

## Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth

Dr. Dinesh Prasad Sahu<sup>1\*</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study was to see the impact of religious value and social value on college youth which was conducted in Madhubani and Darbhanga districts of Bihar (India). The sample consisted of 300 college youth (200 male & 100 female). Tripathi Personal Preference Schedule (1973) and Personal Data Sheet has been developed by research scholar was use on each of the college youth studying class B. A. were selected randomly. The age range of the college youth was 19–20 years with mean age of 19.6 years. Having a collected the data through the questionnaire schedule. The results revealed that college youth of religious value were significantly difference at .01 level of confidence in the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups based on Heterosexuality and social value were significant differences at .05 level of confidence in the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N 25) groups based on Order. Otherwise, other personality need variables i.e. heterosexuality, achievement, deference, autonomy, change, endurance and succorance were not significant at .05 and 0.01 level of confidence.

*Keywords: Religious Value, Social Value*

Value is an integral part of personality which gets its expression in vocational preferences; it creates a response disposition which has a definite influence on vocational choice. People tend to choose such vocation which they believe will enable them to realize the values as something desirable such as love, kindness, quietness, contentment, fun, honesty, decency, relaxation and simplicity. Milton Rokeach (1973) defines value as an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personality or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode or conduct to end-state of existence. From the above discussion, it is clear that value is an enduring belief which plays a vital role in the guiding our actions, attitudes, judgment etc. Keeping into consideration the above discussion regarding the meaning of the value, we adhere to Allport, Vernon & Lindzey (1960) approach which is based on springer's intuitively derived typology. According to Allport, it is very easy to place a person in a particular values category depending on the relative prominence of the six values – I. Theoretical II. Economic, III. Aesthetic IV. Social V. Political and VI. Religious.

<sup>1</sup> Former Research Scholar, Dept. Of Psychology, Lalit Narayn Mithila University, Darbhanga (Bihar), India  
*\*Responding Author*

Received: April 23, 2020; Revision Received: June 20, 2020; Accepted: June 25, 2020

## Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth

The religious values and social values which are examined in this study – Religious values are ethical principles founded in religious traditions, texts and beliefs. Religious value is one of the most prominent and wide reaching social institutions, touching and shaping virtually every sphere of culture and society. Approximately 84% of the world's populations are affiliated with a religious (Pew Research Centre, 2017.). While there are many who believe that religion has a strong influence of personality development. Uncovering the complex relationship between religiosity and values may provide a better understanding of what it means to be religious or non-religious. The article reviews research on a values and religiosity across cultural and religious groups. Although religious groups differ in the importance they attribute to different values, the pattern of correlations between religiosity and values is strikingly consistent across monotheistic religions. Persons more committed to religion attribute relatively high importance to values expressing motivation to avoid uncertainly and change to relatively low importance to values expressing motivations to follow one's hedonistic desires, or to be independent in thought and action.

The social value which are examined in this study while the reasons for the lack of attention to value in social psychological research are varied and complexes, a major reason probably derives from the concern of psychologists to be scientific, and from the subsequent difficulties of applying rigorous, objective methods, and measurement to the study of value. Social values are mainly the development of a better understanding of how, and to what extent, values govern cognition, volition, custom, affection and behavior. Social values are a set of moral principles defined by the society dynamics, institutions, traditions and cultural beliefs. These values are implicit guidelines that provide orientation to individuals and corporates to conduct them properly within a social system. In particular social psychologists and sociologists view values as central to choice behavior (Handy, 1970; Rescher, 1969) and to interpersonal conflicts (Kodf, 1957; Rose, 1955). The assumption here is that in any choice or decision situation, values are the implicit criterion which choices and decisions are based (Rescher, 1969).

### *Aims and objective of the present study*

Aims and objective of the study, as well as its methodological dimensions are as follows the study had been proposed to ascertain the effects of structural and functional dimensions are as follows the study had been proposed to ascertain the religious value and social values which are examined in this study. The college youth (male and female) was considered as independent variables and social value were considered as dependent variables In this context following hypothesis were formulated :

1. There would be no significant difference in the extreme high and the extreme low group of college youth on religious value based on –I. Heterosexuality II. Achievement III. Deference IV. Order V. Change and VI. Endurance.
2. There would be no significant difference in the extreme high and the extreme low group of college youth on social value based on –I. Heterosexuality II. Achievement III. Deference IV. Order V. Autonomy and VI. Succorance.

### *Definition of the variable:*

1. **Religious Value:** Religious values are ethical principles founded in religious traditions, texts and beliefs.
2. **Social Value:** Social values are a set of moral principles defined by the society dynamics, institutions, traditions and cultural beliefs.

## METHODOLOGY

### Sample

The sample comprised 50 youth (extreme high and extreme low) of heterosexuality, 50 youth (extreme high and extreme low) of achievement, 50 youth (extreme high and extreme low) of deference, 50 youth (extreme high and extreme low) of order, 50 youth (extreme high and extreme low) of change and autonomy and 50 youth (extreme high and extreme low) of endurance and succorance. Thus, altogether 300 students (200 male and 100 female) studying in class B. A. were selected randomly which was conducted in Madhubani and Darbhanga districts of Bihar (India). The age range of student was 19-20 years with mean age of 19.6 years.

### Tools used :

1. Personal data sheet has been developed by research scholar.
2. Tripathi Personal Preference Schedule (1973)

## RESULT & INTERPRETATION

Occupational choice is an expression of value orientation. An individual prefers such occupation in which he thinks that his needs and values would find greater satisfaction. The present study was aimed at studying the values which govern the occupational choice and it was also intended to study the motivational constrains which lead to the development of different value orientation. In order to study the differences between the high and the low groups of two values namely, Religious and Social values with regard to t-ratio. The result is given in below -

### Religious Value:

**Table -1.1, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of religious value with regard to Heterosexuality.**

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	Df	t-ratio
Extreme high	13.70	2.50	.51	1.00	48	3.52**
Extreme low	10.18	4.22	.86			

\*\* Significant at .01 level of confidence

### Interpretation

Although Religious value was found to be significantly related with heterosexuality, the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of religious value differed significantly with regard to Heterosexuality ( $t = 3.52$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Thus, the above two group of religious value are significant with regard to Heterosexuality. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is significant difference between the Mean score of extreme high group (M = 13.70) the mean score of extreme low group (M = 10.18).

**Table -1.2, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of religious value with regard to Achievement.**

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	Df	t-ratio
Extreme high	12.66	2.58	.53	.88	48	.45ns
Extreme low	13.06	3.46	.71			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence

**Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth**

***Interpretation***

Table 1.2 indicates that the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of religious value do not differ significantly with regard to Achievement ( $t = .45$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Since religious value and Achievement are not significantly related, it is concluded that Achievement does not have any bearing on religious value-orientation. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (12.66) and extreme low (13.06) with Heterosexuality. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

***Table -1.3, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of religious value with regard to Deference.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	Df	t-ratio
Extreme high	12.18	2.16	.44	.89	48	1.7ns
Extreme low	10.66	3.82	.78			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence

***Interpretation***

Table 1.3 shows that the two groups, namely the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of religious value do not differ significantly with regard to Deference ( $t = 1.71$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Since religious value and Deference are not significantly related, it is concluded that Deference does not have any bearing on religious value-orientation. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (12.18) and extreme low (10.66) with Deference. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

***Table -1.4, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of religious value with regard to Order.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	Df	t-ratio
Extreme high	12.90	2.04	.42	.98	48	1.55ns
Extreme low	14.42	4.56	.89			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence

***Interpretation***

Table 1.4 indicates that the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of religious value do not differ significantly with regard to Order ( $t = 1.55$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Since religious value and Order are not significantly related, it is concluded that Order does not have any bearing on religious value-orientation. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (12.90) and extreme low (14.42) with Order. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

***Table -1.5, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of religious value with regard to Change.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	Df	t-ratio
Extreme high	11.86	2.10	.43	.81	48	.10ns
Extreme low	13.06	3.46	.71			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence

**Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth**

***Interpretation***

It is obvious from table 1.5 that the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of religious value do not differ significantly with regard to Change ( $t = .10$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). The finding indicate that there is neither any significant relationship between religion value and Change nor the extreme high and extreme low groups of religious value differ significantly from one another with regard to Change. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (11.86) and extreme low (13.06) with Change. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

***Table -1.6, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of religious value with regard to Endurance.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	Df	t-ratio
Extreme high	12.74	2.70	.55	.79	48	1.11
Extreme low	13.06	2.78	.57			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence

***Interpretation***

It is observed from table - 1.6 that the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of religious value do not differ significantly with regard to Endurance ( $t = .45$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Since religious value and Endurance are not significantly related, it is concluded that Endurance does not have any bearing on religious value-orientation. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (12.74) and extreme low (13.06) with Endurance. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Social Value:**

***Table -2.1, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of social value with regard to Heterosexuality.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	df	t-ratio
Extreme high	12.42	2.96	.60	.90	48	1.00ns
Extreme low	11.52	3.54	.68			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence

***Interpretation***

As it is obvious from the table – 2.1 that indicates the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) group of social value differed not significantly with regard to Heterosexuality ( $N = 50$ ,  $t = 1.00$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Thus neither any significant relationship exists between social value and Heterosexuality nor does the extreme high group of social value differ from the extreme low group of social value with respect to Heterosexuality. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (12.42) and extreme low (11.52) with Heterosexuality. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

***Table -2.2, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of social value with regard to Achievement.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	df	t-ratio
Extreme high	14.18	2.80	.57	.82	48	1.27ns
Extreme low	13.14	2.93	.60			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence.

## Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth

### ***Interpretation***

Although social value was not found to bear significant relationship with achievement, the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of social value differed significantly with regards to Achievement (N = 50,  $t = 1.27$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Thus neither any significant relationship exists between social value and Achievement nor does the extreme high group of social value differ from the extreme low group of social value with respect to Achievement. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (14.18) and extreme low (13.14) with confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

***Table -2.3, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of social value with regard to Deference.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	df	t-ratio
Extreme high	13.70	2.82	.58	.80	48	1.40ns
Extreme low	12.58	2.68	.55			

ns Not significant at .05 level of confidence

### ***Interpretation***

It is observed from table – 2.3 that the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of social value do not differ significantly with regards to Deference (N = 50,  $t = 1.40$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Thus neither any significant relationship exists between social value and deference nor does the extreme high group of social value differ from the extreme low group of social value with respect to Deference. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (13.70) and extreme low (12.58) with confidence.

***Table – 2.4, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of social value with regard to Order.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	df	t-ratio
Extreme high	12.10	3.00	.61	.99	48	2.18 *
Extreme low	12.26	3.80	.78			

\* Significant at .05 level of confidence

### ***Interpretation***

Although social value was found to be significantly related with order, the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of social value differed significantly with regard to Order (N = 50,  $t = 2.18$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P < .05$ ). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is significant difference between the Mean score of extreme high group (M = 12.10) the mean score of extreme low group (M = 12.26).

***Table – 2.5, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of social value with regard to Autonomy.***

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	df	t-ratio
Extreme high	12.50	2.88	.59	.75	48	1.28ns
Extreme low	11.54	2.26	.46			

ns Not Significant at .05 level of confidence

## Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth

### Interpretation

At it is observed from table –2.5 the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of social values do not differ significantly with regard to Autonomy (N = 50,  $t = 1.28$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). The two groups are almost identical as far as autonomy is concerned. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (12.50) and extreme low (11.54) with Autonomy.

**Table – 2.6, Differences between the extreme high and extreme low group of social value with regard to Succorance.**

Group	Mean	SD	SEm	SD diff.	df	t-ratio
Extreme high	13.06	2.44	.50	.82	48	.68ns
Extreme low	12.26	3.80	.78			

ns Not Significant at .05 level of confidence

### Interpretation

A look of Table – 2.6 reveals that the extreme high (N = 25) and the extreme low (N = 25) groups of social value do not differ significantly with regard to their scores on Succorance (N = 50,  $t = .68$ ,  $df = 48$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Thus, it can be concluded that the two groups are not significantly differed rather they are identical. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean score of extreme high (13.06) and extreme low (12.26) with Succorance. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

## CONCLUSION

As is obvious from the present study was undertaken with a view to exploring the contribution of different manifest needs, as measured through the Tripathi Personal preference Schedule, in shaping different value-orientation. In the light of relevant literature, the following hypothesis with regret the different variables were formulated.

1. That the Religious orientation would be not significant or negatively related with Heterosexuality, Achievement, Deference, Order, Change, and Endurance. That the order motivational constraints namely Achievement, Deference, Change and Endurance would show insignificant contribution in religious value, it was concluded that only Heterosexuality (manifest need) was shows significant bearing on religious value orientation.
2. That the Social orientation would be not significant or negatively related with Heterosexuality, Achievement, Deference, Order, Autonomy and Succurance. That the order motivational constraints namely, heterosexuality, achievement, deference, autonomy and succorance would show not significant contribution in social value, it was concluded that only Achievement (motivational constraint) was shows significant bearing on social value orientation.

## REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). Study of Values. Houghton Mifflin.
- Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1970). Study of Values (Revised 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Chicago: The Riverside Publishing Company.
- Handy, R. (1970). The Measurement Values. St. Louis, MO.: W. H. Green, Inc.
- Kolb, W. L. (1957). The changing prominence of value in Modern Sociological Theory. In H. Becker and A. Baskoff (Ed.), Modern Sociological Theory, New York: Dryden.

## Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth

- Martin, J. L., Maris, V., Simbarloff, D. S. (2016). The need to respect nature and its limits challenges society and conservation science. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 113. 6105 – 6112.
- Pew Research Centre (2017). The changing global religious landscape. Accessed 12 Feb. 2019.
- Rescher, N. (1968). *Introduction to Value Theory*. Englewood Clifis, N. J.: Prentice – Hall Publ. Co.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press. 438pp.
- Rose, A. M. (1955). Sociology and the study of Valiue. *Brit. J. Sociol.* Vol. 7, 1 – 17.
- Tripathi, R. R. (1973). *Tripathi Personal Preference Schedule*. Varanasi: Raghuvir Nagar Publication.

### ***Acknowledgements***

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### ***Conflict of Interest***

The author declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Prasad, D.S (2020). Impact of religious value and social value (personality needs variables) on college youth. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 8(2), 1237-1244. DIP:18.01.141/20200802, DOI:10.25215/0802.141