

The Impact of Professional and Non-Professional Education on A Student's Modernity

Dr. Raj Kumar Pannu,
Vikram Marg, Karnal Haryana India.

Introduction

Some of the studies mainly concerned with “school effects” have shown positive relationship between level of education and modernity. Armer and Youtz (1971) in their studies of the effect of formal western education on the seventeen year old males in Kano, Nigeria, have noted a steady increase in the percentage of “more modern” respondents with increasing educational attainment, independent of several alternative modernizing forces. Inkeles (1973) in his Harvard project has found that modernity increases fairly regularly all along the educational continuum from the lowest grades up to at least the end of secondary. Holsinger (1973) in his systematically formulated Brazilian study has observed that children without schooling and school children have shown a statistically and uniform increase of approximately five points from grade. Klineberg (1973), Jindal (1981), Thakur (1991), and Sharma (1993) have also shown positive association between level of education and modernity.

Key Words- Professional, Non-Professional Student, Modernity

Raghuvanshi (1980) in his study has revealed that people with education are more modern than people with no education. Sharma (1979) in his study of university students have noted a trend of negative association between level of education and modernity. Similarly, Sharda (1989) in his study of schooling and modernity have shown negative relationship between education and modernity. He reports, “The better educated respondents were less modern in their outlook than the less educated and illiterate respondents”.

On the basis of existing literature, we hypothesized that the level of student modernity or the students of professional classes are more modern than the students of non professional classes. For systematic examination, we have some initial sub-hypotheses. Assuming that one of the referent of the level of higher education was the educational degree i.e. undergraduate/non-professional or postgraduate/professional, it was hypothesized that postgraduates/professional would be more modern than undergraduates/non-professional. Considering educational class (1st year, 2nd year and 3rd year students i.e. undergraduates of different faculties) to be another possible referent of the level of education, we

hypothesized that students of a senior class are more modern than students of a junior class or the higher the class, the higher the modernity score.

Methodology-

The present study was conducted in Karnal city in Haryana. There were three approaches, which had been employed in this study they are longitudinal, cross-sectional and control group design. The importance of longitudinal approach (to examine the same respondents at the different points of time) can hardly be overrated. We didn't use this approach in view of time and cost considerations. Finally, both the cross-sectional and control group design was employed in this study. Three groups of respondents were taken from three different faculties i.e. B.Sc., B.Com, and B.A. From each faculty, students of first year, second year, third year (under graduate/non professional and post graduate/professional classes) were taken. The cross-sectional approach enabled us to compare the modernity score of students of different classes representing varying degrees of exposure to professional education. The students of different faculties were represented in the respondent group. The data were collected through well structured personal

interview method. A universe of 1208 students on the role of three faculties (i.e. Science, Commerce and Art) of Dyal Singh College, Govt. (PG) college and National Dairy Research institute (Deemed University) Karnal, during the academic year 2006-2007 comprised the sample size, students of science faculty were drawn from Dyal Singh College, Karnal, Dyal Singh. M.Sc. students were taken from National Dairy Research institute (Deemed University) Karnal. Commerce and Arts faculty students were selected from Govt. (Post- Graduate) College.

Result and Discussion:

The data presented in Table 1 reveals that more of the undergraduates/non professional score in the lower half of modernity, while more the postgraduates/professional fell upper half of the modernity scale. This show that postgraduates/professional were more modern than undergraduates/non-professional. The chi-square test ($\chi^2 = 4.77, P > 0.01$) also indicates positive association between educational degree and student modernity i.e. Postgraduates/professional were more modern the undergraduates/non-professional.

Table 1. Educational Degree and Student Modernity

Educational Degree	Student Modernity		Total
	Low	High	
Undergraduate/ non professional student	146 (58.9)	102 (41.1)	248 (100)
Postgraduate/ professional student	22 (42.3)	30 (57.7)	52 (100)
Total	168	132	300

$\chi^2 = 4.77, df=1, P > 0.01$

Proceeding to the second sub-hypothesis, let us examine the relationship between level of education and level of modernity. Table 2 examines the relationship between level of education and level of modernity.

Table 2. Level of Educational and Level of Modernity

Level of Educational	Student Modernity	Total
----------------------	-------------------	-------

Non-Professional Student	Low	High	
1 st year	54(63.5)	31(36.5)	85(100)
2 nd year	46(58.2)	33(41.8)	79(100)
3 rd year	46(54.8)	38(45.2)	84(100)
Postgraduate/ Professional Student	22(42.3)	30(57.7)	52(100)
Total	168	132	300

$\chi^2 = 7.51, d f=3, P > 0.01$

Table 2 indicates a trend of positive association between level of education and level of modernity. The chi-square test ($\chi^2 = 7.51, d f=3, P > 0.001$) clearly shows positive relationship between level of education and level of modernity. The table clearly shows that percentage of higher modernity cases are increasing fairly with the level of education and the percentage of low modernity cases are showing downward trend as we move toward the level of education. Thus it clearly shows that seniors are more modern than juniors and the results are in favor of our hypothesis that students of professional of classes are more modern than students of non professional classes.

Table-3 Perceived Relevance of professional Education for Modernity and level of Modernity

Perceived relevance	Student Modernity		Totle
	Low	High	
Education perceived as modernizer	153(55.4%)	123(44.6%)	276
Education not perceived as modernizer	15 (62.5%)	9(37.5%)	24
Total	168	132	300

$\chi^2 = 0.47, d f = 1, P > 0.05$

A cursory look at table 3 shows the respondents by perceived relevance or irrelevance or irrelevance of professional education as a modernizer and level of modernity. It is quite interesting to note that 276 (92%) respondents have perceived their education as modernizer. Table 3 shows that percentage

(44.6%) of those who perceived professional education as modernizer is comparatively high in high modernity column than those who did not perceive education as modernizer. But the percentage of both types of respondents is high in low modernity column. Our results ($\chi^2=0.47, df=1, p>0.05$) also reveal that there is no significant relation between perceived relevance and level of modernity. In this study, it is also interesting to note that 279 (93%) respondents were of the opinion that their professional education will help them in getting satisfactory job or future settlement both from economics point of view as well as status point of view.

Table 4. Level of Education and student modernity in various faculties

Faculty with level of Education	Student Modernity		Total	Chi-square Test Results
	Low	High		
B.Sc.				
1 st Year	11(40.8)	16(59.2)	27(100)	$\chi^2=1.90$
2 nd Year	7(31.8)	15(68.2)	22(100)	$df=3$
3 rd Year	9(34.6)	17(65.4)	26(100)	
Postgraduate s / professional	6(23.0)	20(77.0)	26(100)	
B.Com.				
1 st Year	19(67.9)	9(32.1)	28(100)	$\chi^2=0.76$
2 nd Year	15(57.7)	11(42.3)	26(100)	$df=3$
3 rd Year	16(64.0)	9(36.0)	25(100)	$P>0.01$
Postgraduate s / professional student	11(68.8)	5(31.2)	16(100)	
B.A.				
1 st year	24(80.0)	6 (20.0)	30(100)	$\chi^2=4.80$
2 nd year	24(80.0)	6 (20.0)	30 (100)	$df=3$
3 rd year	21(63.6)	12(36.4)	33(100)	$p>0.01$
Post graduates/ professional student	5(50.0)	5 (50.0)	10(100)	

It is observed from table-4 that a significant though not statically significant relationship between level of education and student modernity in B.Sc. and B.Com. Faculties. The most striking to note is a trend of positive

association ($\chi^2 = 4.80, df = 3, p > 0.01$) between level of education and modernity in low faculty, where the percentage of respondents of high modernity score is increasing correspondingly with the level of education and the percentage of respondents is decreasing in the low modernity cell with the increase in level of education.

In almost all sociological studies, age is taken into consideration as it plays a fairly significant role in depicting the differences in views, attitude, values and outlook. Modernity has a temporal context and age acquire immediate relevance to it. Klineberg (1973; p.255) has found that younger the men, the more they are likely to hold modern attitudes and values, Sharma (1979, p.77) in his study have shown negative relationship between age and modernity. Ramana (1992;p.59) in her study have shown negative relationship between education and modernity. In her study, she had taken 225 women teacher working in primary, upper primary and secondary school run by Visakhapatnam Municipal Corporation. She found that teacher at lower age exhibit more modern tendencies than those at higher ages.

Table 5 Undergraduates /Non-Professional Student by Faculty and Modernity

Faculty	Lever of Modernity		Total
	Low	High	
B.Sc.	27 (36.0)	48 (64.0)	75
B.Com	50 (63.29)	29 (36.71)	79
B.A.	69 (73.40)	25 (26.60)	94

$\chi^2=25.01, df = 2, p < 0.01$

It will be revealing to examine faculty differences by level of education. Let us first see it at the undergraduate/non –professional level. The result shows (Table 5) significant faculty differences with respect to modernity at undergraduate/non-professional level. The percentage of respondents at high modernity column show a falling trend in given faculty order ;while the percentage of modern was highest in B.sc faculty respondents, it decreased

in respondents of B.Com. Faculty, reaching the lowest in B.A. faculty.

Table 6. postgraduates/professional student by faculty and Modernity

Faculty	Lever of Modernity		Total
	Low	High	
M.SC	6 (23.0)	20 (77.0)	26
M.Com	11 (68.8)	5 (31.2)	16
M.A.	5(50.0)	5 (50.0)	10
Total	22	30	52

$\chi^2 = 8.75, df=2, P>0.01$

Pertaining to postgraduate/professional stratum, table 6 shows the distribution of respondents by faculty and modernity.

The data presented in table 6 highlighted that statistically speaking; there is not much significant differences with respect to modernity among the postgraduates/professional. Doubtless to say that students of B.Sc. faculty are at the top in the high modernity column, but according to expectations, as the students of B.Com, faculty ought to have been on the second place, but contrary to our expectation the percentage of B.A. faculty postgraduate / professional respondents is higher than the percentage of B.Com. Faculty respondents in high modernity column. It might be due to sample fluctuation. Overall, the result substantiates the hypothesis that B.Sc. students tend to be more modern than B.Com. and B.A. students and B.Com. Students tend to be more modern than B.A. students

Table-7 Students by Degree and Exposure of Mass-Media

Degree	Exposure of Mass-Media		Total
	Low	High	
Undergraduate/ Non-professional	53(21.4%)	195(78.6%)	248(100)
Post Graduates/	13(25%)	39(75%)	52(100)

References

1. Armer, Michael and Robert Youtz (1971). Formal Education and Individual Modernity in an African Society. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 76, No. 4, 604-626.
2. Inkeles, Alex (1973). The School as a Context for Modernization. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. XIV (3-4), 163-179.

professional			
Total	66	234	300

$\chi^2 = 0.34, df=1, P>0.05$

The results of table-7 shows that statistically there is no significant relationship between degree of the students and mass-media exposure. Table-7 stated that the percentage of Undergraduate/non-professional respondents are higher than postgraduate / professional respondents in high media exposure category while the percentage of postgraduate / professional is higher than undergraduates/non professional in low mass- media exposure category. So, on this basis we can say that will be wrong to assume that students of the postgraduate/professional classes are more exposed to mass-media than students of undergraduate/non professional classes. Now, to be more precise, let us examine the relationship between level of education and mass-media exposure.

Conclusion

To summarize, we can say that our study have shown positive relationship between level of education and student modernity. Even dimension wise post graduate/professional has been found to be more modern than undergraduate/non professional. Our study have shown that it will be wrong to assume that student s of professional classes are more exposed to mass-media than students of non-professional classes. In our study, 92% respondents have perceived their education as modernizer. So far as age and level of modernity is concerned, our study has revealed no influence of age on modernity. In our study, females have been found to be slightly more modern than males.

3. Holsinger, D.B.(1973). The Elementary School as Modernizer: A Brazilian Study. *International journal of comparative sociology*, Vol.13, No. 3-4, 180-202.
4. Klineberg, S.L. (1973). Parents, School and Modernity: An Exploratory Investigation of Sex Differences in the Attitudinal Development of Tunisian Adolescents. *International journal of comparative Sociology*, Vol. XIV, No. 3-4, 221-244.
5. Sack, Richard (1973). The impact of education on individual modernity in Tunisia. *International journal of comparative sociology*, Vol.XIV, 3-4,245-272.
6. Jindal,B.L. (1981). Schooling and Modernity. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Panjab university , Chandigarh
7. Thakur,B.B. (1991). Schooling and Modernity: A case study of Dehradun city of UP. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
8. Sharma, Renu (1993). Education and Modernity: A Comparative study of students and non-students, M.phil Dissertation, Panjab University , Chandigarh
9. Raghuvanshi, M.Sc. (1980). Formal Education and Individual Modernity among Rural Youth. *Indian Journal of Social Research*, Vol.21, No. 1,8,19.
10. Sharma, S.L. (1979). Modernizing effects of University Education, Allied publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi