Summary
SUMMARY

Today the modern warfare with extensive use of nuclear weapons, growth of violence and terrorism, accumulation of power and excessive wealth in the hands of a limited few, environmental pollution to an alarming degree, consumerism devoid of any concern about the needs of others and about the limited resources of our planet, the ugly contrast which is visible everywhere between luxury and poverty, frustration, depression, insecurity, loneliness, aimlessness in life and erosion of values that cause a severe psychological breakdown after leading to alcoholism, drug addiction and suicidal tendencies, what then will be the future of humanity?

In the context of present day national and international scenario child's education needs a direction which can include and ensure an initiation of the child into worthwhileness. A look at the education being imparted in schools, reveals the ambiguities and inconsistencies in the methodology of teaching school and home environment where the child studies and lives. This makes any thinking being reflect that all is not well with child's education. And that is why the child of today is becoming more and more self centered, egoist, impatient, disregardful and asocial in his conduct and behaviour. It is probably because we, as teachers and parents, do not seem to educate him but only train or indoctrinate him. The responsibility for such behaviour of children cannot merely be put on them. It is the parents, teachers and society at large which can be said to be responsible for the present state of affairs. In the adults of today there is a maddening pursuit for accumulation of power and status to the total exclusion and neglect of human values.

Education rightly conceived and properly practiced is the only answer to it. It is through education alone that we can initiate people into worthwhileness, and no process or activity. If it is not rooted in human values, then how it can be called worthwhile and, hence, truly educational. In order to be rightly called so, it must enable a person to think on one's own. Indoctrination or authoritarianism of any sort in the practice of education or of human values therefore is anti-educational.
Without any values, the world could not be a place worth living in and, unfortunately, it is heading towards this state due to the present crisis. We witness very often a total lack of regard for the values of others amongst people. Today, very few people care for or have respect for age old values- like freedom, belief, sincerity and self-respect, the right to work and freely express one's views. Most people today refrain from or at least avoid taking so-called "unnecessary" responsibilities making themselves morally accountable for some particular things, whether done by one or the other. Very few people are disciplined enough to fulfill and do justice to such responsibilities and duties, though they heartfully partake of all benefits they can derive from taking that responsibility.

To impart value-orientation to education NPE-1986 suggested, "The National System of Education will be based on a national curricular framework which contains a common core along with other components that are flexible. The common core will be to include, the history of India's freedom movement, the constitutional obligations and other content essential to nurture national identity. These elements will cut across subject areas and will be designed to promote values such as India's common cultural heritage, democracy and secularism, equality of sexes, protection of the environment, removal of social barriers, observance of small family norm and inculcation of the scientific temper. All educational programmes will be carried on in strict conformity with secular values."

In fact, if education cannot provide students the training of analyzing and taking decisions wisely about the future problems, then it is disregarding one of its important purposes. Four pursuits of values have been prescribed in ancient Indian culture viz. religion, wealth, lust and salvation. Religion is a very practical and important value in the view of social context. Patience, forgiveness, abstainment from stealing, pride, virtuosity, self-restraint, wisdom, truth and control over anger are the main traits of the religion. Gandhiji believed that truth, non-violence, satyagraha and not hearing or seeing evil are the supreme moral values.

Actually, the development of moral and social values should have been inculcated in education, but in present circumstances, it is nowhere to be found. Dr. Zakir Hussain was of the opinion that we should not sacrifice morality for technical
progress, rather this progress should be presented in such a way that it may become a means of strengthening high human-values.

For many generations morality was the central theme in defining social relationship and the social sciences were termed 'the moral sciences'. In early part of the century morality was considered to be the key to understanding of social development. Mc Dougall writes, "The fundamental problem of social psychology is the moralization of the individual by the society."

In traditional society the process of socialization at home was enough to transmit the value system and desirable modes of conduct to each new generation. F.Muogrove in his challenging article, 'The Decline of Educative Family' has show how family has given up quite a lot of its educative functions. In this age, process of socialisation at home cannot prepares the rising generation for the moral problems that they are bound to face. Extreme selfishness and utter lack of honesty that can be seen everywhere even amongst the educated people, will convince anyone that it is necessary to consider seriously the question of moral education. If the products or our schools and colleges go out morally illiterate and unprepared, the day is not far when the laws of jungle will replace our civilised ways of life. It is therefore not surprising to find that many consider moral education to be the duty of professional educators. Dempster summarizes, "with uncertain standards children must be prepared for life with a clear settled mind since the morality of a primitive culture has been left behind".

Morality involves decisions and actions, morality is integrated with an individuality being awake to responsibility, a willingness to make personal choices. According to Hume, "Moral distinctions therefore are not be offspring of reason. Reason is wholly inactive, and can never be the source of so active a principle as conscience, or a sense of moral".

Moral education means regulation and sublimation of the natural instincts and inclination of the child. This requires development of such habits, attitudes, ideas and capabilities in the child as can help him in establishing an integration and balance within himself, with his family, with his society, with his nation and with his environment so that he can lead a harmonious, creative and purposeful life. Moral
education is in a way refinement and purification of the mind. Knowledge is important in such a process, but more than that is the importance of personal experience and actual moral conduct. If appropriate feelings are also attached to overt behaviour, the refinements get ingrained in the mind and they become a part of the character. In the whole process of this transformation environment plays a very crucial role. Clean and aesthetic physical environment along with unaffected and impressive cultural environment have great potential refinement of the mind. They lay the foundation of a moral life.

The Bhagwad Gita says, "There is nothing in the world so sacred as knowledge. He who is perfected by yoga, all round development finds in the fullness of time."

According to Professor A.K. Singh the stress on the moral education is indicative of crisis of moral values, and that the present education system has failed in facilitating the process. The education system is information based. The fact, however is that information should move knowledge, and knowledge towards wisdom. In a state of absence of wisdom the society would head for anarchy of valuelessness without wisdom the society and the bearers of information would not know what to do with it or how to use it properly. D.S. Kothari observed in this regard: the fundamental values of life, integrity, pursuit of truth and idealism cannot be sustained by embalming these in monuments and memorials or by inscribing them in textbooks. High ideals and great national goals are meaningless, unless we strive for them passionately and ceaselessly. And each generation has to recreate, revitalize and renovate these through hard work and sacrifice, otherwise ideals and values wither and decay and goals fade away.

Parents have to realise that the world is changing rapidly, that the horizons of knowledge are expanding constantly, and that children are growing in a new atmosphere of currents of culture in which the values of the East and the West blend. This creates a great deal of uncertainty and consequent disequilibrium. It is in these difficult times that parents have to build and maintain bonds of trust with children and guide them with love and understanding, with practical dexterity and with largesse of mind and heart. They have to harmonise the demands of freedom with the demands of self-discipline.
Since the first step in moral development is development of moral reasoning, it is imperative that we as teachers and parents 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 investigator therefore, choose the study entitled "A study of the development of moral reasoning among adolescents in relation to certain personality and environmental variables."

The findings of the present study, therefore, would be extremely helpful in providing better guidance to the students, as well as their parents. To carry out the study systematically the investigator has selected four personality variables viz. intelligence, extroverts-introverts, 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 main objective was to study the various factors which facilitate moral reasoning.

THEORIES OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

I. Piaget's Theory of Moral Development

Jean Piaget is among the first psychologists whose work remains directly relevant to contemporary theories of moral development. He focused specifically on the moral lives of children, studying the way children play games in order to learn more about children’s beliefs about right and wrong. According to Piaget, all development emerges from action that is to say, individuals construct and reconstruct their knowledge of the world as a result of interactions with the environment.

Piaget's Stages of Moral Development

Jean Piaget made the first effort to define stages of moral reasoning in children through actual interviews and through observations of children. Piaget developed a stage theory of the child’s conformity to and understanding of rules. These stages are:
i. Sensorimotor stage (0-2 years approximately)

Upto age two, the child plays with marbles in an apparently ruleless fashion and as might be expected, is unable to verbalize rules.

ii. Pre-operational stage (2-4 years approximately)

The child imitates aspects of the rule-regulated behaviour of older children, but remains idiosyncratic and socially isolated until about next stage.

iii. The Concrete Operational Period (6-10 years approximately)

At about this time the child regards rules as unchangeable, as though they were given by some divine source. New rules or changes in old rules are seen as unfair, even if all agree to them.

iv. Formal Operational period (10 to 12 years onwards)

Children tend to alter rules to fit unique situations and may invent new rules to cover special circumstances. Rules are perceived as a changeable and as the product of evolution during late childhood and early adolescence.

The child’s developing sense of justice was measured by telling children stories about persons who engaged in various wrong doings. The child was then asked why the acts were wrong or, in some instances, which of two acts was more wrong and why this was so. On the basis of these findings, Piaget labelled two stages of morality.

(a) Morality of constraint or moral realism (Rules are rigidly followed).

(b) Morality of cooperation (Rules are viewed as being determined by reciprocal agreements).

Piaget’s main aim was to explore the nature of children’s moral judgements and to do this, he worked in Geneva with individual children, talking to them and questioning them on three broad areas: (i) their attitudes to rules; (ii) their judgment of right and wrong, and (iii) their assessment of justice and fairness. On the basis of
his longitudinal and cross-sectional studies he established that moral judgment is not determined by rewards, punishment or imitation rather it is a developmental process through gradual cognitive restructuring. First of all Piaget (1932) stated that “all morality consists in a system of rules and the essence of all morality is to be sought for in the respect which the individual acquires for those rules”. Piaget was concerned not only with the child’s practice of rules (his moral conduct) but also with the way the child perceives these rules as a restraint on his actions. In such investigations, Piaget chose rules children follow in pursuing the game of marbles. The characteristic of this game is that it is played only by children, and rules followed in this game are seldom passed on by adults but learnt from other children during the game itself.

**Appraisal of Piaget's Views**

The great value of Piaget’s work on moral judgments lies both in the methods he used to investigate children’s thought processes and in the fact that he was the first to view moral thought as a developmental and restructuring process depending largely on child’s growth towards abstract thinking and interaction with his environment and with those with whom he comes into contact. Important questions, left unanswered, by his own work have stimulated further research. For example, although he demonstrates that children move from one stage to another in a fixed sequence, he does not examine the conditions which might facilitate or impede this progress, nor does he explain why some children are apparently arrested in growth before they reach the stage of autonomy. And although teachers and educationists have drawn widely upon Piaget’s work for guidance in planning work for children, Piaget himself never suggested ways in which parents or teachers might help children to develop further. Thus Piaget offers no deliberate guidance to teachers concerned with their responsibility for the moral education of their pupils. However, he did lay the foundations for later investigators to build upon.

**2. Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development**

Lawrence Kohlberg modified and elaborated Piaget’s work, and laid the ground-work for the current debate within psychology on moral development. Consistent with Piaget he proposed that children form ways of thinking through their experiences which include understandings of moral concepts such as justice, rights,
equality and human welfare. Kohlberg followed the development of moral judgment beyond the ages. Studied by Piaget, and determined that the process of attaining moral maturity took longer and was more gradual than Piaget had proposed.

Lawrence Kohlberg, a psychologist belonging to the University of Harvard is known for putting forward theory of the development of moral judgment in the individual, right from the years of early childhood. He has based his theory of moral development on the findings of his studies conducted on hundreds of children from different cultures.

He differs from the popular view that children imbibe the sense and methods of moral judgment from their parents and elders by way of learning. According to him as soon as we talk with children about morality, we find that they have many ways of making judgments which are not internalized from the outside, and which do not come in any direct and obvious way from parents, teachers and even peers (Kohlberg, 1968). Going further he clarified that internal or cognitive processes like thinking and reasoning also play major role in one's moral development, i.e. the way children make moral judgment depends on their level of intellectual development as well as on their upbringing and learning experiences. For studying the process of moral development in human beings, Kohlberg first defined moral development as the development of an individual's sense of justice.

Kohlberg identified three levels of moral development, each containing two stages as shown in table.
Table 1
Kohlberg’s Six Stages of Moral Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Pre-moral</th>
<th>Stage-1</th>
<th>The stage of obedience for avoiding punishment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

To conduct the study scientifically the following objectives have been framed: -

1. To study the difference between high and low groups on intelligence in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
2. To study the difference between extrovert and introvert groups of children in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
3. To study the difference between high and low groups on neuroticism in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
4. To study the difference between high and low groups on psychoticism in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
5. To study the difference between democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parenting in terms of the development of moral reasoning on the following factors:

(i) Control
(ii) Protectiveness
(iii) Punishment
(iv) Conformity
(v) Social Isolation
(vi) Reward
(vii) Deprivation of Privileges
(viii) Nurturance
(ix) Rejection
(x) Permissiveness

6. To study the difference between students of Public schools and Government Schools in terms of the development of moral reasoning.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

There are different ways of formulating hypotheses but the present investigator has adopted the Null form in formulating the hypotheses of present study after going through the related literature.

The following hypotheses have been framed to conduct the study:

1. There is no significant difference between high and low groups on intelligence in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
2. There is no significant difference between extrovert and introvert groups of children in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
3. There is no significant difference between high and low groups on neuroticism in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
4. There is no significant difference between high and low groups on psychoticism in terms of the development of moral reasoning.
5. There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental control on the development of moral reasoning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13. There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental rejection on the development of moral reasoning.

14. There is no significant difference between the democratic, laissez-faire and autocratic parental permissiveness on the development of moral reasoning.

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

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

In order to achieve the objectives stated above and to test the corresponding hypotheses, a sample of 300 subjects of both sexes belonging to various sections of the society and studying in different schools of Delhi was taken. The schools were selected randomly and the subjects were selected on the basis of cluster sample. For collecting data four types of tests and inventories were administered. These tests and inventories were chosen keeping in view the objectives of the study. These were:
For measurement of intelligence, Cattell's culture fair (non-verbal) intelligence test was used.

For measurement of neuroticism, extraversion-introversion and psychoticism, Eysenck personality questionnaire was used.

For measurement of environment variables Standard Home Environment inventory by Dr. Karuna Shankar Mishra was used.

For measurement of moral reasoning standard moral dilemma situation were presented to the subjects and they were asked to resolve the dilemma situation according to what they think as right. They further were asked to give reasons for their choices in the dilemma situation.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Since the study was intended to see the development of moral reasoning among adolescents the sample was selected keeping in view the age norms pertaining to this period (adolescence) of child’s growth. Subject’s age range was from fourteen to fifteen years of age. The study was conducted on ninth class students. The investigator selected a sample from different secondary schools of Delhi. The schools were selected randomly and the subjects were selected on cluster basis i.e. from a particular school, the entire section of a particular class was included into the sample. In order to attain reasonable stratification, schools were randomly selected from the city areas as well as the neighbouring rural areas. The sample comprised rural and urban, boys and girls and co-education schools. In this way, the investigator was satisfied that a sample under study was sufficiently representative of the population of Delhi. Hence, the study was delimited in respect of sample, the concepts, tools and statistical procedures.

RESEARCH DESIGN OF THE STUDY

It was a descriptive study. Scoring was done according to standard procedure given in the manuals of different tools. The data so obtained were processed statistically using appropriate statistical techniques as given below:
VARIABLES INVOLVED IN THE STUDY

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

1. Personality Variables
   a. Intelligence
   b. Extraversion - Introversion
   c. Psychoticism
   d. Neuroticism

2. Environmental Variables
   a. Autocratic Parents
   b. Laissez – Faire Parents
   c. Democratic Parents

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Moral Reasoning

STATISTICAL DESIGN & ANALYSIS

Having obtained scores on different components of HEI (Home Environment Inventory), Personality Questionnaire, Intelligence test and the moral maturity score, the investigator adopted appropriate statistical design to analyse the data. These statistical designs were chosen keeping in view the requirements of the objectives and corresponding hypotheses of the study. The following designs were used for statistical analysis of the data:

1. For comparing moral maturity score belonging to different groups, t-test technique was applied.
2. For determining the relationship between various independent variables of the study with MMS, corresponding correlations were computed and their significance tested.
3. To study the main effects of different levels of a variable and also to study the interaction effects of different variables on moral maturity of the subjects, ANOVA procedures were applied.

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”.
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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".

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 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 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 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 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 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.

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.

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.

**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 bahaviour 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 indoctorination. 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.
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.