



International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)
A Peer-Reviewed Bi-monthly Bi-lingual Research Journal
ISSN: 2349-6959 (Online), ISSN: 2349-6711 (Print)
Volume-III, Issue-IV, January 2017, Page No. 40-47
Published by Scholar Publications, Karimganj, Assam, India, 788711
Website: <http://www.ijhsss.com>

Values Preferences of Secondary School Teachers Teaching Different Subjects

Dr. Neena Sawhney

Principal, Chandigarh College of Education, Landran, Mohali, Chandigarh, India

Abstract

It is believed that the single most influential person in a child's life after his parents is the teacher. The views, knowledge and values of a teacher impact a child greatly leading to the formation of his own value and moral structure. Values of a teacher differ according to their own personal upbringing, social environment, cultural exposure and the course of study. Thus the main purpose of the research was to study the value preference patterns of secondary school teachers teaching English, Science and Maths. The sample of the present study comprised of 360 prospective and in-service teachers from Chandigarh. A self designed Value Preference Form of personal, social and teaching related values was used for the study. The analysis and interpretation of the data was done by applying Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks, a non parametric test to find out the differences in value preferences by assigning ranks by teachers teaching different subjects. The major findings of the study were: 1) The teachers teaching English, Science and Maths showed no significant differences in the order of their Personal value preferences even though differences were evident in top value preferences as English teachers preferred Sincerity as their topmost value as compared to Science and Maths teachers who preferred Honesty in that place 2). The teachers teaching English, Science and Maths differed significantly in their Social Value preferences as the three group of teachers differed greatly in order of their preference on all values except the top 2 values of Helpful and Purity in dealing 3) The teachers teaching English, Science and Maths showed no significant differences in the order of their Teaching related Value preferences even though differences were evident in top value preferences as Maths teachers preferred Discipline as their topmost value as compared to English and Science teachers who preferred Loyalty to duty in that place.

Key Words: Values, Value-preferences, Prospective teachers, In-service Secondary School Teachers, Subjects taught.

Introduction: Values are rightly said to be the anchors of human life. They are part of personality of any individual often finding expression through their behaviour. They occupy the central position in accounting for differences in their behaviour and life styles. Literally, Value means something that has worth, something precious, something dear, and something one is ready to suffer for, sacrifice for and if it is indeed valuable, die for.

In all areas of life people have certain values, beliefs, ideologies and attitudes when they perform actions, and these are often simply referred to as values (Sharfman et al., 2000). According to the definition by Schwartz (1999, 24) Values are conceptions of the desirable that guide the way social actors (e.g. organizational leaders, policy-makers, individual persons) select actions, evaluate people and events, and explain their evaluations and actions. Yet people do not act or choose their values in a vacuum; perceptions and behaviour are not only influenced by their own personal value priorities, but the social value priorities of a group often connect people who are behaving in similar ways (Rohan, 2000).

Values often have a strong linkage with ethics. What we consider as desirable behavior or preference is basically our conception of what is good or bad. Values are further considered as enduring while it is attitudes that can change quickly as per situations. Yet our own values are rarely stagnant or the same throughout our lives. Social interactions and educational exposure play an important role in how we understand and define our own values.

P. Ondrejko \check{c} (1998, p. 356) states that value "influences the behavior of an individual or a group as well as the whole societies, it is a source of motivation and preferences of action, mainly in cases of alternative behavior. Value is generally considered a relational category, most often a relationship between a subject and an object."

Glen (1999: 205) gives an operational definition of a value is something chosen freely from alternatives after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative, prized, publicly affirmed willingly, acted upon and recurring.

Boeree (2006) defines values as a part of personality that makes person different from other people, perhaps even unique. In short, the value we believe in "influences why we do the things we do" (Kashdan, 2013, p. 138).

In the whole educational process, there are many factors which separately or collectively determine the quality of education, though it is difficult to state which of these factors contribute how much and in what manner to the outcome of education. The teacher who belongs to the human factor is the single most important factor responsible for the success, reforms and advancements of the educational programmes. He plays a pivotal role in the teaching learning process upon whose competency and efficiency, the quality of education depends. The teacher traditionally enjoys a position of great respect. This role as a friend, philosopher and guide has been eulogized since time immemorial. It is through teaching that society preserves its culture; schools discharge their duties and attain their objectives. Teaching is thus the act of assisting others to learning (**Mangla, 1992**).

A teacher has a deep impact on the personality of a child as he is the single most influential person in a child's life after his parents having the ability to shape great leaders and visionaries through his interactions, viewpoints and teaching. It is through teaching that society preserves its culture; schools discharge their duties and attain their objectives. The values of a teacher pervade his method of transmitting knowledge and influence the ideology of a child. Values of a teacher differ according to their own personal upbringing, social environment, cultural exposure and the course of study. It is believed that teachers also differ from each other due to the nature of their course, Arts students being more artistic and creative as compared to the pragmatic and scientific nature of study of Sciences. Teachers, the practitioners of curriculums, play an extremely important and active role in transferring certain values (Halstead & Taylor, 2000; YAZICI, 2006).

Method and Procedure: The study was conducted to attain preference patterns on personal, social and teaching related values of secondary school teachers teaching English, Science and Maths.

The investigator conducted an *exploratory research* study using the *ex-post facto design*. A self designed Value Preference Form identified from syllabus of teacher training course by the investigator herself, was the tool used in the study. The sample consisted of 360 prospective as well as in service teachers from 2 teachers training colleges and 22 secondary schools of Chandigarh. The total teachers were segregated in 3 groups according to their subject specialization in teaching English, Science and Maths. The group comprised of 141 teachers specializing in teaching English, 120 teachers of Science and 99 teachers having Maths as their teaching subject. For analysis, ranks were assigned to scores obtained and Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks, a non parametric test was used to derive the results.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data: Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks of value preferences of secondary school teachers with regard to their subject of specialisation in teaching was computed to test the following hypothesis:

- Ho.1: There is no correspondence between preference patterns on Personal Values of teachers teaching English with those teaching Science or Math's.
- Ho.2: There is no correspondence between preference patterns on Social Values of teachers teaching English with those teaching Science or Math's.
- Ho.3: There is no correspondence between preference patterns on Teaching Related Values of teachers teaching English with those teaching Science or Math's.

Preferences on Personal Values: To find out any difference between Personal Value preferences patterns of teachers in relation to the subject they teach, Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks was calculated. The results of data analysis revealed that the value of $H = 5.18$, was not found significant even at the .05 level of confidence.

It suggests that the three groups of teachers did not have different value preferences. The difference, if any, may be ascribed to chance factor. It may be inferred that preferences of

teachers on Personal values were not different with regard to their teaching subjects hence the null hypothesis of equality, Ho.1 stating that:

There is no correspondence between preference patterns on Personal Values of teachers teaching English with those teaching Science or Math’s was not rejected.

The top three ranked personal values and three personal values that have been assigned bottom ranks by teacher’s subject wise have been arranged in Table 1.

Table-1: Master Ranks of Preferences on Personal Values of Teachers (Subject-wise)

Master Ranks	Subjects taught		
	ENGLISH	SCIENCE	MATHS
1	Sincerity	Honesty	Honesty
2	Honesty	Self Confidence	Self Confidence
3	Self Confidence	Sincerity	Sincerity
4	Responsibility	Responsibility	Responsibility
5	Love & Affection	Love & Affection	Love & Affection
6	Perseverance	Perseverance	Perseverance
7	Tolerance	Tolerance	Tolerance
8	Aesthetic Sense	Aesthetic Sense	Aesthetic Sense

It may be observed from the Table-1 that Honesty, Self-confidence and Sincerity was given top preference by the all three group of teachers teaching English, Science and Math’s. The only difference is evident in their order of preference as English teachers prefer sincerity as their topmost value and Science and math’s teachers prefer Honesty at that spot

Perseverance, Tolerance and Aesthetic sense are the bottom three values preferred uniformly by all three groups of teachers teaching English, Science and Math’s.

Preferences on Social Values: To find out any difference between Social Value preferences patterns of teachers in relation to the subject they teach, Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks was calculated. The results of data analysis revealed that the value of H = 16.553, was found significant at the .01 level of confidence.

It suggests that the three groups of teachers had different value preferences beyond the contribution of chance. It may be inferred that preferences of teachers on Social values differ with regard to the subject they teach hence the null hypothesis of equality, Ho.2 stating that:

There is no correspondence between preference patterns on Social Values of teachers teaching English with those teaching Science or Math’s stand rejected.

The top three ranked personal values and three personal values that have been assigned bottom ranks by teachers’ subject wise have been arranged in Table 2.

Table-2: Master Ranks of Preferences on Social Values of Teachers (Subject-wise)

Master Ranks	Subjects taught		
	ENGLISH	SCIENCE	MATH'S
1.	Helpful	Purity in dealings	Helpful
2.	Purity in dealings	Helpful	Purity in dealings
3.	Regards for dignity of individual	Equality of status and opportunity	Regards for dignity of individual
4.	Selfless service unto others	Regards for dignity of individual	Cooperative decision making
5.	Sense of social responsibility	Openness to reason	Equality of status and opportunity
6.	Equality of status and opportunity	Cooperative decision making	Selfless service unto others
7.	Cooperative decision making	Selfless service unto others	Sense of social responsibility
8.	Openness to reason	Sense of social responsibility	Openness to reason

It may be observed from the Table-2 that the teachers teaching English and Math’s agree in their giving highest preference to **Helpful, Purity in dealings** and **Regards for the dignity of the individual**, whereas the teachers teaching Science however show a great degree of variation in their preference as they prefer **Purity in dealings** and **Helpful** followed by **Equality of status and opportunity** which is ranked in bottom 3 of order of preference by English teachers and just one step above in middle order of preference by Math’s teachers.

The secondary school teachers teaching English and Math’s ascribed the bottom rank to **Openness to reason** whereas teachers of Science preferred **Sense of social responsibility** at this rank. The teachers teaching English and Math’s have **Cooperative decision making** and **Sense of social responsibility** as the second to bottom preferences respectively, Whereas the teachers teaching Science prefer **Selfless service unto others** at this place. The English teachers have preferred **Equality of status and opportunity** at the third from bottom place. Whereas the Science teachers show preference for **Cooperative decision making** and Math’s teachers preferred **Selfless service unto others** at this place.

As evident from the table only **Helpful** and **Purity in dealings** among the top three preferences are the uniform characteristic preferences of the entire group of teachers teaching different subjects.

Preferences on Teaching Related Values: To find out any difference between Teaching related Value preference patterns of teachers in relation to the subject they teach, Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks was calculated. The results of data analysis

revealed that the value of $H = 4.865$, was not found significant even at the .05 level of confidence.

It suggests that the three groups of teachers did not have different value preferences. The difference, if any, may be ascribed to chance factor. It may be inferred that preferences of teachers on Teaching related values were not different with regard to their teaching subjects hence the null hypothesis of equality, $H_0.3$ stating that:

There is no correspondence between preference patterns on teaching related Values of teachers teaching English with those teaching Science or Math’s was not rejected.

The top three ranked personal values and three personal values that have been assigned bottom ranks by teacher’s subject wise have been arranged in Table 3.

Table-3: Master Ranks of Preferences on Teaching Related Values of Teachers (Subject wise)

Master Ranks	SUBJECTS TAUGHT		
	ENGLISH	SCIENCE	MATH’S
1.	Loyalty to duty	Loyalty to duty	Discipline
2.	Discipline	Discipline	Loyalty to duty
3.	Punctuality	Punctuality	Punctuality
4.	Regularity	Regularity	Regularity
5.	Justice	Justice	Justice
6.	Leadership	Leadership	Resourcefulness
7.	Resourcefulness	Resourcefulness	Leadership
8.	Team Spirit	Team Spirit	Team Spirit

It may be observed from Table-3 that both English and Science teachers have preferred **Loyalty to duty** as the topmost value whereas Math’s teacher prefers **Discipline** as their topmost value. **Discipline** has been preferred at the second place by both English and Science teachers whereas **Loyalty to duty** has been preferred by Math’s teachers at this place. At the third place all three groups of teachers teaching English, Science and Math’s have uniformly agreed to the value of **Punctuality**.

The values of **Leadership**, **Resourcefulness** and **Team spirit** are the uniform bottom preferences of all three groups of teachers teaching different subjects.

Discussion and Conclusion: The results gathered through analysis on Personal, Social and Teaching Related Values of teachers teaching different subjects revealed that there is a relationship between Social values and Subjects taught. The Social values of the teachers teaching different subjects showed a variation whereas the Personal and Teaching related values of teachers teaching different subjects i.e. English, Science and Math’s showed no significant variations. The results of the study related to hypothesis of Social values were supported by the findings of the study conducted by Nimchinda (1986). Kanti (2013) found

that prospective secondary school teachers gave first preference to social value and last preference to political value

In a study conducted by Whitney (1986), teachers stated that “honesty,” “respect,” and “responsibility” were the three most important values needed in a values education program. In a study carried out by Tepecik (2008), teachers stated that “responsibility” should be taught directly in social studies courses.

Even though no significant difference was observed statistically in **Personal value preferences** of teachers teaching English, Science and Maths , yet the order of preference of Top values differed for English teachers who preferred Sincerity as their topmost value followed by Honesty and Self confidence whereas both Science and Maths teachers preferred Honesty followed by Self confidence and Sincerity. Thus the value of Sincerity assigned top rank by English teachers has been assigned 3rd rank by Science and Maths teachers.

However this trend shows a major shift in **Social value preferences** of teachers as the teachers teaching English and Math’s agree in their giving highest preference to Helpful followed by Purity in dealings and Regards for the dignity of the individual, whereas the teachers teaching Science showing a great degree of variation in their preference as they prefer Purity in dealings in top place followed by Helpful and Equality of status and opportunity. These 3 group of teachers also showed great variation in the bottom order of preference as English teachers have assigned the third from bottom rank to Equality of status and opportunity whereas Science teachers have shown a preference for Co-operative decision making and Math’s teachers for Selfless service unto others. The second from bottom value preferred by English teachers is Co-operative decision making whereas Science teachers have preferred Selfless service unto others and Math’s teachers agree on Sense of social responsibility as their preferred value at this place. The bottom rank value has been taken as Openness to reason by both English and Math’s teachers whereas the Science teachers have preferred Sense of social responsibility at this place.

No significant difference was observed statistically in **Teaching related value preferences** of teachers teaching English, Science and Maths , however the order of preference of topmost value differed for Maths teachers who preferred Discipline as their topmost value as compared to English and Science teachers who preferred Loyalty to duty as their topmost value. Only the top 2 preferences differ for these groups as all other values preferred follow a uniform order of preference.

Thus the results indicate differences in preference order of different subject teachers in relation to Personal, Social and Teaching related values, even though statistically significant differences were observed in Social values only.

References:

1. Boeree, G. (2006). Personality theories. Retrieved January 5, 2010 from <http://webspace.ship.edu/cgboer/persintro.html>.
2. Glen, S. (1999). Educating for inter professional collaboration: Teaching about values.
3. Halstead, J. M., & Taylor, J. M. (2000). Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(2), 169-202. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/713657146>
4. Kanti., K.S. , (2013) “A study the value preferences of prospective secondary school teachers” in *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research (IJEPR)* ISSN: 2279-0179 Volume 2, Issue 3, pp: 42-47, August 2013
5. Kashdan, T. (2013). *Curios? Descoperă ingredientul care îți lipsește pentru o viață împlinită*. București: Editura Trei Sévillia,
6. Mangla, Sheela (1992). *Professional Behaviour of Teachers* p.10-20, Indian P ublications, Ambala.
7. Nimchinda, Prasit (1986). *Social values of secondary social studies teachers in Maharakham province, Thailand*. **Dissertation Abstract International**, Vol. 47, No.08, p.2874-A, February 1987.
8. Ondrejkoč, P. (1998). *Úvod do sociológie výchovy*. Bratislava: Veda.
9. Rohan, M. 2000. A Rose by Any Name? The Value Construct. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 4(3), 255- 277.
10. Schwartz, S. 1999. A Theory of Cultural Values and Some Implications for Work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 48, 23-47. Sharfman, M. P., Pinkston, T.S. and Sigerstad, T. 2000. The Effects of Managerial Values on Social Issues Evaluation: An Empirical Examination. *Business and Society* 39 (2) 144-182
11. Sharfman, M. P., Pinkston, T.S. and Sigerstad, T. 2000. The Effects of Managerial Values on Social Issues Evaluation: An Empirical Examination. *Business and Society* 39 (2) 144-182.
12. Tepecik, B. (2008). Sosyal bilgiler dersinde sorumluluk değerin kazandırılmasına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri (Yüksek lisans tezi, Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir). <http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/adresinden edinilmiştir>.
13. Whitney, I. B. (1986). The status of values education in the middle and junior high schools of Tennessee (Doctoral dissertation, Tennessee State University). Retrieved from <http://digitalscholarship.tnstate.edu/dissertations/AAI8802627>
14. Yazıcı, K. (2006). Değerler eğitime genel bir bakış. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları*, 19, 499-522.