesthetic, Economic, Knowledge, Hedonistic, Power, Family Prestige, Health) with the concept of deprivation using various statistical techniques and surprisingly it was found that some of the values really have bearing on deprivation.*

*Key Words: Hedonistic, Democratic, Religious, Deprivation, Family Prestige*

#### **Introduction**

India is suffering with deprivation in various fields for removing it renowned scholars and psychologists have taken pains in studying and analyzing the various factors which have conditioned the deprivation both in individuals as well as in communities and social groups. According to Hunt, J. Mc.V. (1968) "Caste system in the Indian societies is old tradition. The caste system is almost as old as Indian society; it is very much with us. For countries, the scheduled caste have been being under conditions of intense social disadvantages and prevented from staying in the main stream of socio-culture and economic life of the hindu society. The poor socio-culture atmosphere in which they have lived for ages has resulted in their constituting the bulk of what is today called the weaker section of the society in India. Thus it is seen the scheduled castes have lived a life of deprivation and object poverty for ages. Their life is very miserable today". But so far no scientific studies have been carried out to explore the nature and extent of deprivation among them. Upadhyay, Usha (1982) "However these deficits are not limited to the poor only, children from affluent homes also have been found to possess characteristic peculiar to the deprived, although they do not suffer from absolute deprivation in the sense of real actual deprivation. Children whose parents are below the poverty line may be said to suffer from absolute deprivation. They are victims of other sense of deprivation too. First they are deprived socially as there is a lack of peer-group contacts because of geographic isolation, family restrictions, unfavourable social attitudes on the part of other children or some other conditions. Emotional deprivation is caused by lack of opportunities to experience the

pleasant emotions such as love , joy etc.” Acharya Rammurti committee report (6<sup>th</sup> Nov. 1990) “Committee suggests that education is an integrated and holistic, approaches and its division into formal- non- formal academic- vocation, technical- nontechnical so on hinders with the fundamental change in education system. Committee considers students more significant than resource because considering men as resource is an utilitarian view. For changing this view, humanitarian , liberal , socialistic, cultural and spiritual (religious) dimensions must be included in the education .The committee reintroduced the concept of neighborhood school (primarily suggested by Kothari commission) for providing equal opportunity to all children. Acharya feels that it will lead to an uniform equalitarian and casteless society, and will help in national, cultural and social unity and integrity. He also feels an acute need of researches in social sciences for newer and creative thinking and for inculcating the good values and ancient Indian traditions among students. Though it is evident from the studies that a large number of characteristic factors are responsible for moulding mental mode and temperament underlying human behavior, yet it is not difficult to find out common factors which have always sustained a sense of deprivation in human mind belonging to certain classes or societies, communities, or countries. It has been observed that certain sense of mental behaviour , their group character, national character or community character has been dubbed as undesirable, e.g. the Jews are said to be greedy fellows, the Scotch are considered to be self- conceited, the Germans are known as great opportunists and moors are considered to be very hostile to other nations and ferocious to infidels.

### **Deprivation**

Deprivation is the overall conditions showing insufficient satisfaction of basic, psychological and social needs. It can be used interchangeably for cultural deprivation, social and cultural disadvantage and underprivileged. It also refers so the deficient environmental conditions, impoverished experiences and psychological, physical, social economic as well as other deficiencies as perceived by students.

### **Value**

Value is the underlying motivation for most of the behavior of an individual. In other words, values serve to meet one’s needs. Values are the belief or approach behaviors that help individual to fix up a goal and try to achieve it.

### **Objective of the Study**

The present study is undertaken with the following objective in view:

- To compare the values of the deprived and the non-deprived secondary school students.

### **Hypothesis of the Study**

Following null-hypothesis was formulated in accordance with the objective of the study.

- There is no significant difference in the values (Religious , Socio, Democratic , Asthetic , Economic , Knowledge Hedonistic , Power, family-prestige and Health )of the deprived and non-deprived secondary school students.

### **Methodology of the study**

A research design is an arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure.

### Method

This study is descriptive survey type of research aiming at a comparative study of values, aspiration levels and academic achievement of the deprived and the non-deprived students at the high school level.

### Population

All the students pursuing high school courses in various schools of Varanasi region constitute the population of the study.

### Sample

It is impossible to approach all the students individually to know about their values, therefore, 500 secondary school students taken from different schools of Varanasi region using random sampling method.

### Tools

In order to collect the data the following three tools were used for the study:

1. Deprivation scale (Kalplata Pandey)
2. Personal value questionnaire (PVQ) (G.P.Sherry & R.P.Verma).

### Use of the Statistical Techniques

For the analysis of obtained data and drawing inferences the following statistics were used in the present study. Mean, S.D. and C.R.values of deprived and non deprived students for different values.

### Analysis & Interpretation

The objective of the study reads as “To compare the values of the deprived and the non deprived high school student.” The corresponding hypothesis was: “there is no significant difference in the values (Religious, Social, Democratic, Aesthetic, Economic, Knowledge, Hedonistic, Power and the non-deprived high school students under study

**Table showing comparison of the value scores obtained by the deprived and the non-deprived students**

Values	Deprived Students N=130		Non-Deprived Students N=122		M <sub>1</sub> -M <sub>2</sub>	CR Values	P Value
	M <sub>1</sub>	SD <sub>1</sub>	M <sub>2</sub>	SD <sub>2</sub>			
Religious	6.58	3.96	6.22	3.05	0.36	0.81	Not Significant
Social	6.73	3.89	6.27	2.94	0.46	1.06	-Do-
Democratic	7.12	3.49	5.84	2.85	1.28	3.20	Significant at 0.01
Aesthetic	6.62	3.85	6.61	3.85	0.01	0.02	Not Significant
Economic	6.43	3.62	7.32	3.10	0.89	2.10	Significant at

							0.05
Knowledge	6.62	3.85	6.32	2.83	0.30	0.71	Not Significant
Hedonistic	6.12	3.57	7.73	2.96	0.61	1.48	-Do-
Power	7.12	3.54	7.13	2.97	0.01	0.02	-Do-
Family Prestige	6.96	4.12	7.49	2.94	0.53	1.18	-Do-
Health	6.85	3.75	6.74	3.45	0.11	0.24	-Do-

## Interpretation

### 1. Religious Values

Above table shows that the significance of mean difference between the deprived and the non-deprived students on ten dimensions of value. According to the table it is apparent that on "Religious value" the mean score of the deprived students was higher than that of the non-deprived students. The difference between the two Means was found to be 0.36. This difference is not significant because the obtained C.R. value (0.81) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus the hypothesis stated above stands retained for "Religious value." The result found may be due to the following reasons: the deprived students, most of the time, come from the deficient homes which are devoid of physical facilities and comforts. Dissatisfaction with the present situation and insecurity caused by deficiency makes one depend on divine force. A person who is worldly wise successful may be proud of his skill competence, initiative because his intelligence. Whereas a man who is unsuccessful to procure happy living in this world believes that his failure is caused by destiny or gods who are against him. It is a matter of common observance that poor, illiterate and unsuccessful persons are highly religious whereas the rich persons may or may not be. Insecurity of life breeds religiosity. The origin of religion itself has been ascribed to the feeling of helpless of primitive man facing hostile phenomenon of nature.

### 2. Social value

From the above table it is clear that on "Social value" the mean scores of the deprived and non-deprived students was not significantly different. The actual difference between the two means was 0.46 and C.R. value was 1.06. Thus the null hypothesis stated above stands retained on "social value. The present result may be due to the following reasons; As it has been seen that both the categories of the students, that is, the deprived and the non-deprived live in almost similar social situation. They use the same play ground and class room. Hence it may be due to this reason that they develop similar "Social values" The non- deprived students are expected to be more socially acceptable because most of them come from well off families. There might be better social adjustment for them, which may lead to higher score on "social value" But among the deprived students more cohesiveness is found. There is more give and take in the lower status group than that in the upper. The non-deprived students are more likely to develop individualistic value but their social acceptability balances in favour of "social value" In

the same way, in the deprived groups the dependents on other breeds for higher social value. Thus it was found that there is no significant difference between the deprived and the non-deprived students.

### **3. Democratic value**

From the above table it is clear that on “Democratic value” there is significant difference between the deprived and the non-deprived students. The actual difference between the two means was 1.28 whereas the C.R. value was 3.20 and this difference is significant stated above is rejected on “Democratic values”. This result may be due to the following reasons: the deprived student’s score was significantly higher than the non-deprived students because the deprived students have more occasions to suffer the pinch of lack of freedom and independence. A person values something which he aspires to get but never gets it. Where as a person who gets something easily underestimates this value. This is the reason why gregariousness is found more in illiterates, poor, the diseased and have-nots. Whereas their counterparts develop in it “Anti Democratic value.”

### **4. Aesthetic value**

As per above table both the groups, the deprived and the non-deprived adolescents, have similar scores on “Aesthetic value.” The mean score of the deprived students was 6.62 with the S.D. of 3.85 whereas the mean score of the non-deprived was 6.61 with the S.D. of 3.35. C.R. value was found to be 0.02, which is not significant at any level. Thus the hypothesis stated above stands retained stated above stands retained for “Aesthetic value”. The similarity of both the groups on “Aesthetic value” may be due to the similarity of physical environment of the family and class room of the students. So as both the groups belong to similar physical environment. They might have developed uniform liking for beauty/ugliness. Their upbringing in similar school system also must have conducted on similar aspiration for what is beautiful or not.

### **5. Economic Value**

Above table shows that on “Economic value” there is no significant difference between the deprived and the non-deprived students. The actual difference between the two means is 0.89, whereas the C.R. value was 2.10 which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus the null hypothesis stated above stands rejected for “Economic value”. The table shows that the non-deprived group has higher score on “Economic value” than the deprived group. This phenomenon may be caused by certain reasons. The deprived students belong to families that believe in earning and spending that is living from hand to mouth. Without developing the habit for saving. Whereas the non-deprived students know the importance of saving in life. Most of them have seen their parents, saving for their future rather than spending for the gratification of the present needs.

### **6. Knowledge value**

According to above table the deprived and non-deprived groups of students do not differ significantly on “knowledge value”. The mean of the deprived students is 6.62 with S.D. 3.85, whereas the mean of the non-deprived students is 6.32 with the S.D. 2.83, C.R. value is 0.71 which is not significant. The null hypothesis stated above stands retained. The reason for similar value on “knowledge” dimension may be due to family and environmental conditions. Both the

groups come from same physical areas with no distinct cultural difference. Therefore, they might be holding similar value for knowledge. Sharma (1977) also compared two groups of respondents on “knowledge value”. The groups were backward castes and upper castes. He found significant difference between two groups on “knowledge value”.

### **7. Hedonistic Value**

According to above table the deprived and the non-deprived groups of students do not differ significantly on “Hedonistic value”. The mean of the deprived students is 6.12 with S.D. 3.57, whereas the mean of the non-deprived students is 7.73 with the S.D. as 2.96, C.R. value is 1.48, which is not significant. Thus the null hypothesis stated above is retained for “Hedonistic value”. The reason for the finding is the following. The non-deprived students want comfort, facilities, and pleasure, to avoid labour, pains, troubles and hard work. They are much for the present, to find satisfaction in sensual pleasure. But the deprived students do not have these facilities. Therefore, they might be holding similar value.

### **8. Power value**

On the “Power value”, the mean score of the deprived students was lower than that of the non-deprived students. The difference between the two means was found to be 0.01. This difference is not significant because the obtained C.R. value (0.02) is not significant any level of confidence. Thus the null hypothesis stated above is retained for “Power value”. This result may be due to the following reasons. The similarity of both the groups on “Power value” may be due to the similarity of physical environment of the family and classroom of the students. Both the groups belong to similar physical environment and similar school environment. Therefore, they might be holding similar view for “Power value”.

### **9. Family Prestige Value**

The mean score of the “Family prestige” value of the deprived students was lower than that of the non-deprived students. The difference between the two means was found to be 0.53. the C.R value is 1.18, which is not significant. The null hypothesis stated above is retained. The Present result may be due to the following reasons. As it has been seen that both the categories of the students that is the deprived and the non-deprived live in almost similar social situation. Therefore, up bring in similar family system must have contributed to similar aspiration on “Family prestige” value.

### **10. Health value**

According to above table the mean score for “health value” of the deprived students was higher than that of the non-deprived students. The difference between the two means was found to be 0.11. This difference is not significant because the obtained C.R. value (.24) is not significant at any level. Thus the null hypothesis above stands retained for health value”. The present result may be due to the following reasons. As it has been seen that both the categories of the students, the deprived and the non-deprived, live in almost similar situation. So both the groups belong to the similar physical environment. Therefore, they might be holding similar values for “Health” .

### Conclusion

On the basis of above analysis it can be concluded that there is significant difference between values of deprived and non deprived students. This finding suggests that deprivation can be a reason for deteriorating values in society especially democratic and economic values. Hence it is the responsibility of home, school, society and government that they all should make collective efforts to provide as many facilities to students as possible so as to develop a society free of any kind of deprivation.

### References

- Acharya Ramamurti (1990) Quoted N.K.Singh, "A Psychological Study of the Deprived and the non deprived adolescents". Ph.D. Thesis, Faculty of Education, BHU.1993 Page-4
- Hunt, J. Mc. V. "Environment development and scholastic achievement in deutsch," M. Katz, Io. , Jenson, A.R. (Ed.), Social class, Race and psychological Development, N.Y. Holt, 1968.
- Upadhyay, Usha. "A study of sense of deprivation among high school student," PhD thesis Allahabad Univ., Allahabad, 1982, pp.13-17.
- Singh, N.K. (2017); "Parental Deprivation" Research Paper in PASS Vol.XIV, Page-81-85, Sept. 2017.
- Singh, N.K. (2018); "Weaker Section of Society", Research Paper in NJER vol. XVII, June 2018.

