

# ALIENATION AMONG COLLEGE TEACHERS IN RELATION TO VALUES

**Mandeep Dhillon**

*Department of Education and Community Service, Punjabi University, Patiala.*

## ABSTRACT

*This study is conducted to study the alienation among teachers in relation to values. A sample of 100 with nearly an equal number of male and female teachers is selected at random from private college. For studying alienation among college teachers in relation to values it is proposed to use descriptive statistics mainly mean, median, mode and standard deviation is applied, Relevant statistical techniques such as t-test and analysis of variance is used where two or more groups are to be compared.*

**Keywords:** Alienation, values.

## 1. Introduction

Alienation is a state of being cut off or separation from a person or group of people. The Latin word for alien is alienus which means belonging to another". The idea of not belonging, or not fitting in, gave rise to the Latin verb "alienare" meaning "estrangle", which alienation comes from.

According to Seeman (1959), the feelings of normlessness, powerlessness, self-estrangement, meaninglessness, and isolation and their consequences as a result of social, institutional and relational problems result in the development of alienation.

Powerlessness describes the conditions, under which the individual lacks any control over not only their own product, but also over the outputs of the instruments they have used in this process.

Normlessness means to disapprove of the necessity of the behaviors, which are required to achieve one's objectives.

Isolation, describes either the lack of any bond of friendship, or participation in an organizational environment at the lowest level. Isolation may be experienced due to either the individual's departure from the society, or due to the individual's exclusion from its community.

Meaninglessness, describes the individual's failure in understanding their own activities, a failure in building a bridge between the present and the future.

Self-estrangement can be defined as the psychological state in which person deny one's own interests – of activities giving extrinsic satisfaction, rather than activities giving intrinsic satisfaction. A person becomes

stranger to oneself or to some parts of oneself or has a problem of self-knowledge or authenticity.

## Alienation

Alienation is a concept that refers to both a psychological condition found in individuals and to a social condition that underlies and promotes it. Teachers affect the schools both quantitatively and qualitatively as they are responsible for maintaining social, political, and economic functions of the schools. Alienation to work averts teachers to be creative and to work for the improvement of vocational qualifications of the students, to make contribution in the development of the society, to make learning more effective and to cooperate with management and other teachers.

Types of Alienation Found in Teachers are:

*The alienation of the Teacher from their work.*

*The alienation from teaching itself where teaching becomes meaningless and mundane.*

*The alienation of the teacher from themselves as a social agent.*

*The alienation of the teacher from other students and teachers.*

Teachers feel that they are controlled by economic forces, political forces and the social forces i.e. the force of negative public discourse. The professional views of the teachers have always been excluded from the process of decision making and it is very frustrating. They feel useless and worthless as they have no real say in shaping their work lives.

## Values

In examining the relationship between

the manner in which we direct business and the principles to which we personally attribute, we are inextricably impacted by our respective bringing up, societal environments and academic influences. Robert Rue (2001) emphasizes that values are the essence of who we are as human beings. The way we live, behave and even do our daily activities are controlled by the values. Our decisions and also how do we make those decisions are all under the control of values we possess.

Gordon Allport, a student of American philosopher and psychologist Eduard Spranger, believed that an individual's philosophy is founded upon the values or basic convictions that he holds about what is and is not important in life. Based on Spranger's (1928) view that understanding the individual's value philosophy best captures the essence of a person, Allport and his colleagues, Vernon and Lindzey, created the Allport-Vernon- Lindzey Study of Values. The values scale outlined six major value types.

## 2. The Theoretical

Person is primarily concerned with the discovery of truth. He assumes a "cognitive" attitude in pursuing this objective, seeking only to observe and to reason. In doing so, the theoretical individual searches for fundamental identities and differences, rejecting any considerations of beauty or utility.

### The Economic

Individual places highest value on what is the most useful. They are often times practical and preference is given to the, the elaboration of credit, and the accumulation of tangible wealth. The economic person is interested in making money.

### The Aesthetic

Person places high value of form and harmony. They believe life to be a series of events that are to be enjoyed for its own sake. Judging each single experience from the stand point of grace, symmetry, or fitness, he or she perceives life as a procession of events, with each individual impression enjoyed for its own sake. Such an individual need not be a creative artist but is aesthetic to the degree that his or her chief interest is in the artistic episodes of

life.

### The Social

The highest value of the social type is love of people. Since the Study of Values focuses only upon the altruistic or philanthropic aspects of love (as opposed, for example, to conjugal or familial love), social persons prize others as ends and are themselves kind, sympathetic, and unselfish. Such a person is likely to experience the theoretical, economic, and aesthetic attitudes as cold and inhuman, regarding love as the only suitable form of human relationship. In its purest form, the social attitude is selfless and is closely related to the religious value.

### The Political

The dominant interest of the political individual is power. Vocational activities of this type of person are not necessarily confined to the realm of politics, since leaders in any field generally place a high value on power. Because competition and struggle are inherent in all life, many philosophers have argued that power is the most universal and fundamental human motive. In fact, some of the early writings of Alfred Adler, as you may recall, reflect this point of view. However, for Spranger there are clear individual differences in the power value. For certain personalities, direct expression of this motive overrides all others in that they earn for personal power, influence, and renown above all else.

### The Religious

Religious individuals place their highest value upon unity. Fundamentally mystical, they seek to understand and experience the world as a unified whole. Spranger describes the religious person as one who is permanently oriented toward the creation of the highest and absolutely satisfying value experience.

The behaviour of the students is also influenced by the personality and the values of the teacher. The students perform better in the classes of their favourite teachers. They take more interest in subject of their favorite teacher. Even the percentage of attendance is high in the lectures of the favourite teachers. The teachers who are found to be outgoing, realistic, emotionally stable,

enthusiastic, intelligent, assertive, independent, socially bold, confident, hard to fool, practical, experimenting, controlled, relaxed, conscientious. High performing teachers in comparison to low performing teachers have been found outgoing, more intelligent, emotionally stable, assertive independent, enthusiastic, conscientious, socially bold, realistic, hard to fool, practical, forthright, confident, experimenting, "Joiner" and sound follower, controlled, relaxed. On the other hand the low performing teachers have been found: Reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, humble, taciturn, expedient, shy, tender-minded, easy to get on with/ imaginative, shrewd, depressive, conservative, prefers own decisions, undisciplined, tense.

High performing teachers are relatively high in social, religious theoretical, aesthetic, political, value than low performing teachers whereas in low performing teachers economic values are at peak.

### 3. Review of Related Literature

Sanovar (1991) studied value orientation in relation to professional choices. The drawn conclusions indicated that in the hierarchy of professions, medicine gets highest number of preferences and the predominant value of the subjects who preferred medicine was economic and that of engineers was aesthetic. Social values were found to be predominant among journalists. While those preferred business were high in relations values. Among the subjects intended to join police services theoretical values were found prominent.

Kashmiri (2008) studied the most basic life values of teachers and students in Pakistan. Study was conducted on a sample of 300(118 teachers and 182 students). The result indicates that today's students and teachers prefer enjoyment over traditions.

Vahedi et al.(2010) studied the relationship among college student's spiritual well-being, life satisfaction, economic status and alienation. A sample of 292 undergraduate student including 187 females and 105 males, between the ages of 18 and 26 years, was selected using the cluster sampling method. In

the result it was found that spiritual well-being (religious feelings) was inversely related to alienation.

Ucanok (2011) studied the importance that is attached to work by analysing the link between work related values and attitudes. The focus was on the effects of work value on various organisational attitudes such as work alienation, work centrality and organisational commitment. A sample of 65 males and 114 females was selected. Meaningless dimension of work alienation was correlated with intrinsic work values. Work alienation was found to be negatively correlated with intrinsic work values.

Kim (2014) studied the relationship between money and alienation. A cross-cultural comparison of Korea, US and Sweden was conducted. 1500 consumers in Korea, US and Sweden were selected as sample. Economic levels and socio-economic systems were considered in selecting the examined countries. The research results suggested money is all attitude and alienation levels in Korea were relatively higher than in US and Sweden.

Bazmi (2015) studied the job satisfaction in relation to teaching aptitude and personal values of teachers in the schools of the visually disabled. School probably from all four zones of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh (UP) were selected for the sample. Among these schools some were run by the government agencies while others by private agencies. Therefore, it can be said that if the influence of socio-economic status is partialled out then job-satisfaction become less inversely correlated with democratic values.

### Significance of the Problem

Teacher is a very important part of the society and is playing a crucial role in preparing the society to attain new levels of success and fame. Teachers play a significant role in preparing young people to live successful and productive lives.

Quality of education depends upon the potential and performance of the teacher. So by identifying the factors that affects the performance of a teacher, the teaching can become more effective. We are living in a

transition phase. We are trying to adopt new values and beliefs without discarding the old ones. Under the title of modernization, we are trying to change our culture and society but still we are under the shadow of our traditional culture and beliefs. This creates a state of utter dilemma.

When the teacher is struck to the traditional methods of teaching, he would not be able to satisfy the curiosity of the students of modern age with his teachings. As the teacher would be unable to fulfil the expectations of the students, he would not get internal satisfaction, so this would give birth to alienation.

#### 4. Objective

To study alienation among college teachers in relation to values.

#### Hypotheses of the Study

The following research hypotheses have been formulated:

*Teachers who are high, average and low on theoretical values significantly differ in alienation.*

*Teachers who are high, average and low on economic values significantly differ in alienation.*

*Teachers who are high, average and low on aesthetic values significantly differ in alienation.*

*Teachers who are high, average and low on social values significantly differ in alienation.*

*Teachers who are high, average and low on political values significantly differ in alienation.*

*Teachers who are high, average and low on religious values significantly differ in alienation.*

#### Delimitations of the Study

The present study was delimited to:

*The private college teachers working in private colleges.*

*The district of Gurdaspur.*

#### Operational Definitions of the Terms Used

*Alienation is a state of being cut off or separate from a person or group of people.*

*The values include six major values, such as*

*theoretical (discovery of truth), economic (what is most useful), aesthetic (form, beauty, and harmony), social (seeking love of people), political (power), and religious (unity) as measured through.*

#### Method and Procedure

For the present study, descriptive method of research was used to examine Alienation among schoolteachers in relation to values.

#### Sample

A sample of 100 with nearly an equal number of male and female teachers were selected at random from private colleges in the district of Gurdaspur.

#### Research Tools

Punjabi version of Alienation Scale by Hardeo Ojha (2010) was used which contains 20 items spreading over six dimensions i.e. (a) powerlessness, (b) normlessness, (c) meaninglessness, (d) social isolation, (e) self estrangement and (f) cultural estrangement. Punjabi version of Value Test by R. K. Ojha and M. Bhargava (1992) was used. This test contains 45 statements which measures six values i.e. (a) theoretical, (b) economic, (c) aesthetic, (d) social, (e) political and (f) religious based on Allport, Vernon and Lindzey study of Values.

#### Data Analysis and Interpretation

The purpose of the present study was to study the alienation among college teachers in relation to values. Descriptive survey research method was used, so the data was collected by using the tools from private college teachers in the district of Gurdaspur. The data was collected, organised and tabulated according the objectives of the study. The descriptive statistics i.e., mean and standard deviation was applied. T-test was conducted, followed by ANOVA.

#### Steps of study Step: 1

Gender differences on the variables alienation and values were studied. The results are reported in table 1

Table-1

Values	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t value
Theoretical Value	Male	50	44.26	6.930	1.753
	Female	50	43.33	5.933	
Economic Value	Male	50	41.90	4.985	1.015
	Female	50	41.48	5.302	
Aesthetic Value	Male	50	34.75	7.729	1.30
	Female	50	33.35	5.341	
Social Value	Male	50	41.38	4.959	1.219
	Female	50	41.92	4.767	
Political Value	Male	50	39.65	5.342	1.533
	Female	50	38.61	5.108	
Religious Value	Male	50	39.54	7.051	1.302
	Female	50	38.74	7.593	

Table.1 reveals that no significance difference on theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious values is there. Since no significant difference on values was found, between the male and female samples, therefore, the male and female scores were pooled together.  $M \pm \frac{1}{2} SD$  was taken as the criterion for the formation of low, average and high groups on the independent variables.

### Step: 2

Cut off scores were calculated

Table: 2

Independent Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean $\pm 1/2$ SD	Lower Limit	Upper Limit	Low Group	Average Group	High Group
Theoretical value	43.80	6.46	43.80 $\pm$ 3.23	40.57	47.03	<41	41-47	>47
Economic Value	41.69	5.15	41.69 $\pm$ 2.58	39.11	44.27	<39	39-44	>44
Social Value	41.65	4.87	41.65 $\pm$ 2.44	39.21	44.09	<35	35-44	>44
Religious Value	39.14	7.33	39.14 $\pm$ 3.67	35.47	42.81	<35	35-43	>43
Aesthetic Value	33.35	5.341	33.35 $\pm$ 2.67	30.67	36.02	<30	30-36	>36
Political Value	39.13	5.248	39.13 $\pm$ 2.62	36.51	41.75	<36	36-42	>42

Table:2 represents the cut off scores for low group, average group and high group of independent variables i.e., values. The alienation scores of the three groups, i.e., low, average and high for the above independent variables were analysed through one-way analysis of variance. A significant F-test was conducted.

### Step: 3

Table 3. Mean and Standard Deviations of Alienation Scores of Low, Average and High Theoretical Value groups

GROUP	N	M	SD
Low Theoretical Value(<41)	27	52.47	9.991
Average Theoretical Value(41-47)	45	51.90	7.871

*ALIENATION AMONG COLLEGE TEACHERS IN RELATION TO VALUES*

High TheoreticalValue(>47)	28	49.70	8.701
Total	100	51.38	8.740

*Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviations of Alienation scores of low, average and high Economic Valuegroups*

GROUP	N	M	SD
Low EconomicValue(<39)	27	52.20	8.019
Average Economic Value(41-47)	44	51.94	9.076
High EconomicValue(>47)	29	49.79	8.688
Total	100	51.38	8.740

*Table 5. Mean and Standard Deviations of Alienation scores of low, average and high Social Valuegroups*

Group	N	M	SD
Low Social Value(<39)	22	51.03	8.399
Average Social Value(39-44)	53	50.64	8.457
High Social Value(>44)	25	53.33	8.474
Total	100	51.38	8.740

*Table 6. Mean and Standard Deviations of Alienation scores of low, average and high Religious Valuegroups*

GROUP	N	M	SD
Low Religious Value(<35)	27	52.90	9.494
Average ReligiousValue(35-43)	46	50.98	8.468
High Religious Value(>43)	27	50.55	8.263
Total	100	51.38	8.740

*Table 7. Mean and Standard Deviations of Alienation scores of low, average and high Aesthetic Valuegroups*

GROUP	N	M	SD
Low Aesthetic Value(<31)	28	53.18	8.778
Average Aesthetic Value(31-36)	39	51.71	8.618
High Aesthetic Value(36>)	33	50.51	8.664
Total	100	51.40	8.747

*Table 8. Mean and Standard Deviations of Alienation scores of low, average and high Political Valuegroups*

GROUP	N	M	SD
Low Political Value(<36)	32	52.33	9.081
Average Political Value(36-42)	46	51.40	7.774
High Political Value(42>)	22	50.53	8.960
Total	100	51.42	8.747

### **Summaries of ANOVA Results**

Table 9 Summary of ANOVA results: Alienation (dependent variable) and Theoretical Value (independent variable)



ANOVA					
Alienation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	156.104	2	178.052	<b>5.016*</b>	<b>.007*</b>
Within Groups	14997.730	97	75.373		
Total	15153.834	99			

\*sig(p<0.05,df=2,597)

Since the obtained  $F = 5.016$  is significant at the 0.05 level(df=2,597), therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference on alienation between low, average and high theoretical value is rejected at the .05 level. The research hypothesis "Teachers who are high, average and low on theoretical values significantly differ in alienation" is accepted.

As the research hypothesis has been accepted, the data were further analysed through Fisher's LSD test to study group differences on alienation.

Table 10. Comparison of low, average and high theoretical value groups on alienation

Group	N	M	$M_D$ (between groups)	LSD(0.05 level)	Significance
1)Low theoretical value	27	52.47	(1&2)0.57	1.73	NS(p>0.05)
2)Average theoretical value(93-113)	45	51.90	(1&3)2.77	1.89	Sig(p<0.05)
3)High theoretical value(>113)	28	49.70	(2&3)2.20	0.83	Sig(p<0.05)

### Interpretation

On comparison, the mean difference of 0.57 on alienation, between low and average theoretical value groups, fails to reach the least significant difference between means value of 1.73, at 0.05 level of significance(df=597).

The null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and average theoretical value groups is accepted at 0.05 level. The two groups do not differ significantly on alienation.

The mean difference of 2.77 between low and high theoretical value groups exceeds the least significant difference between means value of 1.89, at 0.05 level of significance.

The null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and high theoretical value groups is rejected at the .05 level.

The two groups significantly differ on alienation.

Group with low theoretical value is more alienated than group with high theoretical value.

The mean difference of 2.20 between average and high theoretical value groups exceeds the least significant difference between means value of 0.83, at 0.05 level of significance.

The null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference on alienation between average and high theoretical value group is rejected. Average theoretical value group is more alienated than high theoretical value group.

Both low and average theoretical value groups are significantly more alienated than high theoretical value group.

### Discussion

The results were found that the teachers with high theoretical values are less alienated than teachers with low and average theoretical values. The present finding is in agreement with Popova (2018) and Zuberi(1984). The teachers with high theoretical values dominate their classes with talks, more active in their classes; make maximum participation of the students in discussions, so more interested in their work, so less alienated.

Table 11. Summary of ANOVA results: Alienation (dependent variable) and Economic Value (independent variable)

ANOVA
-------

Alienation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	135.390	2	317.695	<b>4.204*</b>	<b>0.015*</b>
Within Groups	14997.730	97	75.373		
Total	15133.123	99			

\*sig(p<0.05,df=2,97)

Since the obtained  $F = 4.204$  is significant at the 0.05 level ( $df=2,97$ ), therefore the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference on alienation between low, average and high economic value groups is rejected. The research hypothesis "Teachers who are high, average and low on economic values will significantly differ in alienation" is accepted.

Data was further analysed to find out the differences among low, average and high economic value groups on the dependent variable alienation.

Table 12. Comparison of low, average and high economic value groups on alienation

Group	N	M	$M_D$ (between groups)	LSD(0.05 level)	Significance
1)Low economic value	27	52.20	(1&2)0.26	1.70	NS( $p>0.05$ )
2)Average economic value	44	51.94	(1&3)2.41	1.86	Sig( $p<0.05$ )
3)High economic value	29	49.79	(2&3)2.15	1.66	Sig( $p<0.05$ )

### Interpretation

On comparison ,the mean difference of 0.26 on alienation, between low and average economic valuegroups, fails to reach the least significant difference between means value of 1.70, at 0.05 level of significance( $df=97$ ).

The null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and average economic value groups on alienation is accepted.

Low and average economic value groups do not differ significantly on alienation.

The mean difference of 2.41 between low and high economic value groups exceed the least significantdifference between means value of 1.86, at 0.05 level of significance.

The null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and high economic value groupson alienation is rejected.

Low economic value group is more alienated than high economic value group.

The mean difference of 2.15 between average and high theoretical value groups exceeds the least significantdifference between means value of 1.66, at 0.05 level of significance.

The null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between average and high economic value groups isrejected.

Average economic value group is significantly more alienated than the high economic value group.Low and average economic value groups are more alienated than high economic value group.

### Discussion

The result found that teachers with low economic values and average economic value groups are more alienated than teachers with high economic values. The present finding is in the agreement with the findings of Nisha (1990).

Economic values are related to consumption and acquisition. An economic man is interested in what is useful. It leads to self-satisfaction. And a satisfied man is less alienated. They are more practical.

Table 13. Summary of ANOVA results: Alienation (dependent variable) and Social value(independent variable)

ANOVA					
Alienation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	249.677	2	374.839	<b>4.972*</b>	<b>0.007*</b>



Within Groups	15004.156	97	75.384		
Total	15253.833	99			

\*sig( $p < 0.05$ ,  $df = 2, 97$ )

Since the obtained  $F = 4.972$  is significant at the 0.05 level ( $df = 2, 97$ ), therefore the null hypothesis of no significant difference between low, average and high social value groups on alienation is rejected at the .05 level.

The research hypothesis "Teachers who are high, average and low on social values will significantly differ in alienation" is accepted.

Further analysis of data was done to find out the differences between low, average and high social value groups on the dependent variable alienation. Fisher's LSD test was employed.

Table 14. Comparison of low, average and high social value groups on alienation

Group	N	M	$M_D$ (between groups)	LSD (0.05 level)	Significance
1) Low social value	22	53.33	(1&2) 2.69	1.70	Sig( $p < 0.05$ )
2) Average social value	53	50.64	(1&3) 2.30	2.04	Sig( $p < 0.05$ )
3) High social value	25	51.03	(2&3) 0.39	1.76	NS( $p > 0.05$ )

### Interpretation

On comparison, the mean difference of 2.69 on alienation, between low and average social value groups, exceeds the least significant difference between means value of 1.70, at 0.05 level of significance ( $df = 97$ ). Therefore, the research hypothesis of statistically significant difference between low and average social value groups is retained.

So, low social value group is more alienated than the group with average social value. The mean difference of 2.30 between low and high social value groups exceeds the least significant difference between means value of 2.04, at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, research hypothesis of statistically significant difference between low and high social value groups is retained.

Group with low level of social value is more alienated than the group with high social value. The mean difference of 0.39 between average and high social value groups fails to reach the least significant difference between means value of 1.76, at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, research hypothesis of statistically significant difference between average and high social value groups is rejected. Average and high social value groups do not differ significantly on alienation.

### Discussion

People with high social values pay respect to others as well as consider others with respectful manner, they work for the betterment of others, so are always less alienated from their work. Work alienation is a function of social satisfaction, job satisfaction, social trust, job characteristics and social justice. A worker with high social values is less alienated.

Table 15. Summary of ANOVA results: Alienation (dependent variable) and Religious value (independent variable)

ANOVA					
Alienation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	130.399	2	265.200	<b>3.501*</b>	<b>0.031*</b>
Within Groups	15223.434	97	75.751		
Total	15353.833	99			

\*sig( $p < 0.05$ ,  $df = 2, 97$ )

Since the obtained  $F = 3.501$  is significant at the 0.05 level ( $df = 2, 97$ ), therefore the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low, average and high religious groups on alienation is rejected at the 0.05 level.

The research hypothesis "Teachers who are high, average and low on religious values will significantly differ in alienation" is accepted.

Data was further analysed to find out group differences on alienation between low, average and high religious value groups. Fisher's LSD test was employed.

Table 16. Comparison of low, average and high religious value groups on alienation

Group	N	M	M <sub>D</sub> (between groups)	LSD(0.05 level)	Significance
1)Low religious value	27	52.90	(1&2)1.92	1.68	Sig(p<0.05)
2)Average religious value	46	50.98	(1&3)2.35	1.89	Sig(p<0.05)
3)High religious value	27	50.55	(2&3)0.48	1.68	NS(p>0.05)

### Interpretation

On comparison, the mean difference of 1.92 on alienation, between low and average religious value groups, exceeds the least significant difference between means value of 1.68, at 0.05 level of significance(df=597).

Therefore, the null hypothesis of statistically no significant difference between low and average religious value group is rejected.

Low religious value group is more alienated than average religious value group.

The mean difference of 2.35 between low and high religious value groups exceed the least significant difference between means value of 1.89, at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and high religious value groups is rejected.

Group with low level of religious value is more alienated than the group with high religious value. The mean difference of 0.48 between average and high religious value groups fail to reach the least significant difference between means value of 1.68, at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between average and high religious value groups is accepted. Average and high religious value groups do not differ significantly on alienation.

### Discussion

The result was found that teachers with low religious values are more alienated than teachers with high religious values. The present finding is in agreement with the findings of Khynezhad(2012),Vahedi(2010) and Nisha (1990). Person with more religious values have the characters of neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Such person works for their self-satisfaction, so the alienation is less.

Table 17. Summary of ANOVA results :Alienation (dependent variable) and Aesthetic value (independent variable)

ANOVA					
Alienation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	63.170	2	231.585	<b>3.069*</b>	<b>0.048*</b>
Within Groups	14821.66	97	75.457		
Total	14884.833	99			

\*sig(p<0.05,df=2,97)

Since the obtained F =3.069 is significant at the 0.05 level (df=2,597), therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically difference on alienation between low, average and high aesthetic groups is rejected. Data was further analysed to find out the differences among low, average and high aesthetic value groups on the dependent variable alienation. R.Fischer's Least Significant Difference (LSD) method is employed to study group differences in the dependent variable alienation.

Table 18. Comparison of low, average and high aesthetic value groups on alienation

Group	N	M	M <sub>D</sub> (between groups)	LSD(0.05 level)	Significance
1)Low aesthetic value	28	53.18	(1&2)2.62	1.64	Sig(p<0.05)
2)Average aesthetic value	39	50.56	(1&3)2.67	1.22	Sig(p<0.05)
3)High aesthetic value	33	50.51	(2&3)0.05	1.71	NS(p>0.05)

### Interpretation

On comparison, the mean difference of 2.62 on alienation, between low and average aesthetic value groups, exceeds the least significant difference between means value of 1.64, at 0.05 level of significance (df=97).

Therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and average aesthetic value group is rejected. Group with low aesthetic value is more alienated than the group with average aesthetic value. The mean difference of 2.67 between low and high aesthetic value groups exceed the least significant difference between means value of 1.22, at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and high aesthetic valuegroups is rejected at 0.05 level.

Group with low level of aesthetic value is more alienated than the group with high aesthetic value.

The mean difference of 0.05 between average and high aesthetic value groups fails to reach the leastsignificant difference between means value of 1.71 at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between average and high aesthetic valuegroups is accepted. Average and high aesthetic value groups do not significantly differ on alienation.

### Discussion

The result was found that teachers with low aesthetic value are more alienated than average and theteachers with average and high aesthetic value. The present finding is in agreement with the findings of Varsamopoulou (2018), Jackie(2017) and Sage(1994).

Table 19. Summary of ANOVA results: Alienation (dependent variable) and Political Value(independent variable)

ANOVA					
Alienation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	177.899	2	488.950	<b>6.632*</b>	<b>0.002</b>
Within Groups	11896.101	97	73.724		
Total	12074.000	99			

\*sig(p<0.05,df=2,97)

Since the obtained F =6.632 is significant at the 0.05 level (df=2,97), therefore the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low, average and high political value groups is rejected.

Data was further analysed to find out the differences between low, average and high political value groups onthe dependent variable alienation.

Table 20. Comparison of low, average and high political value groups on alienation

Group	N	M	M <sub>D</sub> (between groups)	LSD(0.05 level)	Significance
1)Low political value	32	52.43	(1&2)1.03	1.58	NS(p>0.05)
2)Average political value	46	51.40	(1&3)1.9	1.79	Sig(p<0.05)
3)High political value	22	50.53	(2&3)0.87	1.66	NS(p>0.05)

### Interpretation

On comparison ,the mean difference of 1.03 on alienation, between low and average political value groups,fails to reach the least significant difference between means value of 1.58, at

0.05 level of significance (df=97).

Therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference on alienation between low and average political value group is accepted. The mean difference of 1.9 between low and high political value groups exceeds the least significant difference between means value of 1.79, at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between low and high political value groups is rejected at 0.05 level.

Low political value group is more alienated than the high political value group. The mean difference of 0.87 between average and high political value groups, fails to reach the least significant difference between means value of 1.66 at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, the null hypothesis of no statistically significant difference between average and high political value groups is accepted. Average and high political value groups do not significantly differ on alienation.

## Discussion

The result was found that teachers with high political value are less alienated. Political values motivate an individual to make use of organizational politics within the institution to make the changes that result in the overall development, so such kind of people are less alienated from their duties. Vincent and Smoker (2007) in their studies revealed that political organization helps in making the conditions at work place favourable, so satisfaction is more, and alienation is less.

## Testing Of Hypothesis

### **Alienation in Relation to Theoretical values**

There is a significant and negative relationship between theoretical values and alienation, at 0.05 level of significance, as theoretical values increase alienation decreases. "Teachers with high, average and low levels of theoretical values significantly differ on alienation" is accepted.

### **Alienation in Relation to Economic values**

There is a significant and negative relationship between economic values and alienation, at 0.05 level of significance, as economic values increase alienation decreases. "Teachers with high, average and low levels of economic values significantly differ on alienation" is accepted.

### **Alienation in Relation to Aesthetic Values**

There is a significant and negative relationship between aesthetic values and alienation, at 0.05 level of significance, as aesthetic values increase alienation decreases. "Teachers with high, average and low levels of aesthetic values significantly differ on

alienation" is accepted.

### **Alienation in Relation to Social values**

There is a significant and negative relationship between social values and alienation, at 0.05 level of significance, as social values increase alienation decreases. "Teachers with high, average and low levels of social values significantly differ on alienation" is accepted.

### **Alienation in Relation to Political values**

There is a significant and negative relationship between political values and alienation at 0.05 level of significance, as political values increase alienation decreases. "Teachers with high, average and low levels of political values significantly differ on alienation" is accepted.

### **Alienation in Relation to Religious values**

There is a significant and negative relationship between political values and alienation, at 0.05 level of significance, as social values increase alienation decreases. "Teachers with high, average and low levels of religious values significantly differ on alienation" is accepted.

## **Major Findings of the Study**

The following conclusions were drawn on the basis of the results of the study:

*Theoretical values are significantly and negatively related with alienation.*

*Economic values are significantly and negatively related with alienation among teachers.*

*Aesthetic values are significantly and negatively related with alienation among teachers.*

*Social values are significantly and negatively related with alienation among teachers.*

*Political values are significantly and negatively*

*related with alienation among teachers.  
Religious values are significantly and negatively  
related with alienation among teachers.*

between alienation and values. Values play a significant role in the development of the personality of the teacher, so teacher who is high on social, religious, theoretical, political, economic and aesthetic values would be less alienated.

## 5. Conclusion

The results of this study reveal that a significant and negative correlation is found

## References

- Archibald, W.P. (2009a). Marx, globalization and alienation: received and underappreciated wisdoms. *Critical Sociology*, 35(2), 151-174.
- Archibald, W.P. (2009b). Globalization, downsizing and insecurity: do we need to upgrade Marx's theory of alienation? *Critical Sociology*, 35(3), 319-342.
- Benedict, C. (2009). Processes of alienation: Marx, Orff and Kodaly *British Journal of Music Education*, 26(02), 213.
- Berardi, F., Cadel, F., & Mecchia, G. (2009). *The soul at work: from alienation to autonomy*. Los Angeles: Semiotexte.
- Berry, D.M. (2004). Internet research: privacy, ethics and alienation: an open source approach. *InternetResearch: Electronic Networking Applications and Policy*, 14(4), 323- 332.
- Byron, C. (2013). The Normative Force behind Marx's theory of alienation. *Critique*, 41(3), 427-435.
- Caoili, M.A. (2012). The concept of alienation in Marx. *Philippine Social Sciences Review*, 48(1-4), 363-387.
- Chopra, R. (1992). *Status of teaches in India*. New Delhi: NCERT Publication.
- Cooper & Patricia, S. (1993). Self-esteem and facial attractiveness in learning disabled children. *Child Study Journal*, 23, 79-88.
- Costas, J., & Fleming, P. (2009). Beyond dis-identification: A discursive approach to self-alienation in contemporary organizations. *Human Relations*, 62(3), 353-378.
- Gupta, B.M. (1997). Role of induction programme in teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Indian Education*, New Delhi: N.C.E.R.T.
- Gupta, M.S. (2001). Personal and professional values of effective teachers student's perception. *Journal of Value Education*, 1(2), 98-109.
- Hansson, S.O. (2001). *The structure of values and norms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1992). Alienation and empowerment: Some ethical imperatives in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(5-6), 413-422.
- Khandelwal, B.P. (2001). Values for human excellence. *Journal of Values Education*, 3(1), 102-125.
- Kornelson, J., Kotaska, A., Waterfall, P., Willie, L., & Wilson, D. (2011). Alienation and resilience: The dynamics of birth outside their community for rural First Nations women. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, 7(1), 55-64.
- Kukreti, B.R., Saxena, M.K., & Gihar, S. (2005). Values and teacher competence. *Journal of All India Association for Educational Research*, 17(3), 86-93.
- Mann, S.J. (2005). Alienation in the learning environment: a failure of community? *Studies in HigherEducation*, 30(1), 43-55.
- Rama Mohan Babu, V. (1992). Job satisfaction attitude towards teaching, job involvement, efficiency of teaching and perception of organizational climate of teacher of residents and non residential schools, in 5<sup>th</sup> Survey of Research in Education by M.B. Buch (1988-1992), New

Delhi:N.C.E.R.T.

- Sindhu, P.S. (1992). A study of professional competence of physical education schools teachers in relation to their intelligence, emotional maturity, and self esteem and environment facilities, in 5<sup>th</sup> Survey of research in Education by M.B. Buch (1988-92) New Delhi: N.C.E.R.T.
- Sirin, E.F., Duman, S., & Karakus, S. (2011). Work Alienation in Predicting Job Satisfaction among Physical Education Teachers. Turkey World Applied Sciences Journal, 12(8), 1207-1213.
- Smith, H.P., & Bohm, R.M. (2008). Beyond anomie: Alienation and crime. Critical Criminology, 16(1), 1-15.
- Thompson, M.J. (2013). Alienation as atrophied moral cognition and its implications for political behavior. Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour.
- Tummers, L., & Den Dulk, L. (2013). The effects of work alienation on organizational commitment, work effort and work to family enrichment. Journal of Nursing Management, 21(6), 850-878.
- Wendling, A.E. (2011). Karl Marx on technology and alienation. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yuill, C. (2011). Forgetting and remembering alienation theory. History of the Human Science.