Chapter – V

Conclusions, Implications and Suggestions

Introduction

The main purpose of conducting a research study is to draw conclusion. Conclusion may be drawn with the help of hypothesis. For this the first task before the investigator is to test the hypothesis. The present chapter starts with the verification of hypothesis formulated on the first chapter.

Conclusions of the Study

Hypothesis one

The hypothesis one says that the ‘t’ value obtained on high Emotional Intelligence test is 3.70. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that there is significant difference in Emotional Intelligence of highly deprived girl students studying in various boards. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Intelligence of highly deprived girl students studying in various boards” may be rejected.
Hypothesis two

The hypothesis two says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Emotional Intelligence test is .85. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Emotional Intelligence. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Intelligence of low deprived girl students studying in various boards” may be accepted.

Hypothesis – 3

The hypothesis three says that the ‘t’ value obtained on high and low Emotional Intelligence test is .73. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that high and low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Emotional Intelligence. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Intelligence of highly and low deprived girl students studying in various boards” may be accepted.

Hypothesis – 4

The hypothesis four says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Emotional Intelligence test is 4.63. This value is significant at .05 level of
significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low and highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Intelligence. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Intelligence of low deprived girl students of U.P. board and highly deprived girl students of CBSE board” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis – 5**

The hypothesis five says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly Theoretical Value test is 1.06. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Theoretical Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Theoretical Value of highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis – 6**

The hypothesis six says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly Emotional Value test is 3.61. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in
their Emotional Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Value of highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis – 7**

The hypothesis seven says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly Aesthetic Value test is 1.06. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Aesthetic Value of highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis – 8**

The hypothesis eight says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly Social Value test is 0.33. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Social Value of highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.
Hypothesis -9

The hypothesis nine says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly Political Value test is 3.40. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Political Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Political Value of highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

Hypothesis-10

The hypothesis ten says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly Religious Value test is 1.85. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Religious Value of highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

Hypothesis-11

The hypothesis eleven says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Theoretical Value test is 1.03. This value is not significant at .05 level of
significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Theoretical Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Theoretical Value of low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-12**

The hypothesis twelve says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Emotional Value test is 2.49. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Value of low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-13**

The hypothesis thirteen says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Aesthetic Value test is 1.22. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no
significant difference in the Aesthetic Value of low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-14**

The hypothesis fourteen says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Social Value test is 0.66. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Social Value of low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-15**

The hypothesis fifteen says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Political Value test is 1.77. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Political Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Political Value of low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-16**
The hypothesis sixteen says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Religious Value test is .35. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Religious Value of low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-17**

The hypothesis seventeen says that the ‘t’ value obtained on high and low Theoretical Value test is 4.95. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that high and low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Theoretical Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Theoretical Value of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-18**

The hypothesis eighteen says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Emotional Value test is 1.17. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298.
It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Emotional Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Value of highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-19**

The hypothesis nineteen says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Aesthetic Value test is 3.56. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of UP board differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Aesthetic Value of highl and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-20**

The hypothesis twenty says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Social Value test is 1.35. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of UP board do not differ significantly in their Social Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no
significant difference in the Social Value of highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

Hypothesis-21

The hypothesis twenty-one says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Political Value test is 1.61. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of UP board do not differ significantly in their Political Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Political Value of highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

Hypothesis-22

The hypothesis twenty-two says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Religious Value test is 1.39. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of UP board do not differ significantly in their Religious Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Religious Value of highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

Hypothesis-23
The hypothesis twenty-three says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Theoretical Value test is 2.18. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board differ significantly in their Theoretical Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Theoretical Value of highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-24**

The hypothesis twenty-four says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Emotional Value test is .16. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board do not differ significantly in their Emotional Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Value of highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-25**

The hypothesis twenty-five says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Aesthetic Value test is 2.03. This value is significant at .05 level of
significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Aesthetic Value of highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-26**

The hypothesis twenty-six says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Social Value test is .35. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board do not differ significantly in their Social Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Social Value of highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-27**

The hypothesis twenty-seven says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Political Value test is .23. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board do not differ significantly in their Political Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no
significant difference in the Political Value of highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-28**

The hypothesis twenty eight says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Religious Value test is .11. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board do not differ significantly in Religious value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Religious Value of highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE board studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-29**

The hypothesis twenty nine says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Theoretical Value test is 3.44. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Theoretical Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Theoretical Value of highly and low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-30**
The hypothesis thirty says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Emotional Value test is 3.18. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Value of highly and low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-31**

The hypothesis thirty-one says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Aesthetic Value test is 2.20. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Aesthetic Value of highly and low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-32**

The hypothesis thirty-two says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Social Value test is .69. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298.
It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in Social value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Social Value of highly and low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-33**

The hypothesis thirty-three says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Political Value test is 3.80. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Political Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Political Value of highly and low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-34**

The hypothesis thirty-four says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Religious Value test is 1.71. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in Religious value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no
significant difference in the Religious Value of highly and low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-35**

The hypothesis thirty-five says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Theoretical Value test is 3.43. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low and highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Theoretical Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Theoretical Value of low and highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-36**

The hypothesis thirty-six says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Emotional Value test is 2.42. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low and highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Emotional Value of low and highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-37**
The hypothesis thirty-seven says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Aesthetic Value test is 3.42. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low and highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Aesthetic Value of low and highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

Hypothesis-38

The hypothesis thirty eight says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Social Value test is 1.00. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low and highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in Social value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Social Value of low and highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

Hypothesis-39

The hypothesis thirty nine says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Political Value test is 1.50. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298.
It shows that highly and low and highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in Political value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Political Value of low and highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-40**

The hypothesis forty says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Religious Value test is .47. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low and highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in Religious value. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Religious Value of low and highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-41**

The hypothesis forty-one says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly Academic Achievement test is 3.44. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly deprived girl students of various boards differ
significantly in their Academic Achievement. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Academic Achievement of highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-42**

The hypothesis forty-two says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low Academic Achievement test is 0.80. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Academic Achievement. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Academic Achievement of low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-43**

The hypothesis forty-three says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Academic Achievement test is 4.21. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board differ significantly in their Academic Achievement. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Academic Achievement
of highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-44**

The hypothesis forty-four says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Academic Achievement test is 1.59. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Academic Achievement. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Academic Achievement of highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Hypothesis-45**

The hypothesis forty-five says that the ‘t’ value obtained on highly and low Academic Achievement test is 4.95. This value is significant at .05 level of significance because it is greater than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that highly and low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Academic Achievement. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Academic Achievement of highly
and low deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be rejected.

**Hypothesis-46**

The hypothesis forty-six says that the ‘t’ value obtained on low and highly Academic Achievement test is .74. This value is not significant at .05 level of significance because it is less than the required ‘t’ value 1.97 when df is 298. It shows that low and highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Academic Achievement. Thus the hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the Academic Achievement of low and highly deprived girl students of various boards studying in various schools” may be accepted.

**Implications of the study**

**Discussion**

1- **Emotional Intelligence of highly deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE Boards** - The result of the study concludes that highly deprived girl students studying in various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Intelligence.

2- **Emotional Intelligence of low deprived girl students U.P. and CBSE Boards** - The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students
studying in various boards do not differ significantly in their Emotional Intelligence.

3- Emotional Intelligence of highly and low deprived girl students U.P. and CBSE Boards - The result of the study concludes that high and low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Emotional Intelligence.

4- Emotional Intelligence of low and highly deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low and highly deprived girl students studying in various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Intelligence.

5- Theoretical Value of highly deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Theoretical Value.

6- Emotional Value of highly deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Value.
7- Aesthetic Value of highly deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value.

8- Social Value of highly deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value.

9- Political Value of highly deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Political Value.

10- Religious Value of highly deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value.

11- Theoretical Value of low deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Theoretical Value.

12- Emotional Value of low deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students of various boards differ significantly in their Emotional Value.
13- **Aesthetic Value of low deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards.**

The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value.

14- **Social Value of low deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards.** The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value.

15- **Political Value of low deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards.**

The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Political Value.

16- **Religious Value of low deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards.**

The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students of various boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value.

17- **Theoretical Value of highly and low deprived girl students of UP board.**

The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of U.P. board differ significantly in their Theoretical Value.

18- **Emotional Value of highly and low deprived girl students of UP board.**

The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP boards do not differ significantly in their Emotional Value.
19- Aesthetic Value of high and low deprived girl students of UP board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP boards differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value.

20- Social Value of high and low deprived girl students of UP board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value.

21- Political Value of high and low deprived girl students of UP board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP boards do not differ significantly in their Political Value.

22- Religious Value of high and low deprived girl students of UP board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value.

23- Theoretical Value of high and low deprived girl students of CBSE board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards differ significantly in their Theoretical Value.

24- Emotional Value of high and low deprived girl students of CBSE board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Emotional Value.
25- Aesthetic Value of high and low deprived girl students of CBSE board.

The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value.

26- Social Value of high and low deprived girl students of CBSE board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value.

27- Political Value of high and low deprived girl students of CBSE board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Political Value.

28- Religious Value of high and low deprived girl students of CBSE board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value.

29- Theoretical Value of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Theoretical Value.
30- Emotional Value of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Emotional Value.

31- Aesthetic Value of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value.

32- Social Value of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE board. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value.

33- Political Value of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Political Value.

34- Religious Value of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that highly and low deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value.
35- Theoretical Value of low and high deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low and high deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Theoretical Value.

36- Emotional Value of low and high deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low and high deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Emotional Value.

37- Aesthetic Value of low and high deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low and high deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Aesthetic Value.

38- Social Value of low and high deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low and high deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Social Value.

39- Political Value of low and high deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low and high deprived girl
students of UP & CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Political Value.

40- Religious Value of low and high deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low and high deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Religious Value.

41- Academic Achievement of highly deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that high deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards differ significantly in their Academic Achievement.

42- Academic Achievement of low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards. The result of the study concludes that low deprived girl students of UP & CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Academic Achievement.

43- Academic Achievement of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. board. The result of the study concludes that high and low deprived girl students of UP board differ significantly in their Academic Achievement.

44- Academic Achievement of high and low deprived girl students of CBSE board. The result of the study concludes that high and low deprived girl
students of CBSE board do not differ significantly in their Academic Achievement.

45- **Academic Achievement of high and low deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards.** The result of the study concludes that high and low deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards differ significantly in their Academic Achievement.

46- **Academic Achievement of low and high deprived girl students of U.P. and CBSE boards.** The result of the study concludes that low and high deprived girl students of UP and CBSE boards do not differ significantly in their Academic Achievement.

**Educational Implications of the Study**

In the present study, measures of deprivations are used. It cannot be denied, however, that deprivation of specific experiences has differential effects on behavior. Deprivation area need to specify and made measureable for isolating and determining their differential effects on cognition. The results of the study indicate that prolonged experiential deprivation may lead to impoverished growth of cognitive functions and that experiential enrichment is essential for fuller psychological growth. But it is equally true
that there is a long way to go before psychologists can specify precisely the specific features of the environment that promote or retard cognitive growth. It is clear, however, that the various aspects of environmental stimulation are important and that these aspects differ from highly deprived to less deprived groups.

It is clear that an adequate understanding of deprivational effects calls for a refined treatment of environmental variables and their mode of interaction with organismic characteristics.

**Suggestions for Personality Development**

Attempt should be made to develop effective intervention strategies on the basis of deprivational background rather than membership of a specific caste or cultural group. Focus on maximum utilization of existing potentials by treating individuals in terms of their own distinct abilities and achievements are also needed. This involves assessment of potentials as well as adequate provision of opportunities for a diversity of conditions suited to the diversity of individual abilities and needs. Finally, it may be pointed out that deprivational effects are not limited to cognition only. They also have
motivational consequences which, in turn, may influence cognitive performance. Therefore, an analysis of motivational concomitants of deprivation should be done while investigating the cognitive effects of deprivation.

**Suggestions for Further Researches**

Future research should focus on this aspect of the deprivational aspects of the problem with a larger sample.

****