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DISCUSSION OF RESULTS, MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

After analysis of the data and interpreting the results in the preceding chapter, the present chapter proposes to present findings, discussion of the results and conclusions which have been obtained in the study. Efforts have been made in this chapter, to throw light on the educational implications of the study in the present context. Investigator has indicated some of the potential areas for further research in the field related to this study. The statistical data of the present study is related to the following findings in the order of the objectives and hypotheses.

6.1 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

(1) DISCUSSION OF THE RESULT RELATING TO OBJECTIVE NO. 1

Hypothesis no. 1 relating to objective no. 1 reads as under:

Hypothesis no. 1: “There is no significant difference between high and low groups on intelligence in terms of the development of moral reasoning”.

It is evident from Table 1 that null hypothesis 1 is rejected because there is significant difference in the moral reasoning between high and low intelligence groups of children at 0.01 level of significance. Pratibha (1988) also on the basis of her study found that intelligence plays a vital role in the development of moral reasoning. Bajpai, A. (1990) also on the basis of his experimental study found that intelligence is significantly related to the concept of moral reasoning.

(2) DISCUSSION OF THE RESULT RELATING TO OBJECTIVE NO. 2

Hypothesis no. 2 relating to objective no. 2 reads as under:
Hypothesis no. 2: “There is no significant difference between extrovert and introvert groups of children in terms of the development of moral reasoning.”

It is evident from the table 2 that the null hypothesis 2 is accepted, which states that there is no significant difference between extrovert and introvert groups of children in terms of the development of moral reasoning.

(3) DISCUSSION OF THE RESULT RELATING TO OBJECTIVE NO. 3

Hypothesis no. 3 relating to objective no. 3 read as under

Hypothesis no. 3: “There is no significant difference between high and low groups on neuroticism in terms of the development of moral reasoning.”

It is evident from the Table 3 that the null hypothesis 3 is accepted, which states that there is no significant difference between high and low groups on neuroticism in terms of the development of moral reasoning. Mian, Shamshada (1988) in his comparative study also showed that no significant difference was found between boys and girls on neuroticism.

(4) DISCUSSION OF THE RESULT RELATING TO OBJECTIVE NO. 4

Hypothesis no. 4 relating to objective no. 4 read as under:

Hypothesis no. 4: “There is no significant difference between high and low groups on psychoticism in terms of the development of moral reasoning”.

It is evident from the Table 4 that the null hypothesis 4 is rejected because there is significant difference between high and low psychoticism groups of children in terms of the development of moral reasoning at .01 significant level.

(5) DISCUSSION OF THE RESULT RELATING TO OBJECTIVE NO. 5

Hypothesis no. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 are relating to objective no. 5 read as under:
Hypothesis no. 5: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental control on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 6: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental protectiveness on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 7: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental punishment on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 8: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental conformity on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 9: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental social isolation on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 10: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental reward on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 11: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental deprivation of privileges on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 12: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental nurturance on the development of moral reasoning”.

Hypothesis no. 13: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental rejection on the development of moral reasoning”.
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Hypothesis no. 14: “There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental permissiveness on the development of moral reasoning”.

It is evident from the Table 5.5 that the null hypothesis no. 5 is rejected because the children of Laissez-faire group on control differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning. Interestingly we can hold that the higher the control of the child, the lesser the moral reasoning score.

The null hypothesis no. 6 is also rejected because the children of Laissez-faire group on protectiveness differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning. Interestingly we can hold that the higher the protectiveness by the parents of the child, the lesser the moral reasoning score.

The null hypothesis no. 7 is accepted because the children of Laissez-faire group on punishment do not differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning.

The null hypothesis no. 8 is also accepted because the children of Laissez-faire group on conformity do not differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning.

The null hypothesis no. 9 is accepted because the children of Laissez-faire group on social isolation do not differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning.

The null hypothesis no. 10 is rejected because the children of Laissez-faire group on reward differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning. Interestingly we can hold that higher the reward given to the child by the parents, the higher the moral reasoning score.
The null hypothesis no. 11 is accepted because the children of Laissez-faire group on deprivation of privileges do not differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning.

The null hypothesis no. 12 is accepted because the children of Laissez-faire group on nurturance do not differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning.

The null hypothesis no. 13 is accepted because the children of Laissez-faire group on rejection do not differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning.

The null hypothesis no. 14 is rejected because the children of Laissez-faire group on permissiveness differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning. Interestingly we can hold that the higher the permissiveness of the child, the higher the moral reasoning score.

(6) DISCUSSION OF THE RESULT RELATING TO OBJECTIVE NO. 15

Hypothesis no. 15 relating to objective no 6 reads as under:

Hypothesis no. 15: “There is no significant difference between students of Public schools and Government schools in terms of the development of moral reasoning.”

It is evident from the table no 15 that the null hypothesis no. 15 is rejected because the moral reasoning score of Public school students are higher than the moral reasoning score of Government school students. Savadamuthu, T. (1994) in his study of student morale at secondary level showed that the morale of public school students is higher than that of Government school students.
6.2 MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

On the basis of analysis done and results obtained as explained above, the present investigator obtained the following main findings of the study:

1. Intelligence is a contributory factor for moral maturity. Higher the intelligence level of the child, higher the moral reasoning.
2. Extraversion-Introversion is not a factor to determine moral maturity.
3. Neuroticism as a dimension of personality is not a factor for determining the moral maturity or moral reasoning of students.
4. Psychoticism is a contributory factor for moral maturity. Higher the psychoticism, lower the moral reasoning.
5. The children of Laissez-faire group on control differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning. Higher the control of the child, the lesser the moral reasoning score.
6. The children of Laissez-faire group on protectiveness differ significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning. Higher the protectiveness by the parents of the child, the lesser the moral reasoning score.
7. Punishment, Conformity, Social Isolation, Deprivation of Privileges, Nurturance and Rejection as a dimension of Home Environment are not the factors to determine moral reasoning.
8. The higher the reward given to the child by the parents, the higher the moral reasoning score.
9. The higher the permissiveness given to the child by the parents, the higher the moral reasoning score.
10. Four significant correlation were obtained between MMS and Home Environment Scores:
   a. Moral maturity has a significant negative relationship with control. It implies that higher the control imposed by parents, lower will be moral reasoning of the subjects.
   b. Moral maturity has a significant negative relationship with protectiveness. It implies that higher the protectiveness provided by parents, lower will be moral reasoning of the subjects.
c. Moral maturity has a significant positive relationship with reward. It means that if the reward is given to the children for their good behaviour, they will show more maturity in their moral reasoning.

d. Moral maturity has a significant positive relationship with permissiveness. It implies that the more the permissiveness provided by the parents, the more will be the moral maturity.

11. Moral maturity has a significant positive correlation with intelligence also. It means that if the child is intelligent, then the child shows more maturity in his moral behaviour.

12. Moral reasoning score of Public School students are higher than the moral reasoning score of Government School students.

6.3 CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

Since the first step in moral development is development of moral reasoning, it is imperative that we as teachers should concentrate on development of this aspect. Proper development of moral reasoning can take place when we consider the total environment of the child and his personality make up.

The present study entitled “a study of the development of moral reasoning among adolescents in relation to certain personality and environmental variables” has been conducted on four personality variables viz. intelligence, extraversion-introversion, neuroticism and psychoticism. Among the environmental variables, home environment variables have been selected in the study. The reason for selecting home environment variables, is that the child’s personality is most affected by the kind of treatment and nurturing the child gets at home. The attitude of parents towards the child in particular greatly influences the child’s development and especially his/her moral development. The analysis of the data obtained has been done following rigorous statistical designs. This has been done in three distinct ways (i) correlation analysis (ii) t-test analysis and (iii) F-test analysis using ANOVA. All this has been done to ensure accuracy of results and to trace any type of effect of various independent variables on the dependent one.

A look at the findings of the study indicates some very interesting results. If the child has extraversion-introversion, neuroticism then it does not affects its moral
maturity. If the child has psychoticism, then it affects its moral maturity. Higher the psychoticism, lower the moral reasoning. Four dimensions of home environment i.e. control, protectiveness, reward and permissiveness affects the moral reasoning of the child. Higher the control of the child, the lesser the moral reasoning score. Higher the protectiveness by the parents of the child, the lesser the moral reasoning score. The higher the reward given to the child by the parents, the higher the moral reasoning score. The higher the permissiveness of the child, the higher the moral reasoning score. Other dimensions of the home environment i.e. punishment, conformity, social isolation, deprivation of privileges, nurturance and rejection do not affect the moral reasoning of the child. Reward and permissiveness are positively related with moral maturity. Control and protectiveness are negatively related with moral maturity. Intelligence is also positively related with moral maturity. Moral reasoning of Public School students is more than the moral reasoning of Government School students. On the whole, we can say that there is not a single factor responsible for the development of moral reasoning. But there are a host of factors or combination of factors which can be said to affect development of moral reasoning equally well with people from different socio-cultural groups. This fact leads to the conclusion that development of moral reasoning in children is a very complex phenomenon, depending upon many psychological, sociological, cultural and personal factors which constitutes the human personality. The only generalization that this investigator can reach in this regard is that development of morality is possible only when the significant others show a kind of involvement, a concern and a sense of belongingness with the child. It depends upon the development of a relationship, a reciprocity and love with the child.

6.4 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Parents can bring about certain worth-while changes in the child’s personality like development of morality only when they show a kind of belongingness, a care and concern for the child. Its only our deep embeddedness with the children that we can help the child develop into desirable direction failing which education ceases to have any meaning. We infact receive back what we give to the child. If we give him love and affection we can receive the same from the child. If we neglect him or show
some kind of coercion or control them also it will affect the child’s personality. In such a situation, the child instead of being influenced by the parents or the teachers will be more affected by haphazard influences.

The investigator realized it very well that there are different approaches to the development of moral behaviour in the child. Some suggests that moral development in the form of moral character can be enhanced by enabling students to practice various attributes of moral behaviour like benevolence, cooperation, helping others, honesty, non-violence, selflessness etc. Kohlberg described this kind of approach as “bag of virtues” and at the same time he stated that imparting morality in this way leads to indoctrination. The child in such an approach accepts the different values simply because they are suggested by such authority as parents. But the real purpose of moral education is attained only when the child understands on his own that moral behaviour is a matter of justifiability. The child should be able to give reasons for his behaviour and therefore Kohlberg also suggested that development of morality takes place by developing moral reasoning among students and not by teaching them different virtues or by training them in a particular kind of behaviour, however, desirable that may be. Morality is a kind of self-realization on the part of child and therefore the present study can be of immense use for the parents who are responsible for the inculcation of qualities of a good human being among children.

The findings of the present study can be made applicable to home. For the proper development of moral reasoning among children healthy and congenial environment is necessary. The role of family in this regard is of utmost importance. On the basis of the present findings, the investigator concluded that if the parents accept the child as a full fledged individual at home he will show greater moral maturity in his behaviour.

Another important implication of the present study that can be of utmost importance for parents is that parents must cooperate, encourage and provide opportunities to children for proper use of their capabilities and potentialities. The children must be given opportunities to express themselves freely and to think and decide on their own. The child must be rewarded for his good deeds or behaviour and care should be taken not to use any kind of harsh words and physical punishment to control the child.
One can say that guidance on the part of parents can be helpful in promoting the moral reasoning of the child. The development of moral reasoning of child though does not guarantee that the individual actual conduct will be moral but it increases the possibility of being so. Because when a person knows what ever he is doing is morally wrong, it is atleast a self check on his conduct. Though it is true that knowledge does not mean necessarily, how to conduct, because as a human being we suffer from passions. Inspite of the fact that we suffer from passion, which lead us to a kind of self-oriented behaviour, it is true beyond any doubt that without the knowledge of the good, we would in most cases, fail to do good. Socrates held that virtue is the knowledge of the good and Plato went even further to declare that knowledge is virtue.

### 6.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Though the present investigator has taken every care to make the study as scientific as possible in terms of representativeness of the sample, validity of the tools and appropriateness of the statistical design for the analysis of the data, yet there are many a pitfalls and bottlenecks which were beyond the control of the present investigator. And therefore, there are many aspects of the problem which could not be covered in the study. Being cognizant of all such limitations some personal and some related with space and time the present investigator gives certain suggestions which can be helpful in a more thorough investigation of the development of moral reasoning. These suggestions are given as under:

(i) Because of the limitations of time the investigator could not take up a very large sample. Moreover, she had to choose her sample from the metropolitan sample of Delhi only. Therefore, replica studies can be taken up choosing the sample from different parts of the country which can represent the Indian population and culture.
(ii) Because of the personal limitations of the present investigator in terms of her limited knowledge of statistical designs and their interpretations, she could not apply more rigorous statistical techniques like – factor analysis, regression, multiple analysis etc. A study can be conducted using these techniques which probably may reveal certain interpretation.

(iii) A study can be conducted longitudinally to study the growth of development of moral reasoning at different stages of child’s development.