

Value Orientations of Central Philippine University Students*

Macario B. Ruiz

This study is a sequel to a previous investigation on the value orientations of teachers at Central Philippine University, a report of which has previously been released. The present investigation aimed to investigate the attitudes of students towards selected dimensions of value orientations and to compare the attitudes of first year and fourth year students. Incidentally, a comparison of the value orientations of the teachers and the students has been included in this report.

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS AND RESPECTIVE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES.

1. What are the value orientations of the students on the Man-Nature dimensions? Are they mastery-over-nature harmony-with-nature, or subjugation-to-nature oriented? Our research hypothesis was that they are primarily mastery-over-nature oriented and harmony-with-nature oriented secondarily.

* This is the second of Dr. Ruiz's studies on value orientations of Central Philippine University faculty and students.

2. What are the orientations of the students on the Time dimension? Are they past, present, or future oriented? We hypothesized that they are primarily present oriented and future oriented secondarily.

3. What are the orientations of the students on the Relational dimension? Are they individualism, collaterality, or lineality oriented? Our research hypothesis was that, as a group, they are individualism oriented primarily and collaterality oriented secondarily.

4. What are the value orientations of the students on the Activity dimension? Are they "doing" (achievement), being-in-becoming, or being oriented? The research hypothesis was that primarily they are being-in-becoming oriented primarily and "doing" (achievement) oriented secondarily.

These research hypotheses were based on two primary considerations: (1) The subjects in this study are all college students, who presumably have been reared into the more modernistic attitudes, such as mastery over nature, preferring things of the present as contrasted with things of the future, institutionalized into the cultural pattern

of self-centeredness of people in most cultures, including those of developing countries; (2) we have been influenced, fortunately or unfortunately, by the findings in the study on the value orientations of the faculty members of this University.

Comparison of Value Orientations of First Year and Fourth Year Students

Are there basic differences in the value orientations of first year and fourth year students on the four dimension? Our hypothesis was that the basic trends of preferences or attitudes towards each of the variations of each value dimension would be the same. For instance, the freshmen would, like the seniors, be mastery-over-nature oriented primarily and harmony-with-nature secondarily. The basis of this research hypothesis is that the questionnaire was intended to measure the value orientations of people from low through the very high educational levels, people from the traditional societies through the most modern ones. However, we further hypothesized that there would be differences in the "amount" or "extent" of preferences as shown by differences in their group scores.

Comparison of Value Orientations of Students and Teachers

Are there basic differences in the value orientations of the students and the teachers on the four dimensions? Our hypothesis, based on the same considerations as above, was that the trends would be the same for both groups but that there would also be minor differences in the "amount" of preferences as shown by their group scores.

Comparison of Value Orientations by Colleges

How do the various colleges compare in value orientations? The research hypothesis was that they would show the same trend of value orientations or preferences in so far as the three postulated variations of each dimension are concerned.

PROCEDURE

The procedure followed in this investigation was the same as that in the study of the value orientations of teachers. The same questionnaire was used. We did not feel the need for repeating the details of the procedure here. (*See Southeast Asia Journal, Vol. 7, No. 1.*)

The Sample. A systematic sampling of one for every fourth student in the enrollment list for the second semester, 1973-1974 was adopted

for purposes of this study, except that in the smaller colleges, all the students were included in the original sample list. A little over one thousand questionnaires were sent through the deans for them to distribute to the pre-selected respondents. Six hundred and ninety-three questionnaires were returned, distributed as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| (1) College of Arts and Sciences | 145 |
| (2) College of Agriculture | 46 |
| (3) College of Commerce | 84 |
| (4) College of Education | 59 |
| (5) College of Engineering | 118 |
| (6) College of Law | 3 |
| (7) College of Nursing | 210 |
| (8) College of Theology | 20 |
| (9) Graduate School | 8 |
| Total | 693 |

Some questionnaires came in too late to be included in the computations of the tabulated data for the present report, although they were included in the preparation of the charts.

The sample for the section on a comparison of the value orientations of first year and fourth year students consisted of only one hundred students each, selected from the main sample on a representative sampling design.

FINDINGS. The findings are reported in the succeeding tables. For the first problem, only the relevant

statistical measures have been presented. Frequency distributions may, however, be found in the section on a comparison of the value

orientations of students and teachers.

Value Orientations of Students

1. Man-Nature dimension.

TABLE 1
Value Orientations of C.P.U. Students on the Variations of Man-Nature Dimension

| | V a r i a t i o n s | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Mastery over Nature (N=693) | Harmony with Nature (N=693) | Subjugation to Nature (N=693) |
| Median | 25.15 | 20.80 | 13.94 |
| SE _{mdn} | .12 | .10 | .13 |
| Diff. | +4.35 | +6.86 | |
| SE _{diff.} | .16 | .17 | |
| CR | 27.00 | 40.00 | |

Note: A critical ratio (CR) of 2.58 is necessary for the difference in the medians to be significant at the 1 per cent level.

Table reads: Difference of 4.35 in favor of MA over HA is significant at more than the 1 per cent level; the difference of 6.86 in favor of HA over Su is also more than significant at this level. It can be deduced that the difference between MA and Su is also significant.

The data confirmed Research Hypothesis 1. The students would control and/or modify nature or their environment to suit and improve their life style, and secondarily,

they would put up with nature or be in harmony with it. The orientation, then is mastery over nature, harmony with nature, and subjugation to nature in that order. The

obtained critical ratios say that if we select another random sample of 693 students and administer the questionnaire to them, we would be practically certain that the trend of the orientations, mastery over nature, harmony with nature, and subjugation by nature in that order, would be obtained.

2. Time dimension

The data also confirmed our Research Hypothesis 2. The students

are primarily present oriented and secondarily future oriented. They tend to show preference to or have more concern for problems in life that have to do with the present, rather than those which have to do with the future or the past. As in the case of the Man-Nature dimension, we can be sure that if we selected a random sample of 693 from the student body, we would get the same trend – present, future, and past in that order.

TABLE 2
Value Orientations of C.P.U. Students on the Variations
of Time Dimension

| | V a r i a t i o n s | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | Future (N=693) | Present (N=693) | Past (N=693) |
| Median | 20.93 | 22.02 | 16.80 |
| SE _{mdn} | .12 | .11 | .12 |
| Diff. | +1.09 | | |
| SE _{diff.} | .16 | | |
| CR | 6.8 | | |

Note: A CR of 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level.

Note: Since the SE_{mdns} are practically the same, the differences between the Present and the Past Variations or the Future and the Past are also significant at this level. Their respective differences are larger than 1.09.

3. Relational dimension

TABLE 3
Value Orientations of C.P.U. Students on the Variations
of Relational Dimension

| | V a r i a t i o n s | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| | Individualism N = 693 | Lineality N = 693 | Collaterality N = 693 |
| Median | 22.49 | 16.79 | 20.93 |
| SE _{mdn} | .15 | .13 | .12 |
| Diff (In-Co) | +1.56 | | |
| SE _{diff.} | .19 | | |
| CR | 8.5 | | |

Note: A CR of 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level.

Table reads: The difference of 1.56 score points between Individualism and Collaterality in favor of the former is very significant, the obtained CR being 9.5. There was no point computing for the significance of the other pairs of median (*In* vs *Li*, and *Li* vs *Co*). Their differences are also significant at the 1 per cent level.

The data confirmed Research Hypothesis 3 that the students are individualism, collaterality, and lineality oriented in that order. They tend to be individualistic, to see each individual in society as one responsible to himself, to be autonomous, rather than to see each

individual as a part of the social order. Secondly, they would have preference to group authority as against the authority which comes from rank or age. The obtained critical ratio of 8.5 says that if we selected a random sample of 693 students from the same population

of C.P.U. students, we would be practically certain that we would get the same trend of preferences on this dimension.

4. Activity dimension

Research Hypothesis 4 was also confirmed by the data. The students, as a group, are primarily being-in-becoming oriented, and achievement oriented secondarily.

TABLE 4
Value Orientations of C.P.U. Students on the
Variations of Activity Dimension

| | V a r i a t i o n s | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| | Doing (Achievement) N = 693 | Being-in-becom- ing N = 693 | Being N = 693 |
| Median | 19.22 | 23.99 | 16.68 |
| SE _{mdn} | .13 | .13 | .13 |
| Diff. | 2.54 | +4.77 | |
| SE _{diff.} | .24 | .24 | |
| CR | 10.6 | 19.00 | |

Note: A CR of 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level; 1.96 at the 5 per cent level.

Table reads: The difference of 4.77 in the median of Column 2 and Column 1 is significant at the 1 per cent level; the difference of 2.54 between Column 1 and Column 3 is significant at the 1 per cent level. It can be assumed that the difference between Column 2 and Column 3 is significant at the 1 per cent level.

They are motivated to become someone or to be worthy, successful in life. But the goal, which is the primary consideration, is self-oriented. As achievement (doing)

oriented, the source of satisfaction (or happiness) is in the activity, the process, not in the ultimate attainment of the purpose of this activity, although such goal is not entirely

ignored. They have to do something or "bust" as the idiom goes. As in the case of the other dimensions, if a random sample of 693 students from the students were chosen and if given the same questionnaire to accomplish, the chances would be

better than 99 per cent that the trend would be the same as in the present sample.

Comparison of the Value Orientations of First and Fourth Year Students.

5. Man-Nature dimension

TABLE 5
Comparison of Value Orientations of First Year and Fourth Year Students, Man-Nature Dimension

| Score | First Year (N = 100) | | | Fourth Year (N = 100) | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|--------|
| | MA (1) | Ha (2) | Su (3) | MA (4) | Ha (5) | Su (6) |
| 30 | — | — | — | 1 | — | — |
| 29 | 2 | — | — | 5 | — | — |
| 28 | 12 | — | — | 8 | — | — |
| 27 | 14 | 1 | — | 20 | — | — |
| 26 | 14 | — | — | 21 | — | — |
| 25 | 12 | 1 | — | 13 | 1 | — |
| 24 | 17 | 6 | — | 13 | 4 | — |
| 23 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 2 |
| 22 | 5 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 23 | 1 |
| 21 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 2 |
| 20 | 5 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 24 | 2 |
| 19 | 2 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 2 |
| 18 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| 17 | — | 6 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 16 | — | 2 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 15 | — | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| 14 | — | — | 18 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 13 | — | — | 12 | 0 | — | 13 |
| 12 | — | — | 18 | 0 | — | 20 |
| 11 | — | — | 4 | — | — | 17 |
| 10 | — | — | 2 | — | — | 2 |
| Median | 24.84 | 20.44 | 14.28 | 25.74 | 20.85 | 15.35 |
| SD | 2.52 | 2.17 | 2.69 | 2.51 | 1.94 | 2.90 |
| SE _{mdn} | .32 | .28 | .34 | .32 | .25 | .37 |
| Diff. | | | +.93 | +.90 | +.41 | |
| SE _{diff.} | | | .50 | .45 | .37 | |
| CR | | | 1.86 (ns) | 2.00 | 1.1 (ns) | |

Note: A CR of 2.58 is necessary for the median difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level; 1.96 at the 5 per cent level.

Table reads: Differences between Column 1 and Column 4 is +.90 in favor of the seniors; between Column 2 and Column 5 is +.41 in favor of seniors; and between Column 3 and Column 6 is +.93 in favor of freshmen.

TABLE 6
Comparison of Value Orientations of First Year and
Fourth Year, Time Dimension

| Score | First Year (N = 100) | | | Fourth Year (N = 100) | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | (Fu (1)) | Pr (2) | Pa (3) | Fu (4) | Pr (5) | Pa (6) |
| 30 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 29 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 28 | 1 | 1 | — | — | 1 | — |
| 27 | — | 1 | — | — | 1 | — |
| 26 | 3 | 4 | — | 2 | 5 | — |
| 25 | 4 | 3 | — | 3 | 14 | 1 |
| 24 | 9 | 8 | — | 6 | 17 | — |
| 23 | 13 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 14 | 1 |
| 22 | 11 | 15 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 2 |
| 21 | 13 | 23 | 4 | 17 | 14 | 2 |
| 20 | 21 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 9 |
| 19 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 17 | 8 | 8 |
| 18 | 6 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| 17 | 3 | 1 | 19 | 9 | 1 | 28 |
| 16 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 1 | — | 18 |
| 15 | 1 | 0 | 11 | — | — | 12 |
| 14 | — | 1 | 7 | 1 | — | 6 |
| 13 | — | — | 1 | — | 1 | 3 |
| 12 | — | — | — | — | — | 1 |
| 11 | — | — | — | — | — | 1 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Median | 20.81 | 21.33 | 17.86 | 20.68 | 22.68 | 16.83 |
| SD | 2.48 | 2.37 | 2.18 | 2.37 | 2.44 | 2.29 |
| SE _{mdn} | .32 | .30 | .28 | .30 | .31 | .29 |
| Diff. | +1.13 | | +1.03 | | +1.32 | |
| SE _{diff.} | .44 | | .43 | | .40 | |
| CR | .4 (ns) | | 2.4 | | 3.0 | |

Note: A CR of 2.58 is necessary for the median difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level; 1.96 at the 5 per cent level.

Relational dimension

TABLE 7
Comparison of Value Orientations of Freshmen and Seniors, Relational Dimension

| Score | First Year (N = 100) | | | Fourth Year (N = 100) | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------|--------|-----------------------|---------|--------|
| | IN (1) | Lin (2) | Co (3) | IN (4) | Lin (5) | Co (6) |
| 30 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 29 | — | — | — | 2 | | |
| 28 | 1 | | | 3 | | |
| 27 | 1 | | | 9 | | |
| 26 | 4 | | 2 | 11 | | 1 |
| 25 | 14 | | 6 | 11 | 1 | 5 |
| 24 | 11 | | 6 | 9 | | 7 |
| 23 | 12 | | 12 | 15 | | 17 |
| 22 | 13 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| 21 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 20 |
| 20 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 6 | 19 |
| 19 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| 18 | 6 | 16 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 5 |
| 17 | 4 | 16 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 3 |
| 16 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 1 |
| 15 | 1 | 7 | — | 2 | 20 | 1 |
| 14 | 1 | 4 | 1 | — | 6 | — |
| 13 | — | 5 | — | — | 10 | — |
| 12 | — | 2 | — | — | 9 | |
| 11 | — | — | — | 1 | — | — |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Median | 21.97 | 17.69 | 20.72 | 23.17 | 15.96 | 21.0 |
| SD | 2.85 | 2.51 | 2.53 | 3.36 | 2.71 | 2.15 |
| SE _{mdn} | .36 | .32 | .32 | .43 | .34 | .27 |
| Diff. | | +1.73 | | +1.90 | | +2.28 |
| SE _{diff.} | | .86 | | .56 | | .42 |
| CR | | 2.0 | | 3.4 | | .6(ns) |

Note: A CR of 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level; 1.96 at the 5 per cent level.

Activity dimension

TABLE 8
Comparison of Value Orientations of Freshmen and Seniors, Activity Orientation

| Score | Freshmen (N = 100) | | | Seniors (N = 100) | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|-------------------|--------|--------|
| | Do (1) | Bb (2) | Be (3) | Do (4) | Bb (5) | Be (6) |
| 30 | | | | | | |
| 29 | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| 28 | | 2 | | | 4 | |
| 27 | | 6 | | | 6 | |
| 26 | 1 | 10 | | | | 1 |
| 25 | | 18 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 1 |
| 24 | 4 | 13 | — | 5 | 13 | — |
| 23 | 10 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 19 | — |
| 22 | 6 | 14 | — | 10 | 12 | 3 |
| 21 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 9 | 1 |
| 20 | 20 | 5 | 9 | 19 | 3 | 8 |
| 19 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 5 | 8 |
| 18 | 16 | 2 | 12 | 12 | 3 | 10 |
| 17 | 11 | 2 | 22 | 7 | — | 15 |
| 16 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 20 |
| 15 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 2 | — | 17 |
| 14 | 4 | — | 6 | 1 | — | 11 |
| 13 | 2 | — | 1 | — | — | 4 |
| 12 | — | — | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| 11 | — | — | 1 | — | — | — |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Median | 19.55 | 23.58 | 17.14 | 19.82 | 22.40 | 16.35 |
| SD | 2.66 | 2.78 | 2.45 | 2.30 | 2.58 | 2.50 |
| SE _{mdn} | .34 | .35 | .31 | .29 | .33 | .32 |
| Diff. | | +1.8 | +79 | +27 | | |
| SE _{diff.} | | .48 | .45 | .44 | | |
| CR | | .37(ns) | 1.7(ns) | .60(ns) | | |

Note: A CR of at least 1.96 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 5 per cent level; 2.58 at the 1 per cent level.

The data confirmed the Research Hypothesis that each group would show the same trend of their value orientations -- mastery-over-nature, harmony with nature, and subjugation to nature in that order. However, it appears that the seniors are more mastery-over-nature oriented than the freshmen, the difference of +.90 being significant at the 5 per cent level. It was found that neither of the two groups is more harmony with nature nor subjugation by nature oriented than the other. The small differences are probably due to sampling errors.

As in the case of the Man-Nature dimension, the two groups show the same trend of preferences for the three variations of the Time Dimension -- present, future, and past in that order. Neither of the two groups is more future oriented than the other, the median difference being insignificant at the 5 per cent level. The freshmen are, however, more past oriented than the seniors. The difference of 1.03 score points is significant at the 5 per cent level, but not at the 1 per cent level. On the other hand, the seniors are more present oriented than the freshmen. The difference of 1.32 is significant at the 1 per cent level.

The same general trend of the value orientations has been found for both the freshmen and the seniors -- individualism, collateral-ity, and lineality in that order. The seniors appeared to be more individualism oriented than the freshmen, but the freshmen were more lineality oriented than the seniors. In both cases the median differences are significant at the 1 per cent and 5 per cent levels respectively.

The data confirmed the research hypothesis in that the general trend of orientations of both group is the same -- "being-in-becoming, doing, and being," in that order. There appears to be no differences between the two groups in so far as the three variations are concerned. The respective median differences are all insignificant.

It appears from the above table that although the average development score of the seniors is higher by .81, this difference is not significant. The null hypothesis has thus been accepted and that the alternative hypothesis was accepted. Both groups are, statistically speaking, equally oriented. Using the criterion adopted (Table 9), we can say that the seniors fall within the "high" total development category,

whereas the freshmen come within the "medium" total development category, just a fraction of a decimal below the high category.

The data confirmed the basic research hypothesis, that both groups have the same trend in their attitudes towards the three postulated variations of the Man-Nature dimension— mastery over nature, harmony with nature, and subjugation by nature in that order.

The table shows that (a) the teachers are definitely more mastery over nature oriented than the students, the median difference of 1.70 being significant at the 1 per cent level (See Columns (1) and (4)); (b) the students are generally more harmony with nature oriented than the teachers, the difference of .43 score points being significant at the 5 per cent level (See Columns 2 and 5); and (c) not surprising at

TABLE 9

Comparison of Average Development Score of First and Fourth Year Students

| Dimensions | First Year (N= 100) | | Fourth Year (N= 100) | |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | Median | SE _{mdn} | Median | SE _{mdn} |
| Mastery over Nature | 24.84 | .32 | 25.74 | .32 |
| Future | 20.81 | .32 | 20.68 | .30 |
| Individualism | 21.97 | .36 | 23.17 | .43 |
| Doing (Achievement) | 19.55 | .34 | 19.82 | .29 |
| Total | 87.17 | | 89.41 | |
| Average | 21.79 | .335 | 22.60 | .335 |
| Difference | | | + .81 | |
| CR | | | 1.7 | |

Note: A CR of at least 1.96 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 5 per cent level; 2.58 at the 1 per cent level.

TABLE 10

Comparison of Value Orientations of Faculty
and Students— Man-Nature Dimension

| Score | Faculty (N= 165) | | | Students (N= 693) | | |
|---------------------|------------------|--------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|
| | Ma (1) | Ma (2) | Su (3) | Ma (4) | Ha (5) | Su (6) |
| 30 | . 5 | — | — | 1 | — | — |
| 29 | 30 | — | 1— | 29 | — | — |
| 28 | 36 | — | — | 74 | — | — |
| 27 | 40 | — | — | 95 | 1 | — |
| 26 | 20 | — | — | 111 | 1 | 2 |
| 25 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 103 | 4 | — |
| 24 | 12 | 2 | — | 115 | 10 | 2 |
| 23 | 3 | 6 | — | 66 | 28 | 4 |
| 22 | 2 | 23 | — | 39 | 78 | 1 |
| 21 | 3 | 45 | 1 | 23 | 126 | 9 |
| 20 | — | 41 | 2 | 18 | 145 | 10 |
| 19 | — | 27 | 1 | 8 | 138 | 19 |
| 18 | — | 13 | 3 | 1 | 92 | 28 |
| 17 | — | 5 | 3 | 2 | 38 | 53 |
| 16 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 71 |
| 15 | — | — | 11 | 4 | 7 | 84 |
| 14 | — | — | 21 | 1 | 7 | 112 |
| 13 | 1 | — | 36 | — | 1 | 103 |
| 12 | 1 | — | 35 | — | — | 110 |
| 11 | — | — | 42 | — | — | 70 |
| 10 | — | — | 6 | — | — | 15 |
| Median | 26.85 | 20.37 | 12.50 | 25.15 | 20.80 | 13.94 |
| SD | 2.63 | 1.54 | 2.60 | 2.52 | 1.91 | 2.63 |
| SE _{mdn} | .305 | .16 | .26 | .12 | .10 | .13 |
| Diff. | +1.70 | | | | .43 | +1.44 |
| SE _{diff.} | .327 | | | | .18 | .29 |
| CR | 5.2 | | | | 2.4 | 5.0 |

Note: A CR of at least 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at 1 per cent level; 1.96 to be significant at 5 per cent level.

TABLE 11
Comparison of Value Orientations of Faculty and
Students, Time Dimension

| Score | Faculty (N = 165) | | | Students (N = 693) | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------|-------|--------------------|---------|-------|
| | Future | Present | Past | Future | Present | Past |
| 30 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 29 | 1 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 28 | — | 1 | — | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| 27 | 1 | 3 | — | 1 | 13 | — |
| 26 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 19 | 19 | 1 |
| 25 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 28 | 59 | 2 |
| 24 | 10 | 15 | — | 37 | 91 | 3 |
| 23 | 4 | 21 | 1 | 69 | 98 | 6 |
| 22 | 18 | 29 | — | 98 | 124 | 12 |
| 21 | 23 | 24 | 4 | 97 | 113 | 29 |
| 20 | 31 | 22 | 2 | 114 | 73 | 47 |
| 19 | 28 | 8 | 6 | 81 | 49 | 65 |
| 18 | 21 | 8 | 19 | 56 | 33 | 98 |
| 17 | 9 | 1 | 24 | 31 | 7 | 118 |
| 16 | 8 | 8 | 34 | 16 | 2 | 106 |
| 15 | 5 | 2 | 25 | 5 | 4 | 106 |
| 14 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 67 |
| 13 | 2 | — | 16 | — | — | 24 |
| 12 | — | — | 4 | 1 | — | 6 |
| 11 | — | — | 2 | — | — | 1 |
| 10 | — | — | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| Median | 19.74 | 21.70 | 16.07 | 20.93 | 22.02 | 16.80 |
| SD | 2.58 | 2.94 | 2.35 | 2.42 | 2.33 | 2.42 |
| SE _{mdn} | .25 | .29 | .23 | .12 | .11 | .12 |
| Diff. | | | | +1.19 | +32 | +73 |
| SE _{diff.} | | | | .27 | .31 | .26 |
| CR | | | | 4.4 | 1.03 | 2.8 |

Note: A CR of 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level; 1.96 to be significant at the 5 per cent level.

Relational dimension

TABLE 12

Comparison of Value Orientations of Faculty and Students, Relational Dimension

| Score | Faculty (N = 165) | | | Students (N = 693) | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------|--------|--------------------|---------|--------|
| | In (1) | Lin (2) | Co (3) | In (4) | Lin (5) | Co (6) |
| 30 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 29 | — | — | — | 4 | — | — |
| 28 | 3 | — | — | 15 | — | 1 |
| 27 | 25 | — | — | 35 | 3 | 5 |
| 26 | 23 | — | 1 | 56 | 1 | 16 |
| 25 | 23 | — | 3 | 78 | 2 | 24 |
| 24 | 32 | 1 | 5 | 70 | 4 | 55 |
| 23 | 29 | 1 | 16 | 87 | 10 | 78 |
| 22 | 10 | 2 | 26 | 97 | 24 | 96 |
| 21 | 7 | — | 38 | 71 | 29 | 125 |
| 20 | 4 | 6 | 36 | 54 | 38 | 119 |
| 19 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 32 | 70 | 78 |
| 18 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 30 | 91 | 50 |
| 17 | 2 | 18 | 10 | 31 | 104 | 29 |
| 16 | 1 | 28 | 3 | 10 | 89 | 11 |
| 15 | — | 30 | — | 13 | 99 | 3 |
| 14 | 1 | 26 | 1 | 5 | 58 | 2 |
| 13 | — | 24 | — | 2 | 47 | — |
| 12 | — | 10 | — | 1 | 23 | — |
| 11 | — | 1 | — | 2 | 1 | — |
| 10 | — | 1 | — | — | — | 1 |
| Median | 24.27 | 15.15 | 20.67 | 22.49 | 16.79 | 20.93 |
| SD | 2.49 | 2.36 | 1.85 | 3.16 | 2.74 | 2.38 |
| SE _{mdn} | .25 | .22 | .18 | .15 | .13 | .12 |
| Diff. | +1.78 | | | | +1.64 | +2.26 |
| SE _{diff.} | .29 | | | | .25 | .22 |
| CR | 6.0 | | | | 6.5 | 1.2 |

Note: A CR of at least 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level; 1.96 to be significant at the 5 per cent level.

all is the observation that the students are definitely more subjugation to nature oriented than the teachers (See Columns 3 and 6).

The obtained critical ratios (CR) say that if groups of 165 faculty members and 693 students were chosen at random and asked to answer the same questionnaire, the chances are more than 95 out of a hundred that the same trend of differences would be obtained; the teachers would be more mastery-over-nature oriented, that the students would be more harmony with nature oriented, and more subjugation by nature oriented than the teachers.

The table shows that both teachers and students have the same preference to the three postulated variations of the Time dimension – present, future, and past in that order. In this respect, the data confirmed the research hypothesis.

On the basis of the scores, both groups appear to be equally present oriented. It is to be noted that the median difference of $+0.32$ in favor of the students is not significant. The CR of 1.08 says that we get a random sample of the same number of students and teachers and ask

the group to answer the questionnaire, there is no assurance that there will be a difference in favor of the students.

The table also reveals that the students as a group are more future oriented than the teachers, as shown by the fact that the difference of 1.19 score points in favor of the students is significant at the 1 per cent level. What this says is that if another sample of the same number were asked to answer the questionnaire, the chances are 99 out of a hundred that there will be some difference in favor of the students. This is why one says the difference is significant at the one per cent level.

Similarly, the students appear to be more past oriented than the teachers. The median difference of $.73$ in their favor is significant at the 1 per cent level.

Table 12, above, shows that the teachers are more individualism oriented than the students, the difference of 1.78 score points, with a critical ratio of 6.0, indicates that this difference is significant at the 1 per cent level.

On the other hand, it appears from the table that the students are more lineality oriented than the

Activity dimension

TABLE 13
Comparison of Value Orientations of Faculty and
Students, Activity Dimension

| Score | Faculty (N = 165) | | | Students (N = 693) | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| | Do (1) | Bb (2) | Be (3) | Do (4) | Bb (5) | Be (6) |
| 30 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| 29 | — | 2 | — | — | 13 | — |
| 28 | — | 12 | — | — | 19 | — |
| 27 | 1 | 21 | — | — | 71 | 1 |
| 26 | 1 | 25 | — | 2 | 94 | — |
| 25 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 97 | 4 |
| 24 | 3 | 29 | — | 28 | 103 | 4 |
| 23 | 8 | 17 | — | 38 | 113 | 4 |
| 22 | 15 | 18 | 4 | 56 | 68 | 16 |
| 21 | 20 | 8 | 3 | 74 | 50 | 25 |
| 20 | 23 | 8 | 8 | 107 | 25 | 46 |
| 19 | 28 | 4 | 11 | 110 | 15 | 68 |
| 18 | 32 | — | 20 | 93 | 10 | 89 |
| 17 | 16 | — | 20 | 76 | 9 | 108 |
| 16 | 9 | 1 | 23 | 53 | 3 | 109 |
| 15 | 4 | — | 32 | 24 | 1 | 103 |
| 14 | 3 | — | 30 | 12 | 1 | 56 |
| 13 | — | — | 5 | 8 | — | 41 |
| 12 | — | — | 5 | 2 | — | 15 |
| 11 | — | — | 1 | — | — | 3 |
| 10 | — | — | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| Median | 19.16 | 24.40 | 18.88 | 19.22 | 23.99 | 16.68 |
| SD | 2.38 | 2.53 | 2.32 | 2.57 | 2.64 | 2.65 |
| SE _{mdn} | .33 | .24 | .22 | .13 | .13 | .13 |
| Diff. | | +41 | | +06 | | +80 |
| SE _{diff.} | | .27 | | .35 | | .25 |
| CR | | 1.5 | | .17 | | 3.2 |

Note: A CR of at least 2.58 is necessary for the difference to be significant at the 1 per cent level; 1.96 to be significant at the 5 per cent level.

teachers. The difference of 1.64 in favor of the students is significant at the 1 per cent level.

The table shows that both groups are equally collaterality oriented. The difference of +.26 in favor of the students is not significant.

As in the case of the three previous orientations, the data confirm the research hypothesis, that both groups would have the same trend of preferences in the three postulated variations of each value dimension. The table also reveals that the two groups did not differ in their preferences in the achievement and the being-in-becoming variations, al-

though the students seem to be more being oriented than the teachers. The difference of .80 in favor of the students is significant at the 1 per cent level.

Comparison of Average Development Scores. It has been postulated that of each of the three variations of the four dimensions, there is one which is characteristic of developed countries, and are indicative of development orientation.

These are (1) individualism, (2) achievement (doing) (3) future, and mastery-over-nature. The data were analyzed to compare the development orientation of the teachers

TABLE 14
Comparison of Development Orientation of Faculty and Students

| Variations | Faculty | | Students | |
|------------------------|---------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|
| | Median | SE _{mdn} | Median | SE _{mdn} |
| 1. Mastery Over Nature | 26.85 | .305 | 25.15 | .12 |
| 2. Future | 19.74 | .290 | 20.93 | .11 |
| 3. Individualism | 24.27 | .250 | 22.49 | .15 |
| 4. Achievement | 19.16 | .330 | 19.22 | .13 |
| Average | 22.480 | .294 | 22.197 | .127 |
| Difference | + .283 | | | |
| CR | .9 | | | |

and the students. The research hypothesis was that the teachers were more development oriented than the students. The respective group medians and the standard error of the median were averaged for purposes of analysis. The findings are reported in Table 14.

The data did not confirm the research hypothesis. There is no evidence to show that the teachers are more development oriented than the students. The difference of .283 score points in favor of the teachers is too small, which may be due to sampling errors.

The median total development score of the teachers is around 90, and that of the students is 89. Considering the fact that the range of the "high total development score" is 88–103, one can assume that the faculty and the students are "highly development oriented.*"

Summary and Implications of Findings.

It has been shown that the students at Central Philippine University, like their teachers, would rather modify and/or control their environment, rather than be in harmony with it or a slave to it. Like their teachers, they tend to be more concerned about problems that have to

do with the present, rather than those that have to do with the future or with the past, believing, possibly, that the future is vague and unpredictable, that the past is "history"—as it were—and has little or nothing to do with meeting the problems of the work-a-day world. They tend to be individual, rather than group oriented. They see the individual in society as one who should be responsible to himself, to regard their autonomy as a precious facet of their life-style. If authority has to be a part and parcel of social life, it must be that of the group, not that coming from age, or rank, or position. They tend, finally, to be motivated in their activities to become someone worthy or respected by others. The goal for each activity is, more often than not, self-oriented, for self-actualization, not to say, survival. Secondly, they also tend to find satisfaction in the activity, the process, not necessarily in the ultimate purpose of the activity.

What is the implication of the fact that, basically, the students and their teachers have the same value orientations in the four dimensions?

Values, we are told, exert a great force in making rational or on-the-spot decisions. Since this is so, we

can assume that ordinarily, both student and teacher would have about the same attitude towards a given issue. There is no problem of "generation gap." Suppose, however, a teacher is "past oriented" and keeps harping about the "good old days" and refuses to "learn" from the "new dimensions of cultural change." If the students are present and/or future oriented then there would be an endless conflict of perspectives, which widens the generation gap.

As we are trying to re-formulate our objectives in the light of government expectations and the New Society and in the midst of a world energy crisis and population explosion, what shall we, for one thing, do? Shall we teach students to exploit Nature for the sake of survival in the present, or shall we teach students to live in harmony with nature for the sake of a philosophy of hope? Shall we idealize or idolize group living over and above self-centeredness and individualism? These are basic issues that cannot be decided by fiat. Whatever the decisions, somehow they have to be reflected in the basic goals we are trying to achieve.

The data also revealed that the teachers as a group are not more

development oriented than the students. It is fortunate that this is definitely so. For if the students were more development oriented than the teachers, they may lose — in a manner of speaking — admiration for them. In this context, we pose a rhetorical question: If a teacher is subjugation to nature, past, lineality, and being oriented and his students are mastery-over-nature, future, individualism and activity oriented — that is, in complete contrast with the teacher — what will happen during the days and weeks and months that the teacher and the students come in contact with each other?

For a final word: We have mentioned that the literature on social change suggests that mastery, achievement, individual, and future orientations are associated with planning development — social development, education development, and all other forms of development. These orientations, above all, influence our attitudes towards even the least fundamental issues in the classroom. Maybe, teachers should be aware of these, not only for today and tomorrow and the next day, but for all days, so that they will help enhance a development perspective in the context of school business.