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Abstract: The purpose of this research was to examine the impact of educational level of fathers on the value pattern of their children. Sample was selected from senior secondary schools of Himachal Pradesh (India) by using simple random sampling. The data was collected from the twelfth class students of the age group of 15-18 years. It was hypothesized that the students having different levels of their paternal education do not differ significantly in their value pattern with respect to political, economic, social and religious values. The statistical technique of two-way ANOVA was used to analyze the data. It has been found that Students with different levels of their paternal education differed significantly in their political value pattern scores. Students whose fathers were illiterate had significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers were educated up to higher level. In the same fashion, the students, whose fathers were educated up to primary and matriculation levels had significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers were educated up to higher level. The students with different levels of their fathers’ education did not differ significantly in their economic, social and religious value pattern scores. Paternal education and sex interact significantly with respect to political value pattern scores of students. However, paternal education and sex do not interact significantly with respect to economic, social and religious value pattern scores of students.
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INTRODUCTION

The nature of education of an individual is determined not only by his inherited powers and capacities but also in a great measure by the environment in which he grows up. In case of Indian civilization it is the oldest and richest with a great deal of diversity in thoughts, beliefs, and creeds and, a deep and general appreciation of values. In the beginning years of individual’s life, parental education constitutes an essential determining factor in development and self-construction. It has rightly been observed that, educating a man means educating an individual but educating a woman means educating her children. Parental education constitutes an essential determining factor in development and self-construction. What the parents communicate in the process of primary socialization appears to the child to be the components of an only world possible. Although the child does not remain passive in socialization, it does not choose its educational partners and, indeed, it is those partners who define the content which is passed on to the child.

Today’s children are the citizens, voters, parents and teachers of tomorrow. The adequacy and quality of their future service and leadership are being determined by the extent to which they are becoming intelligently self-directive. One of the most important factors in the development of this quality is the formation of a wholesome, socially desirable pattern of values or operational principles guiding actions.

Parental education is the major factor which has a great influence on the overall development of the personality of the individual. Parental education includes educational level of father and mother. Educational status of the parents leaves indelible impression on the career aspiration of the children. In the family, education of father is crucial, because it influences all the family members in one-way or the other. Educational status of the parents may affect the socio-economic life of the students. Education plays an important role in shaping the values and attitudes of an individual. It is very important to quote here that the education of mother is much more vital in the process of socialization of the children. Children being closed to their mothers from the very young age (birth) are more influenced by their educational levels.

Kapoor and Puniah (1997) observed that as the educational level of the respondents’ parents goes up, the relative percentage of the students for higher studies also increases. This might be due to the fact that educated parents consider higher education a status symbol and a remunerative proposition. Educated parents seemed to have guided their children in...
a right perspective to get the higher education in future. Diwedi (1983) found that (I) the place of residence i.e. rural or urban had a close relationship with values; religious, ethico-cultural, political and educational. (ii) girls were more religious, ethical, cultured and keenly interested in societal problems as compared to the boys. On the other hand boys were higher in political values than those of girls. Dingman (2003) found that students develop academic and personal skills, including critical thinking and ability to take initiative. They increased their values of community involvement in their personnel and professional lives. Not least, students’ attitudes towards their role as a volunteer, the effectiveness of service and people of diverse backgrounds were affected.

Value pattern is the important constituent of the personality of an individual. Values are guiding principles, which are conducive to one’s physical, social, and mental health and which enable the individual to make notable adjustment with the environment (Singh, 2004). In fact, values are beliefs upon which man acts by preference. Realizing the importance of fathers’ education in the life of a child and its impact on the value pattern of the new generation, it becomes essential to analyze the paternal education and value pattern of the adolescents. Keeping in mind the above discussion the researcher conducted a study on the following objectives:

1. To study the difference in the value pattern of students at different levels of their paternal education with respect to:
   i. Political values.
   ii. Economic Values.
   iii. Social Values.
   iv. Religious values.

2. To study the significance of difference in the value pattern scores of male and female students with respect to:
   i. Political values.
   ii. Economic Values.
   iii. Social Values.
   iv. Religious values.

3. To study the interactional effect of paternal education and sex on the value pattern of students with respect to:
   i. Political values.
   ii. Economic Values.
   iii. Social Values.
   iv. Religious values.

**HYPOTHESES**

Observing the nature of the study in hand the following null hypotheses were formed.

1. Students with different levels of their paternal education do not differ significantly in their value pattern with respect to:
   i. Political Values.
   ii. Economic Values.
   iii. Social Values.
   iv. Religious Values.

2. Male and female students do not differ significantly in their value pattern scores with regard to:
   i. Political values.
   ii. Economic Values.
   iii. Social Values.
   iv. Religious values.

3. Paternal education and sex do not interact significantly in terms of the value pattern of students with respect to:
   i. Political Values.
METHOD

Sample: The sample consisted of male and female students studying in senior secondary schools of Himachal Pradesh, India. Owing to the vast educational diversity among the fathers of the adolescents, the sample was selected using simple random sampling and data was gathered from the adolescents studying in twelfth class.

Tool: The ‘Value Pattern Scale’ by Singh and Singh (2004) was used to measure the value pattern of students. This test consists of 58 items and each item is meant to study the political, economic, social and religious value patterns of the subjects. The split-half reliability coefficients for the political, economic, social and religious values in the value pattern scale were 0.74, 0.88, 0.64 and 0.90 respectively. The test-retest reliability coefficients for political, economic, social and religious value in the value pattern scale were 0.69, 0.72, 0.59 and 0.82 respectively. The content, criterion and construct validity of the scale was also found out. Positive relationship with criterion test signifies that the present test has the power to measure the dominance of a particular value as determined by Ojha’s Study of Values Test (1970). Also, the dominant value preferences exhibited by the contrasted groups (politicians, businessmen, social workers and religious persons), showed that value pattern test has construct validity, to differentiate people in terms of their preferences for political, economic, social and religious values.

Procedure: The value pattern test was administrated to the selected students. Respondents were asked to read all the four alternatives of each item and rank those in order of preferences. Data were tabulated as per requirement in 4x2 factorial design involving 4 levels of paternal education i.e. illiterate, primary, matriculation & higher and 2 levels of sex i.e. male and female keeping in view the objectives of the study. In order to study the main effects of paternal education and sex along with their interactional effect on the political, economic, social and religious value pattern of students, statistical technique of analysis of variance (4x2 factorial design involving 4 levels of paternal education i.e. illiterate, primary, matriculation & higher and 2 levels of sex i.e. male and female) was applied on the means of political, economic, social and religious value pattern scores respectively. The analysis of variance was followed by t-test in order to find out the significance of difference in different pairs of comparison, because f-value was found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance.

FINDINGS

1. MAIN EFFECTS

(a1) Paternal Education and Political Value Pattern of Students:- The computed value of ‘F’ for the main effect of paternal education on the political value pattern scores of students, irrespective of their sex, for df 3 and 1002, came out to be 3.29, which is higher than the table value (2.60) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis 1(i) that “The students with different levels of their paternal education do not differ significantly in their political value pattern scores” was rejected. Hence it may be interpreted that students differ significantly in their political value pattern at different levels of their paternal education. It may be said that the students differ significantly in their means of political value pattern scores at different levels of their paternal education. Further, to find out the differences in the means of political value pattern scores of students at different levels of their paternal education, ‘t’ test was applied. The results are shown in Table-III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Pairs of Comparison</th>
<th>Paternal Education and Political Value Pattern</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td>Standard Error of the Difference Between Means</td>
<td>‘t’ Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Illiterate-Primary</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Illiterate-Matriculation</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE-III: Pairs of Comparison, Mean Differences, Standard Error of the Difference Between Means and ‘t’ Ratios.
The obtained value of ‘t’ for comparing the means of political value pattern scores of students whose fathers are illiterate and those whose fathers are educated up to higher level, for df 614, came out to be 3.07, which is greater than the table value even at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it may be interpreted that the students whose fathers are illiterate have significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher level. Similarly, the calculated value of ‘t’ for comparing the means of political value pattern scores of students whose fathers are educated up to primary level and those whose fathers are educated up to higher level, for df 620, came out to be 2.35, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, it may be interpreted that the students whose fathers are educated up to primary level have significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher level. In the same manner, the observed value of ‘t’ for comparing the means of political value pattern scores of students whose fathers are matriculates and those whose fathers are educated up to higher level, for df 944, came out to be 5.62, which is significant even at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it may be interpreted that the students whose fathers are matriculates have significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher level. The pairs of comparison i.e. illiterate - primary, illiterates – matriculation and primary - matriculation do not differ significantly in their political value pattern scores.

It may be concluded that students having illiterate fathers have significantly higher means of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher levels. Students whose fathers are educated up to primary level have significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher levels of education. Similarly, the students with matriculate fathers also have significantly higher mean of political value scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher level of education.

(a2) Paternal Education and Economic Value Pattern of Students:- The computed value of ‘F’ for the main effect of paternal education on the economic value pattern of students, irrespective of their sex, for df 3 and 1002, came out to be 0.89, which is much below the table value (2.60) even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis number 1(ii) that “The students with different levels of their paternal education do not differ significantly in their economic value pattern scores” was accepted. However, it is evident from table-1, that the students whose fathers are highly educated have highest mean of economic value pattern scores (125.52) followed by those whose fathers are educated up to primary level (123.11), matriculation (121.13) and illiterates (119.98), but these differences are not significant statistically.

(a3) Paternal Education and Social Value Pattern of Students:- The computed value of ‘F’ for the main effect of paternal education on the social value pattern scores of students, irrespective of their sex, for df 3 and 1002, came out to be 1.05, which is much below the table value (2.60) even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis number 1(iii) that “The students with different levels of their paternal education do not differ significantly in their social value pattern scores” was accepted. However, from the means table-1, it is evident that students whose fathers are illiterates have highest mean of social value pattern scores (169.43) followed by those whose fathers have studied up to higher level (166.85), matriculation level (165.59) and primary level (165.19) respectively, but these differences are not significant statistically.

(a4) Paternal Education and Religious Value Pattern of Students:- The computed value of ‘F’ for the main effect of paternal education on the religious value pattern scores of students, irrespective of their sex, for df 3 and 1002, came out to be 1.67, which is much below the table value (2.60) even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis number 1(iv) that “The students with different levels of their paternal education do not differ significantly in their religious value pattern scores” was accepted. However, from the means table-1, it is evident that students whose fathers have received education up to matriculation level have highest means of religious value pattern scores (152.94) followed by those whose fathers are
educated up to higher level (152.68), primary (150.94) and illiterates (145.89) respectively, but, these differences are not significant statistically.

(b) Sex: - The calculated value of ‘F’ for the main effect of sex on the political and religious value pattern scores of students, irrespective of the level of their paternal education, for df 1 and 1002, came out to be 0.38 and 3.14 respectively, which are both below the table value (3.84) even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis number 2(i and iv) that, “The male and female students do not differ significantly in their (i) political and (iv) religious value pattern” were accepted. However, it is evident from the means table-1, that male students have higher mean of political value pattern scores (140.40) than their female counterparts (139.12), whereas, female students have higher means of religious value pattern scores (152.86) than their male counterparts (148.37) but these differences are not significant statistically.

The calculated value of ‘F’ for the main effect of sex on the economic and social value pattern scores of students, irrespective of the level of their paternal education, for df 1 and 1002, came out to be 4.21 and 5.92 respectively, which were higher than the table value (3.84) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis number 2(ii and iii) that, “The male and female students do not differ significantly in their (ii) economic and (iii) social value pattern” were rejected. From the means table-1, it may be interpreted that male students have significantly higher means of economic value pattern scores (125.06) than their female counterparts (119.80), but on the other hand, female students have significantly higher mean of social value pattern scores (169.03) than their male counterparts (164.50).

2. INTERACTIONAL EFFECT (PARENTAL EDUCATION & SEX)

The obtained value of ‘F’ for the interactional effect of paternal education and sex on the political value pattern scores of students, for df 3 and 1002, came out to be 2.84, which is higher than the table value (2.60) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis number 3(i) that, “Paternal education and sex do not interact significantly with regard to the political value pattern of students” was rejected. It may be interpreted that the magnitude of the differences in the means of political value pattern scores of students at different levels of their paternal education i.e. illiterate, primary, matriculation and higher are not the same within the limits of random variations for male and female students. The significant interactional effect of paternal education and sex is also shown in figure-1.

FIGURE-1: Interaction of Paternal Education and Sex with respect to Political Value Pattern Scores of Students
The obtained value of ‘F’ for the interactional effect of paternal education and sex on the economic, social and religious value pattern scores of students, for df 3 and 1002, came out to be 0.19, 0.56 and 0.13 respectively, which are much below the table value (2.60) even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis number 3(ii, iii & iv) that, “Paternal education and sex do not interact significantly with respect to economic, social and religious value pattern scores” was accepted. It may be interpreted that there are approximately the same differences in the means of economic, social and religious value pattern scores of students at different levels of their paternal education i.e. illiterate, primary, matriculation and higher regardless of their gender i.e. male and female.

CONCLUSION

From the above analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that the students differ significantly in their value pattern scores at different levels of their paternal education with respect to the political values. Students with different levels of their paternal education differ significantly in their political value pattern scores. Students whose fathers are illiterate have significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher level. In the same fashion, students whose fathers are educated up to primary and matriculation levels have significantly higher mean of political value pattern scores than those whose fathers are educated up to higher level. The students with different levels of their fathers’ education do not differ significantly in their economic, social and religious value pattern scores. The results were found to be in partial agreement and partial disagreement with Singh (1982), Annamma (1984) and Leela (1988) who found that there is no significant difference in the value pattern of students at different levels of their parental education. Paternal education and sex interact significantly with respect to political value pattern scores of students. However, paternal education and sex do not interact significantly with respect to economic, social and religious value pattern scores of students.
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TABLE I: Means of Political, Economic, Social & Religious Value Pattern Scores of Male and Female Students at Different Levels of their Paternal Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Illiterat e</td>
<td>147.04</td>
<td>136.61</td>
<td>140.74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>128.61</td>
<td>124.18</td>
<td>12.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>165.09</td>
<td>163.44</td>
<td>164.32</td>
<td>16.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144.88</td>
<td>148.50</td>
<td>150.65</td>
<td>14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Illiterat e</td>
<td>139.77</td>
<td>144.94</td>
<td>139.90</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>119.00</td>
<td>119.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>118.07</td>
<td>118.25</td>
<td>117.77</td>
<td>116.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>166.77</td>
<td>166.86</td>
<td>166.86</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146.90</td>
<td>153.38</td>
<td>155.22</td>
<td>15.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Illiterat e</td>
<td>143.40</td>
<td>140.77</td>
<td>140.32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>119.98</td>
<td>123.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>121.13</td>
<td>121.55</td>
<td>121.13</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>165.19</td>
<td>165.59</td>
<td>165.19</td>
<td>16.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145.89</td>
<td>150.94</td>
<td>152.94</td>
<td>15.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Summary Table of Analysis of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Political V P Scores</th>
<th>Economic V P Scores</th>
<th>Social V P Scores</th>
<th>Religious V P Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS (V)</td>
<td>F-Ratio</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Paternal Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2353.67</td>
<td>784.56</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
<td>994.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1554.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2034.79</td>
<td>678.26</td>
<td>2.84*</td>
<td>213.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Error variance</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>239045.83</td>
<td>238.57</td>
<td>370133.92</td>
<td>369.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>243526.64</td>
<td>372896.56</td>
<td>197051.94</td>
<td>363146.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 0.01 level of significance