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ABSTRACT

Aim: The present study was conducted to assess and compare the personal values among male adolescents in the families categorized under three groups based on their family income as Low-Level Income Group (LLIG), Medium-Level Income Group (MLIG) and High-Level Income Group (HLIG).

Sample: The total sample consisted of 90 male adolescents in the age group of 17-19 years from the two selected colleges of GB Pant University of Agriculture and Technology (College of Home Science and College of Agriculture), Pantnagar.

Sample Design: From the selected colleges, the students were randomly drawn under three classified groups within the age group irrespective of their degree program.

Sample Selection: The list of male students enrolled in I and II year (of both Agriculture and Home Science within the age group of 17-19 years) made was collected from the office of four colleges and scrutinised under three groups based on their family income. The sample of 30 male adolescent students was randomly selected under each group constituting the total sample of 90.
students. The Deans of both the colleges were personally contacted for seeking permission to have rapport and collect the information legally.

**Tools:** Self-structured general information questionnaire along with the Personal value questionnaire by Sherry and Verma [8] was administered to collect the data.

**Results:** The results revealed that the family income plays a crucial role in the personal values of adolescents. Except for social and religious values, the students from HLIG are having a significantly high level of personal values when compared to LLIG and MLIG. Hence, the higher the family income, the more focus on personal development and so the improved personal values of the younger generations.

**Conclusion:** We were able conclude that the family income plays a crucial role in the personal values of adolescents.

**Keywords:** Family income; personal values; adolescents; religious value; democratic value; social value.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The period of adolescence is remembered special for its energy level. The stage starts with the onset of puberty and ends before entering to adulthood and considered to be the transition period between childhood and adulthood. According to scientists, the range of adolescent age are 11-19 years containing early, middle and late adolescents as sub-stages in it. The term originated from Latin word “adolescere” meaning “to grow” or “to grow to maturity”. On entering in to this stage, the child will undergo radical changes in all the aspects like biological, cognitive, emotional, social, etc. These younger ones start worrying about their future and begin to over-think that who one is and one’s place in the larger social order. The fifth stage of Erikson is Puberty or genital stage in which most of the individual with the crisis of “Identity versus role confusion”. Since they are uncertain about themselves, they cling to peer groups very easily and identify with “in groups”. A teenager’s effort to make sense of the self is not “a kind of maturational malaise” [1]. Rather, it is the positive resolving of earlier named stages viz., trust, autonomy, initiative and industry. Since the male are always know for their strength, the society does not teach him to release the pent-up energy which make them live a pressurized life when compared to the female adolescents. The society concentrate the maturity and safety needs of the female where they unintentionally ignore the male society’s emotions, needs and problems due to their physical and emotional transitions. Just as adolescents usually feel tension between dependency on their own parents, the parents too have some mixed emotions. They want their children to be independent to look after their life yet, finding very emotional weak and hard to leave. This fine line of giving enough freedom and protecting them from immaturity sometimes overlap resulting in judgemental behaviour. Some children feel frustrated ending up with delinquent behaviour when the parenting is hard and cold.

According to Kumari et al. [2] personality of a human being is evolved from the biological and environmental factors in the form of behaviours, cognitions and emotional patterns. Bowlby [3] has reported in his study that children face a lot of adjustment problems due to lack of parental love which in later stages would be manifested in the form of irresponsibility, lack of initiative and dependency. The positive behaviour patterns will be facilitated by a healthy parent-child relationship, which would end-up in enhanced positive self-concept and reduction of indiscipline in an adolescent. Most adolescents “excel in most areas of their lives when they simply feel that come from loving home with responsive parents” [4]. Still although adolescents are different from young children, authoritative parenting seems to work best [5]. These parenting styles and approach sometimes get curtailed by the society’s gossips and other negative view on family. So, irrespective of the family income the parents of all families think to dominate their children’s broad ideas in order to protect them from going wrong and delinquent behaviour.

Parallelly on the other side, in today’s time of struggle and existence, an intellectual ignore is being monitored in moral and social values. Modernization has an escort to the surfacing of high-class life style, and raised living standard of people. A set of values may be placed in to the notion of a value system. These values are inculcated in the childhood, influenced by other social factors and transferred in to later stages.
These values give meaning and strength to a person’s character by occupying the central place in his life by reflecting one’s personal attitude, judgements, decision, choice, behaviour, relationships, dreams and vision. Bradley and Crowyn [6] have reported in their study that the economic stress caused by the poverty has high negative impacts on familial interactions, quality of parenting and the adjustment of the child. The human values have been modified as good or bad based on the society they live. Human being started chasing money rather than social and moral values. But the personal values will remain constant unless and until it is influenced by any factors like economic situation of the family, medical issues in the family or in the individual itself, parents’ educational status or occupation of their parents. Similarly, Zentner and Bates [7] have said that not only for the adolescent from economically under-privileged home the privileges and enriching experiences are denied but also, his life also is greatly affected by parental ambitions. Human beings are social animals. We all of us are born and brought up in the same society. The impact would therefore will be there strongly on our behaviour and personal values. As discussed before, the factors are school, family, home environment, neighbourhood, peer group influence, birth order and social acceptance. So, an attempt was made to investigate the influence of family income on personal values of adolescents with the following objectives:

1. To assess personal values of adolescents from families of Low, Medium and High-level income group.
2. To investigate the statistical differences of adolescents from families of Low, Medium and High-level income group.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Locale

The sample for the present study was drawn from the two selected colleges (College of Home Science and College of Agriculture) of GB Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand.

2.2 Sample Size

The sample of 90 male adolescents was selected under three broadly classified income group viz., Low level income group (LLIG), Medium level income group (MLIG) and High-level income group (HLIG). The sample of 30 students was randomly drawn under each category irrespective of their degree programme.

2.3 Sample Selection

The list of male students enrolled in I and II year (of both Agriculture and Home Science within the age group of 17-19 years) made was collected from the office of four colleges and scrutinised under three groups based on their family income. The sample of 30 male adolescent students was randomly selected under each group constituting the total sample of 90 students. The Deans of both the colleges were personally contacted for seeking permission to have rapport and collect the information legally.

2.4 Tools

(i) Self structured general information sheet: This sheet was used to collect the basic information on Socio-economic and socio-demographic characteristics of the adolescents like name, age, sex, educational status, family income, place of residence, etc.

(ii) Personal value questionnaire [8]: The personal values of the adolescents were measured by Personal value questionnaire constructed by Sherry and Verma [8] containing ten dimensions such as Religious value, Social value, Democratic value, Aesthetic value, Economic value, Hedonistic value, Knowledge value, Power value, Health value and Family prestige value. It has a total of 40 items distributed under 10 dimensions.

2.5 Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics and ANOVA one way was used to analyse the data.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The tabulated data from Table 1 accentuates the frequency and percentage distribution of personal values among the male adolescents across different family income.

It clearly explains that majority of the students from LLIG (56.67%) and MLIG (56.67%) poses high level of religious value when compared to the students from HLIG (56.67%) whose values fall under medium level. But, in the case of social value dimension, values are
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Table 1. Frequency distribution of personal values of adolescents with respect to their family income

| Dimensions          | Levels | Adolescents (n=90) | LLIG (n=30) | MLIG (n=30) | HLIG (n=30) |
|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     |        |                    | f* %        | f %         | f %         |
| Religious value     | **L    | 1 3.33             | 1 3.33      | 11 36.67    |
|                     | ***M   | 12 40              | 12 40       | 17 56.67    |
|                     | *V     | 17 56.67           | 17 56.67    | 2 6.67      |
| Social value        | L      | 10 33.33           | -           | 8 26.67     |
|                     | M      | 13 43.33           | 15 50       | 19 63.33    |
|                     | H      | 7 23.33            | 15 50       | 3 10        |
| Democratic value    | L      | 20 66.67           | 13 43.33    | 7 23.33     |
|                     | M      | 10 33.33           | 13 43.33    | 16 53.33    |
|                     | H      | -                  | 4 13.33     | 7 23.33     |
| Aesthetic value     | L      | -                  | 15 50       | 2 6.67      |
|                     | M      | 30 100             | 12 40       | 12 40       |
|                     | H      | -                  | 3 10        | 16 53.33    |
| Economic value      | L      | -                  |            | 13 43.33    |
|                     | M      | 13 43.33           | 17 56.67    | 12 40       |
|                     | H      | 17 56.67           | 11 36.67    | 5 16.67     |
| Knowledge value     | L      | 5 16.67            | 10 33.33    | 3 10        |
|                     | M      | 13 43.33           | 9 30.00     | 13 43.33    |
|                     | H      | 12 40              | 11 36.67    | 14 46.67    |
| Hedonistic value    | L      | 13 43.33           | -           | 10 33.33    |
|                     | M      | 12 40              | 11 36.67    | 15 50       |
|                     | H      | 5 16.67            | 19 63.33    | 5 16.67     |
| Power value         | L      | 20 66.67           | -           | 4 13.33     |
|                     | M      | 10 33.33           | -           | 10 33.33    |
|                     | H      | 0                  | 30 100      | 16 53.33    |
| Family prestige value | L   | 19 63.33           | 15 50       | 1 3.33      |
|                     | M      | 7 23.33            | 11 36.67    | 15 50.00    |
|                     | H      | 4 13.33            | 4 13.33     | 19 63.33    |
| Health value        | L      | 17 56.67           | 12 40       | 4 13.33     |
|                     | M      | 12 40              | 18 60       | 15 50.00    |
|                     | H      | 1 3.33             | -           | 11 36.67    |

*Frequency; f; **low: l; ***medium: m; *high: h

distributed in different way. The adolescents from HLIG (63.33%) followed by MLIG (50%) and LLIG (43.33%) found to fall under medium level of social values in which the adolescents from MLIG (50%), were also found to be equally distributed in high level social value. On coming to the next dimension which is Democratic value, the adolescents from LLIG (66.67%) were identified with low level of democratic value followed by the students from HLIG (53.33%) having medium level and the students from MLIG were found to have medium (43.33%) and low (43.33%) level of democratic value. Likewise, the distribution found under Aesthetic value was also quite different. The students from LLIG (100%) were found to have medium level followed by HLIG (53.33%) having high level of aesthetic value and students from MLIG (50%) were having medium level of aesthetic value. On moving to the next sub-scale economic value, the proportionate distribution was found in a descending order preceding high level in LLIG (56.67%) followed by the same proportion but in the medium level in MLIG (56.67) and low level in HLIG (43.33). However, in the knowledge value dimension, it was found that most of the students were having medium and high level of knowledge value. Among them, adolescents came from HLIG (46.67%) found to have high level of knowledge value followed by medium level in LLIG (43.33%) and finally high level in MLIG (36.67%). Surprisingly, in LLIG, all the students were found to have low level of all the remaining values. The sequence as followed as power value (66.67%), family prestige value (63.33%), health value (56.67%) and last
Table 2. Mean scores of the personal values of adolescents across their family income

| Dimensions          | LLIG       | MLIG       | HLIG       | F Cal. |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------|
|                     | Mean      | SD.        | Mean      | SD.    | Mean      | SD.    |
| Religious value     | 15.97\(^a\) | 3.25       | 14.75\(^b\) | 1.51   | 10.91\(^c\) | 1.49   | 7.02*   |
| Social value        | 10.33\(^b\) | 0.23       | 17.22\(^b\) | 2.03   | 11.28\(^b\) | 2.29   | 8.63*   |
| Democratic value    | 10.18\(^a\) | 1.12       | 18.12\(^c\) | 1.22   | 23.12\(^b\) | 1.55   | 11.23** |
| Aesthetic value     | 11.23\(^b\) | 0.29       | 9.32\(^a\)  | 1.51   | 20.99\(^b\) | 2.48   | 12.58** |
| Economic value      | 13.52\(^b\) | 2.01       | 12.60\(^c\) | 1.67   | 9.97\(^c\)  | 3.65   | 7.22*   |
| Knowledge value     | 11.72\(^b\) | 1.64       | 13.34\(^c\) | 1.32   | 17.13\(^c\) | 1.58   | 8.41*   |
| Hedonistic value    | 9.70\(^a\)  | 1.91       | 7.15\(^b\)  | 3.21   | 19.40\(^b\) | 1.51   | 7.33*   |
| Power value         | 6.25\(^a\)  | 2.21       | 15.51\(^c\) | 2.22   | 19.95\(^c\) | 2.56   | 9.63**  |
| Family prestige value | 9.73\(^a\) | 1.77       | 9.24\(^b\)  | 1.64   | 20.24\(^c\) | 3.21   | 10.57** |
| Health value        | 9.83\(^a\)  | 1.52       | 10.56\(^b\) | 1.98   | 16.66\(^b\) | 1.97   | 9.94**  |

Note: 1. **p<0.01, *p<0.05
2. Higher the score, higher the personal values
3. Means with different superscriptions show significant differences. (a- Low, b- Medium and c- High)

Fig. 1. Mean score distribution of the personal values on different dimensions across family income

The data unveils that except religious, social and economic value, the adolescents from HLIG are highly personalized when compared with LLIG and MLIG. Mishra [9] who expressed that the ambiguity of values that adolescents observe in the adult world, the absence of powerful role models, increasing gaps between aspirations and possible achievements, not surprisingly, lead to alienation and identity diffusion. Parents themselves appeared ill-prepared to cope up with the social changes, having grown up in hierarchically structured and interlinked social and caste groups that provided stability. The adolescents from LLIG are having significantly

hedonistic value (43.33%). On comparing the students from MLIG and HLIG, most of the students found to have medium and high level of hedonistic, power and heath values except in the case of family prestige value in which the MLIG (50%) students were falling under low level family prestige value. Data from Table 2 depicts the mean scores of personal values among male adolescents across family income.
high level of religious and economic value whereas the students from MLIG are high significantly differing in social value. Among the sub-scales, religious (F-value= 7.02; p<0.05), social (F-value= 8.63; p<0.05), economic (F-value= 7.22; p<0.05), knowledge (F-value= 8.41; p<0.05) and hedonistic (F-value= 7.33; p<0.05) values are significantly high whereas democratic (F-value= 11.23; p<0.01), aesthetic (F-value= 12.58; p<0.01), power (F-value= 9.63; p<0.01), family prestige (F-value= 10.57; p<0.01) and health values (F-value= 9.94; p<0.01) are significantly very high.

4. CONCLUSION

From the result we can clearly conclude that the family income plays a crucial role in the personal values of adolescents. Except social and religious values, the students from HLIG are having significantly high level of personal values when compared to LLIG and MLIG. Similar results were found by Bhutia [10] who reported that boys were more democratic in nature and believed in partiality and social justice. The girls were more concerned about keeping their body fit and gave importance to good physical health. This mainly could be the carelessness due to lack of money in the families with LLIG and MLIG. On considering the HLIG, the need for money and chasing behind that would be comparatively less so, the parents of HLIG would automatically concentrate and help in overall development of their children. Akee et al. [11] reported that they have found a larger benefit in different aspects of the adolescents like emotional, behavioural and personality traits. They also quoted that the intervention in income also would end up in improved parent-child relationship. The results from the data apparently shows that money cannot change a person, rather chasing behind would seriously change his or her approach to view and behave to this world. Another study by Nidhi and Jyoti [12] also reveals that survey conducted in a college showed that the students preferred economic and per vales very high when compared to hedonistic and aesthetic values. Values play a crucial role in determining human behaviour and social relationships as well as maintaining and regulating social structure and interactions on the one hand and giving them cohesion and stability on the other hand [13]. The results would also help the human personnel to understand the interplay between gender in different combinations in determining personal values and modernization effect on adolescent and accordingly formulate strategies for creating encouraging environment at home to help adolescents grow at home.
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