

# The status of value orientation among rural and urban adolescents

■ Manpreet Kaur\* and Tejpreet Kaur Kang

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana (Punjab) India  
(Email : manpreetjkbro@gmail.com)

## ARTICLE INFO :

Received : 08.07.2020  
Revised : 17.08.2020  
Accepted : 11.09.2020

## KEY WORDS :

Values, Value orientation

## HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE :

Kaur, Manpreet and Kang, Tejpreet Kaur (2020). The status of value orientation among rural and urban adolescents. *Adv. Res. J. Soc. Sci.*, 11 (2): 47-53, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/ARJSS/11.2/47-53. Copyright © 2020: Hind Agricultural Society

\*Author for correspondence

## ABSTRACT

The present study entitled 'the status of value orientation among rural and urban adolescents' was undertaken in the Ludhiana and Kapurthala districts of Punjab. The study was designed to assess the status of value orientation among rural and urban adolescents. The sample for the present study comprised of 480 adolescents within the age group of 16-18 years [boys (n=120) and girls (n=120) from rural (n=120) as well as urban area (n=120)]. Personal Value Questionnaire by Sherry and Verma was used to assess the value orientation of adolescents. The scale consisted of 40 items representing ten types of values namely Religious Values, Social Values, Democratic Values, Aesthetic Values, Economic Values, Knowledge Values, Hedonistic Values, Power Values, Family Prestige Values and Health Values. Results revealed that more number of urban females were having high level of aesthetic value, knowledge value, power value and health value whereas more number of rural females had high level of social value and total value orientation. More number of rural males were having high level of power value and health value. More number of rural respondents had low level of aesthetic value in value orientation as compared to urban respondents.

## INTRODUCTION

Values are socially approved drives and goals that are internalized through the process of learning socialization process. Values are considered to be organizing factors with in personality and especially important to moral character. Life with values is always meaningful. Moreover it means literally something precious, something dear, something for which one is ready to suffer, to sacrifice for and it is indeed valuable to die for. Broudy (1975) gave seven areas of values *i.e.* economic, health, bodily and recreational, social, moral,

aesthetic, intellectual and religious. Each value area has a subjective and an objective aspect.

Sometimes we speak of values from individual experience of satisfaction and sometimes values refer to some property or quality of the object or of an act, as value is a relation between an organism and an object.

Personal values develops from circumstances with the outside world and might alternate over time. Morality in the utility of values refers to its continuity; folks have integrity if they practice their values as it should be irrespective of arguments or negative reinforcement from others. Values are applied as it should be when they may

be implemented within the right area. For an instance, it might be suitable to apply religious values in times of happiness as well as in times of despair. Personal values are implicitly related to preference, they guide decisions by way of taking into account a person's alternatives to be in comparison to every desire's related values. Personal values are emerged from early in life and it is resistant to change. They're derived from the one's particular groups or structures, such as lifestyle, religion, and political party. But, personal values aren't ordinary, one's genes, family, country and historic surroundings help deciding one's personal values. The value concepts of ourselves are not usual, simply that each individual possess a unique idea of it *i.e.* a personal expertise of an appropriate values for his or her own genes, feelings and experience. So values vary from individual to individual and from group to group (Kluckhohn, 1965).

A value can be defined in phrases of one's ideals about the proper as in opposition to those which are unwanted or less suited. It follows that a value serves to provide a basic set of requirements or standards that guide human thoughts and actions. Through socialization processes, cultural, institutional, societal and personal forces act upon the character and form the man or woman's values and cultural persona. Values are, consequently, social and cultural products. Person in any given society gains and interiorize via socialization, the beliefs, attitudes and values of that society, the acceptable dreams and appropriate modes of conducts which might be to sure quantity ordained via that society. In every tradition or society, values mirror assumptions of people they keep about man and globe he lives in. In the present world of developmental activity and continuous changes, the value emphasis is on materialism, wealth, success and luxury. However, these created losses of faith, doubt and confusion. Value orientation means the fundamentals of true and false that are acquired by a personal or a social group ([www.free-dictionary.com](http://www.free-dictionary.com)). It is a set of interwoven values that form a system and strengthen everyone.

Value orientation performs a critical role in selection making and preference making process. In truth each human action is the mirrored image of personal or social values. Lecky (1994), talked about that once values are incorporated into the persona they act as barriers to the recognition of new ones which would possibly in opposition to the values of the humans. The humans will no longer

undertake it and as a result the values of peoples act as obstacles to change. Value orientation, represents person's hierarchical system of values determining the orientation of a person or the selectiveness of his behaviour. Kuzmanovic (1995) assumes that value orientations are wide, less articulated device of beliefs, respectively incredibly consistent and sufficient coherently directed to certain categories of the goals.

The development of value orientations is a sign of maturity of the person, an indicator of the degree of socialization of the individual. The stable and consistent structure of value orientation reasons improvement of such capabilities of character like integrity, self assurance, loyalty closer to positive ideas and ideals and energetic lifestyles function. Instability, however, creates inconsistency in behaviour. Underdevelopment of value orientations is a sign of infantilism (Golub, 2009). Value orientations in adolescents are gradually formed in the process of his or her socialization by reaching through of social information in the individual - psychological world of the adolescent. Forming of a system of value orientations is a process of person building and such system shows up to be a remedy for conducting of certain social goals. In modern conditions, the process of forming of value orientations in young generations takes place in the context of reforms happening in society. These changes not only lead to changes in economic relations, but also directly affect the spiritual climate and interpersonal relations (Sogolu, 2003).

### Methods and procedure:

The sample comprised of 480 adolescents in the age range of 16-18 years, studying in 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> classes. The sample was divided to have equal number of boys (n=120) and girls (n=120) from rural (n=120) as well as urban area (n=120). The samples were equally taken in a group of 240 each from Ludhiana and Kapurthala districts. For each district, 120 samples were taken from two schools falling each in urban and rural area.

Personal Value Questionnaire by Sherry and Verma (1994) was used to assess the value orientation of adolescents. The scale consisted of 40 items representing ten types of values namely Religious Values, Social Values, Democratic Values, Aesthetic Values, Economic Values, Knowledge Values, Hedonistic Values, Power Values, Family Prestige Values and Health Values. The scale was translated into Punjabi so that adolescents could easily

understand the statements. Each question had three options and subjects were asked to respond to each item. High scores were interpreted as high values and low score as low values of the respondents.

across different levels of value orientation among female respondents. The results indicated that 55 per cent of rural respondents and 49.2 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 15.8 per cent and 19.2 per cent were at medium, 29.2 per cent of rural respondents and 31.7 per cent of urban respondents were at low levels of religious value, respectively. 57.5 per cent of rural respondents and 51.7 per cent of urban respondents were at high,

## OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Table 1 reveals locale- wise per cent distribution

Table 1: Locale- wise per cent distribution across different levels of value orientation among female respondents/adolescents								
Dimensions	Levels	Female				Z- value	Total (n=240)	
		Rural (n <sub>1</sub> =120)		Urban (n <sub>2</sub> =120)			f	%
		f	%	f	%			
Religious value	Low	35	29.2	38	31.7	0.421	73	30.4
	Medium	19	15.8	23	19.2	0.680	42	17.5
	High	66	55.0	59	49.2	0.904	125	52.1
Social value	Low	34	28.3	42	35.0	0.163	76	31.7
	Medium	17	14.2	16	13.3	0.792	33	13.8
	High	69	57.5	62	51.7	2.744**	131	54.6
Democratic value	Low	44	36.7	34	28.3	1.378	78	32.5
	Medium	23	19.2	19	15.8	0.680	42	17.5
	High	53	44.2	67	55.8	1.807	120	50.0
Aesthetic value	Low	73	60.8	37	30.8	4.663**	110	45.8
	Medium	12	10.0	29	24.2	2.915**	41	17.1
	High	35	29.2	54	45.0	2.539**	89	37.1
Economic value	Low	39	32.5	39	32.5	0.000	78	32.5
	Medium	20	16.7	19	15.8	0.175	39	16.3
	High	61	50.8	62	51.7	0.129	123	51.3
Knowledge value	Low	48	40.0	23	19.2	3.535**	71	29.6
	Medium	9	7.5	16	13.3	1.479	25	10.4
	High	63	52.5	81	67.5	2.371*	144	60.0
Hedonistic value	Low	53	44.2	47	39.2	0.786	100	41.7
	Medium	37	30.8	37	30.8	0.000	74	30.8
	High	30	25.0	36	30.0	0.867	66	27.5
Power value	Low	56	46.7	49	40.8	0.911	105	43.8
	Medium	41	34.2	27	22.5	2.005*	68	28.3
	High	23	19.2	44	36.7	3.021*	67	27.9
Family prestige value	Low	39	32.5	35	29.2	0.559	74	30.8
	Medium	21	17.5	27	22.5	0.968	48	20.0
	High	60	50.0	58	48.3	0.258	118	49.2
Health value	Low	76	63.3	68	56.7	1.054	144	60.0
	Medium	24	20.0	16	13.3	1.386	40	16.7
	High	20	16.7	36	30.0	2.441*	56	23.3
Total	Low	9	7.5	34	28.3	4.208**	43	17.9
	Medium	86	71.7	76	63.3	1.378	162	67.5
	High	111	92.5	86	71.7	4.208**	197	82.1

\* and \*\* indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

14.2 per cent and 13.3 per cent medium, 28.3 per cent and thirty-five per cent were at low levels of social value. In case of democratic value, 44.2 per cent of rural respondents and 55.8 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 19.2 per cent and 15.8 per cent medium, 36.7 per cent and 28.3 per cent were at low level, respectively. 29.2 per cent of rural respondents and 45.0 per cent of total urban respondents were at high, ten per cent and 24.2 per cent medium, 60.8 per cent and 30.8 per cent were at low level of aesthetic value. 50.8 per cent of rural respondents and 51.7 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 16.7 per cent and 15.8 per cent medium, 32.5 per cent and 32.5 per cent were at low level of economic value. Higher percentage of urban respondents possessed high level of knowledge value as compared to rural respondents, *i.e.* 67.5 per cent in urban respondents and 52.5 per cent in rural respondents. The locale differences were found to be significant. Whereas 7.5 per cent of rural respondents and 13.3 per cent of girls were at medium, forty per cent and 19.2 per cent were at low levels in case of knowledge value. In hedonistic value twenty-five per cent of rural respondents and thirty per cent of urban respondents were at high, 30.8 per cent and 30.8 per cent were at medium, 44.2 per cent and 39.2 per cent were at low levels. 19.2 per cent of rural respondents and 36.7 per cent of total girls were at high, 34.2 per cent and 22.5 per cent medium, 46.7 per cent and 40.8 per cent were at low levels of power values. Fifty per cent of rural respondents and 48.3 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 17.5 per cent and 22.5 per cent medium, 32.5 per cent and 29.2 per cent were at low level of family prestige value. 16.7 per cent and thirty per cent of rural respondents and urban respondents were at high, twenty per cent and 13.3 per cent were at medium, 63.3 per cent and 56.7 per cent were at low levels of health value. In total values rural respondents were at high level of values *i.e.* (92.5%) than urban respondents (71.7%) per cent. Natasha (2013) reported that adolescents from urban and rural areas gave first preference to social values because both are resourceful and can translate virtues like love, sympathy and kindness into their behaviour.

Table 2 reveals locale-wise per cent distribution across different levels of value orientation among male respondents. The results indicated that 49.2 per cent of rural respondents and 43.3 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 24.2 per cent and 21.7 per cent medium,

26.7 per cent of rural respondents and thirty-five per cent of urban respondents were at low levels of religious value. 63.3 per cent of rural respondents and 60 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 12.5 per cent and 18.3 per cent medium, 24.2 per cent and 21.7 per cent were at low levels of social value. Forty-five per cent of rural respondents and 45.8 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 19.2 per cent and 13.3 per cent medium, 35.8 per cent and 40.8 per cent were at low level of democratic value. 35.8 per cent of rural respondents and 30.8 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 23.3 per cent and 30 per cent medium, 40.8 per cent and 39.2 per cent were at low level of aesthetic value. 54.2 per cent of rural respondents and forty-five per cent of urban respondents were at high, 23.3 per cent and 22.5 per cent medium, 22.5 per cent and 32.5 per cent were at low level of economic value. 55.8 per cent of rural respondents and 53.3 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 15 per cent and 14.2 per cent medium, 29.2 per cent and 32.5 per cent were at low levels of knowledge value. 28.3 per cent of rural respondents and 34.2 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 33.3 per cent and 31.7 per cent medium, 38.3 per cent and 34.2 per cent were at low levels of hedonistic value. Forty per cent of rural respondents and 23.3 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 23.3 per cent and 28.3 per cent medium, 36.7 per cent and 48.3 per cent were at low levels of power value. 54.2 per cent of rural respondents and 49.2 per cent of urban respondents were at high, twenty per cent and 23.3 per cent medium, 25.8 per cent and 27.5 per cent were at low levels of family prestige value. 26.7 per cent of rural respondents and 15.8 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 16.7 per cent and 30.8 per cent medium, 56.7 per cent and 53.3 per cent were at low levels of health value. In overall urban respondents were at high level of value orientation *i.e.* (83.3%) than rural respondents (79.2%).

Table 3 depicts overall locale-wise per cent distribution across different levels of value orientation among total respondents. The results indicated that 52.1 per cent of rural respondents and 46.3 per cent of urban respondents were at high, twenty per cent and 20.4 per cent medium, 27.9 per cent of rural respondents and 33.3 per cent of urban respondents were at low levels of religious value. 60.4 per cent of rural respondents and 55.8 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 13.3 per cent and 15.8 per cent medium, 26.3 per cent and

28.3 per cent were at low levels of social value. 44.6 per cent of rural respondents and 50.8 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 19.2 per cent and 14.6 per cent medium, 36.3 per cent and 34.6 per cent were at low level of democratic value. 32.5 per cent of rural respondents and 37.9 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 16.7 per cent and 27.1 per cent medium, 50.8 per cent and thirty-five per cent were at low level of aesthetic

value. 52.5 per cent of rural respondents and 48.3 per cent of urban respondents were at high, twenty per cent and 19.2 per cent medium, 27.5 per cent and 32.5 per cent were at low level of economic value. 54.2 per cent of rural respondents and 60.4 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 11.3 per cent and 13.8 per cent medium, 34.6 per cent and 25.8 per cent were at low levels of knowledge value. 26.7 per cent of rural

**Table 2: Locale-wise differences in per cent distribution of male respondents across different levels of value orientation**

Dimensions	Level	Male				Z- value	Total (n= 240)	
		Rural (n <sub>1</sub> =120)		Urban (n <sub>2</sub> =120)			f	%
		f	%	f	%			
Religious value	Low	32	26.7	42	35.0	1.398	74	30.8
	Medium	29	24.2	26	21.7	0.461	55	22.9
	High	59	49.2	52	43.3	0.906	111	46.3
Social value	Low	29	24.2	26	21.7	0.461	55	22.9
	Medium	15	12.5	22	18.3	1.251	37	15.4
	High	76	63.3	72	60.0	0.531	148	61.7
Democratic value	Low	43	35.8	49	40.8	0.797	92	38.3
	Medium	23	19.2	16	13.3	1.225	39	16.3
	High	54	45.0	55	45.8	0.130	109	45.4
Aesthetic value	Low	49	40.8	47	39.2	0.264	96	40.0
	Medium	28	23.3	36	30.0	1.168	64	26.7
	High	43	35.8	37	30.8	0.822	80	33.3
Economic value	Low	27	22.5	39	32.5	1.735	66	27.5
	Medium	28	23.3	27	22.5	0.154	55	22.9
	High	65	54.2	54	45.0	1.420	119	49.6
Knowledge value	Low	35	29.2	39	32.5	0.559	74	30.8
	Medium	18	15.0	17	14.2	0.183	35	14.6
	High	67	55.8	64	53.3	0.389	131	54.6
Hedonistic value	Low	46	38.3	41	34.2	0.671	87	36.3
	Medium	40	33.3	38	31.7	0.276	78	32.5
	High	34	28.3	41	34.2	0.975	75	31.3
Power value	Low	44	36.7	58	48.3	1.828	102	42.5
	Medium	28	23.3	34	28.3	0.885	62	25.8
	High	48	40.0	28	23.3	2.775**	76	31.7
Family prestige value	Low	31	25.8	33	27.5	0.292	64	26.7
	Medium	24	20.0	28	23.3	0.627	52	21.7
	High	65	54.2	59	49.2	0.775	124	51.7
Health value	Low	68	56.7	64	53.3	0.519	132	55.0
	Medium	20	16.7	37	30.8	2.578**	57	23.8
	High	32	26.7	19	15.8	2.051*	51	21.3
Total	Low	25	20.8	20	16.7	0.827	45	18.8
	Medium	25	20.8	20	16.7	0.827	45	18.8
	High	95	79.2	100	83.3	0.827	195	81.3

\* and \*\* indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

respondents and 32.1 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 32.1 per cent and 31.3 per cent medium, 41.3 per cent and 36.7 per cent were at low levels of hedonistic value. 29.6 per cent of rural respondents and 30.0 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 28.8 per cent and 25.4 per cent medium, 41.7 per cent and 44.6 per cent were at low levels of power value. 52.1 per cent of rural respondents and 48.8 per cent of urban respondents

were at high, 18.8 per cent and 22.9 per cent medium, 29.2 per cent and 28.3 per cent were at low levels of family prestige value. 21.7 per cent of rural respondents and 22.9 per cent of urban respondents were at high, 18.3 per cent and 22.1 per cent medium, sixty per cent and fifty-five per cent were at low levels of health value. In overall rural respondents were at high level of values *i.e.* 85.8 per cent than urban respondents (77.5 %) per

**Table 3 : Overall locale-wise per cent distribution of the respondents across various levels of value orientation**

Dimensions	Level	Rural (n <sub>1</sub> =240)		Urban (n <sub>2</sub> =240)		Z-value	Total (n= 480)	
		F	%	f	%		f	%
Religious value	Low	67	27.9	80	33.3	0.910	147	30.6
	Medium	48	20.0	49	20.4	0.080	97	20.2
	High	125	52.1	111	46.3	0.904	236	49.2
Social value	Low	63	26.3	68	28.4	0.362	131	27.3
	Medium	32	13.3	38	15.8	0.549	70	14.6
	High	145	60.4	134	55.8	0.720	279	58.1
Democratic value	Low	87	36.2	83	34.6	0.270	170	35.4
	Medium	46	19.2	35	14.6	0.948	81	16.9
	High	107	44.6	122	50.8	0.969	229	47.7
Aesthetic value	Low	122	50.8	84	35.0	2.477*	206	42.9
	Medium	40	16.7	65	27.1	1.952	105	21.9
	High	78	32.5	91	37.9	0.878	169	35.2
Economic value	Low	66	27.5	78	32.5	0.845	144	30.0
	Medium	48	20.0	46	19.2	0.163	94	19.6
	High	126	52.5	116	48.3	0.646	242	50.4
Knowledge value	Low	83	34.6	62	25.8	1.476	145	30.2
	Medium	27	11.3	33	13.8	0.586	60	12.5
	High	130	54.2	145	60.4	0.979	275	57.3
Hedonistic value	Low	99	41.2	88	36.7	0.728	187	39.0
	Medium	77	32.1	75	31.3	0.139	152	31.7
	High	64	26.7	77	32.1	0.921	141	29.4
Power value	Low	100	41.7	107	44.6	0.456	207	43.1
	Medium	69	28.8	61	25.4	0.581	130	27.1
	High	71	29.5	72	30.0	0.071	143	29.8
Family prestige value	Low	70	29.2	68	28.3	0.143	138	28.8
	Medium	45	18.8	55	22.9	0.795	100	20.8
	High	125	52.0	117	48.8	0.516	242	50.4
Health value	Low	144	60.0	132	55.0	0.783	276	57.5
	Medium	44	18.3	53	22.1	0.723	97	20.2
	High	52	21.7	55	22.9	0.233	107	22.3
Total	Low	20	11.8	27	20.2	1.668	39	10.4
	Medium	34	14.2	54	22.5	1.668	88	18.3
	High	186	74.0	159	57.3	1.668	353	71.3

\*indicate significance of value at P=0.05

cent.

## REFERENCES

---

- Broudy, H.S. (1965). *Building a philosophy of education*, Delhi. Prentice pp. 480.
- Golub (2009). The social and professional profile of natural and social scientists. In:K. prpic (Ed.): *Beyond The Myths About Natural And Social Sciences; A Sociological View*, Zagreb, pp. 23-87.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1965). *Education, values and anthropological relativity*. Culture and Behaviour, New York: The Free Press.
- Kuzmanovic, B. (1995). *Variations in value orientations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Leeky, P. (1994). *Self consistency*, New York. The Island Press.
- Natasha (2013). A comparative study of value pattern among adolescent. *Internat. J. Edu. Plann. Admin.*, **3**(1) : 75-79.
- Sherry, G.P. and Verma, R.P. (1994). *Personal value questionnaire : National Psychological Corporation*, Agra.
- Sogolub (2003). *Personal values and corporate strategies*. Harvard Business Review.

11<sup>th</sup>  
Year  
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★