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CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The present study aims at identifying the moral stages of high school students in Bangalore City. The personality profiles of the students at different moral stages are also studied. The social factors are also studied.

6.2 THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objectives of this study are as follows:

i) To find out the level of moral development of children.
ii) To find out how personality influences the moral development in children.
iii) To find out whether the social factors influence the moral development in children.
iv) To find out whether Socio Economic status of the parents has influence of the children's moral judgment.
v) To find out whether there are gender differences in the moral development of children.
vi) To find out whether age influences the moral development.
vii) To find out whether medium of instruction has influence on the moral development.
viii) To find out whether scholastic achievement has a correlation with moral stages.

6.3 THE STUDY

Type of Study: This is a normative study. Students numbering 540 studying in VIII, IX and X are involved in the study. The research paradigm is given below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>TOOLS</th>
<th>DATA ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Sex</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>a) Kohlberg's Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dilemma Stories and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>following them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Medium of Instruction</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>b) Cattell's High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Personality Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) SES</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Class</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Boys</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Scholastic achievement</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX Boys</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Personality (14 traits)</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Social Skills (6 types)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX Boys</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Moral stage</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII Boys</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6.1
RESEARCH PARADIGM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Central Tendency - Mean, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Percentage in each stage with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect to age, sex, class, medium of instruction, S.E.S and scholastic achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differential Analysis
a) Analysis of variance
b) $\chi^2$ values of moral stages with sex, age,
6.4 HYPOTHESIS

Many hypothesis were formulated and they were tested statistically. These were already mentioned in the previous chapters.

6.5 TOOLS OF INVESTIGATION

Three tools were used to measure the students moral judgement, personality and socialisation.

Kohlberg's six moral dilemma stories were taken with the probing questions. The subjects were asked to answer the questions to find out in which stage they were. Kohlberg's standard stories were adopted and to make more suitable for Indian setting they were modified slightly. The answers to the probing questions were asked to be written in the space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>medium of instruction, and SES</td>
<td>Multivariate analysis</td>
<td>a) Profile</td>
<td>b) Factor analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provided. Each dilemma was followed by eight to ten standardized probe questions designed to clarify the reasons "why a subject had made a particular moral judgement". The dilemma and the probe questions were translated into Tamil as to test whether there were difference in the moral stages in the Tamil medium students.

The H.S.P.Q. is a standardised test that can be given to find out the general assessment of personality development. The H.S.P.Q. measures fourteen distinct dimensions of traits of personality which have been found by psychologists to come near to covering the total personality. The scoring can be done rapidly by a stencil key. The questionnaire and the answer sheets were given. More personal details were elicited from the students like Name, Class, School, Age, Sex, Parent's occupation and address so that the upper part will serve as the card which was removed easily after the 14 scores were marked.

The same questionnaire and answer sheet were translated in Tamil and kept for the Tamil medium students. The H.S.P.Q contains 142 statements. Students had to respond to these statements on a three point scale.

The third questionnaire was to find out the social skills of a child. This was taken from "Scope and sequences of social skills" by Colleen J. Mandell and Veronica Gold. The social scores were prepared. There were six parts for this questionnaire relating to various skills like (a) Personal skills (b) Inter Personal Skills (c) Communication (d) Interaction with friends (e) Interaction with teachers (f) School behaviour. The students had to tick in the respective column, say for example always, at times, never.
The totals were added for each part and weightage was given and calculated. Each child had six social score and a global score for socialisation.

6.6 SAMPLE

The sample was taken from Six Schools of which three were boy's school and three girl's School. Four English medium and two Tamil medium schools were taken. Roughly 100 students from each school and 30-35 students from each class. One section of each class from every school was taken. The students with ages 13+ from standard VIII, 14+ from Standard IX and 15+ from Standard X were taken.

The personal particulars of the child were also collected like Name, Class, Age, Sex, School, Parent's occupation and address. From the parents occupation the socio economic status of the child was also found out. The achievement percentage marks were also collected for some.

All were given the three questionnaires and were asked to write their answers and they were collected and moral development stage was assessed as explained in earlier chapters.

6.7 MAIN FINDINGS

The main findings are as follows:

(1) The children with different chronological ages differ in the stages of moral development ($\chi^2 = 18.896$, Significant).

a) Moral development stages do not differ in boys and
girls of the same ages. \( \chi^2 = 5.86 \) not significant at .05 level).

b) Students through different mediums of instruction do not differ in the moral development stage \( \chi^2 = 7.59 \), not significant at .05 level).

c) Students from different S E S differ in their moral development stage. \( \chi^2 = 17.56 \), Significant)

d) Students with varying scholastic achievement levels differ in their moral development stage. \( F=6.00 \), significant at .01 level).

(2) There is significant association between moral development stage and personality traits.

a) There is difference between moral development stage and reserved and outgoing personality. 
\( F=10.84 \), Significant at .01).

b) There is difference between moral development stage and less intelligent and more intelligent students. 
\( F=10.99 \), Significant at .01 level).

c) There is difference between moral development stage and those affected by feelings and Emotionally stable. 
\( F=6.79 \), significant at .01)

d) There is difference between moral development stage and Phlegmatic and Excitable personality. 
\( F=17.01 \), Significant at .01)
e) There is difference between moral development stage and Obedient and Assertive person.  
(F=16.79, Significant at .01)

f) There is difference between moral development stage and Sober and Happy Go Lucky personality.  
(F=5.23, Significant at .01 level)

g) There is difference between moral development stage and Expedient and Conscientious personality.  
(F=3.42, Significant at .05 level)

h) There is no difference between moral development stage and Shy and Venturesome personality.  
(F=1.76, not significant)

i) There is no difference between moral development stage and with tough minded and tender minded personality.  
(F=1.78, not significant)

j) There is difference between moral development stage and Vigorous and Doubting personality.  
(F=5.62, Significant at .01)

k) There is difference between moral development stage and Placid and Apprehensive personality.  
(F=23.44, Significant at .01 level)

l) There is difference between moral development stage and Group dependent and Self sufficient personality.  
(F=5.46, Significant at .05 level)

m) There is difference between moral development stage
and Self conflict and controlled personality.
\( F=3.26, \text{ Significant at } .05 \text{ level} \)

d) There is difference between moral development stage and Relaxed and Tense personality.
\( F=10.10, \text{ Significant at } .01 \text{ level} \)

(3) The moral development stages differ according to the social factor.
\( F=4.33, \text{ Significant at } .01 \text{ level} \)

a) There is no difference between moral development stage and personal skills.
\( F=1.32, \text{ not significant} \)

b) There is no difference between moral development stage and Inter personal skills.
\( F=2.06, \text{ not significant} \)

c) There is no difference between moral development stage and Communication.
\( F=1.38, \text{ not significant} \)

d) There is difference between moral development stage and Inter-action with friends.
\( F=3.09, \text{ Significant at } .05 \text{ level} \)

e) There is difference between moral development stage and Interaction with teachers.
\( F=3.39, \text{ Significant at } .05 \text{ level} \)

f) There is difference between moral development stage and School Behaviour of the students.
\( F=10.94, \text{ Significant at } .01 \text{ level} \)
(4) The personality profiles are compared. Stage 2/3 is taken as Group I, Stage 3 as Group II and 3/4 as Stage 3.
When the profiles are parallel, the following are the results.

i) Stage 2/3 and Stage 3 differ in their personality profile (F=5.23).

ii) Stage 3 and 3/4 differ significantly (F=4.81).

iii) Stage 2/3 and 3/4 differ significantly (F=6.23).

When the profiles are at the same level the following are the results.

i) Stage 2/3 and 3 differ significantly (t_0 = 3.23)

ii) Stage 3 and 3/4 differ significantly (t_0 = 5.36)

iii) Stage 2/3 and 3/4 differ significantly (t_0 = 4.64)

When the effect of variables are same, the following are the results.

i) Stage 2/3 and 3 differ (F=16.23)

ii) Stage 3 and 3/4 differ (F=12.64)

iii) Stage 2/3 and 3/4 differ (F=10.26)

The three groups differ in their personality profiles.

(5) Principal component analyses are made for the three groups separately to study the personality structure of the three groups. The personality variables are subjected to principal component analysis and the first seven components are selected.
In general the variables differ in the different groups and hence present different personality structure in the components. Only in component 1 and 4 some variables are common in all the three groups showing the dominant personalities of those components.

(6) The discriminant function analysis is made using the six social factors. The variables discriminate the moral stage groups. The \( D^2 \) square values are significant in all the three possible pairs of combination.

Group I and Group II are significant
\[ (D^2 = 6.625, F = 63.377) \]

Group II and III are significant
\[ (D^2 = 14.523, F = 250.35) \]

Group III and I are significant
\[ (D^2 = 21.8, F = 179.27) \]

(7) The discriminant functions for all the three groups are given. When the social scores are substituted in these functions a student has to be assigned to the group in which he/she gets the maximum score. The student is assigned that stage.

6.8 DISCUSSION

Thus we find that the moral development stages do differ with chronological ages. In general we find that the Standard VIII students are generally in stage 2/3, Standard IX in stage 3 and Standard X in stage 3/4. Very few had gone
to stage 4. It is found that they are mainly in Stages 2/3, 3 and 3/4. They differ with socio economic status. Scholastic achievement level is correlated to the moral stages. The stages differ with the personality traits. The stages differ with some of the social factors like interaction with students, interaction with teachers and school behaviour. So the stages differ when a person is intelligent, outgoing, mixing well with others and also with socio economic status.

They do not differ with regard to sex or medium of instruction. They also do not differ with the personal, inter-personal and communication social skills.

6.9 RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The study reveals that children in chronological ages differ in the stages of moral development. Students from different socio-economic status differ in the moral stages. Students with varying scholastic achievement levels differ in the moral development stages.

There is significant association between moral development stages and personality traits. There are differences in the following personality traits among students in different moral development stages. The personality traits are reserved and outgoing, less intelligent and more intelligent, those affected by feeling and emotionally stable, obedient and assertive, sober and Happy Go Lucky, Expedient and Conscientious, Vigorous and Doubting, Placid and Apprehensive, Group Dependent and Self sufficient, Undisciplined self conflict and controlled, Relaxed and Tense.
Students in different moral development stages differ in their social factors. Students in different moral development stages differ in interaction with friends, interaction with teachers, and School Behaviour skills.

However students in different moral development stages do not differ in Personal, Interpersonal skills and Communication skills. The stages do not differ in Shy and Venturesome personality and tough minded and tender minded personality. The moral development stages do not differ in boys and girls of the same ages. They do not differ among the students studying through different media of instruction also.

The three groups (Stage 2/3, Stage 3 and Stage 3/4) differ in their personality profiles. The variables present different personality structure with their components. The social variables also discriminate the moral stages.

It is recommended that since the moral development stages differ with chronological ages, moral education syllabus must be arranged according to the different classes. The teachers can help in framing the curriculum. Since the achievement levels differ with moral stages, the next higher stage can be introduced to the academically higher achievers.

Since there is significant association between moral development stages and personality traits, we must try to develop the personality of a student. Curricular and co-curricular activities have to be introduced. The uniform services can be stressed which will bring out the total personality of a child. All children must be given opportunities to take part in every field in all the activities. When the personality improves the moral
development also increases. The teachers and parents together can work for this improvement.

The moral stages also differ according to the social factors. Since there are differences in the moral development stages with the communication, interaction with teachers and students there must be lot of scope for the activities. The students should have ample opportunities to mix up with the teachers and other students. Various activities and group work have to be introduced in the academic subjects like Projects, Exhibition, Quix etc. Lot of outdoor activities like visits to neighbouring villages, jail, homes for the aged, homes for lesser fortunate people have to be thought of. The interaction helps in their social development which in turn will fasten the moral development.

It is also recommended that moral education has to be arranged according to the moral developmental stages. Just as we do not expect a child to shave like his father with a cut-throat rasor or we would not ask a child to attempt tasks beyond his intellectual ability, one should be able to speak of 'readiness for morality'. In moral growth just as in physical maturation or intellectual development, there are clearly defined stages and each has tasks not only appropriate to it but also essential for subsequent development. The children can only learn what they are ready to learn and the teacher has to help in this.

Since the arrival of any stage of 'readiness' depends upon previous experience, the teacher should see that children are given every opportunity to be involved in preparatory experiences. Just as for understanding weight they learn by weighing, the numbers by counting, for time by measuring its
duration within a time sequence, understanding morality should be by being involved in moral situations. There must be no attempt to force this development. This may be done by a well meaning parent or teacher but the result can be disastrous. It is the teacher's privilege to feed in the ideas which the developing mind can assimilate and handle. Work must be appropriate to that particular stage and each stage must be catered for if development is to continue.

It is recommended that a moral education syllabus can be framed according to the various stages of growth and the ages. A change should be favoured instead of the current uninformed but well-meaning efforts of teachers. Instead of the 'frank' discussions, heart to heart talks, Principal's assembly reprimands, the "I know what's best for you lad" techniques and the naive assumptions that factual information on appropriate topics assures moral growth, teachers must brace themselves to this change and work for it. It can thereby aid the development of that moral maturity which is the hallmark of responsible citizenship in democratic society.

6.6 SUGGESTIONS

The study has established that moral development stages differ with the ages, socio economic status, achievement level and personality. In some of the social skills also there are differences in the stages. It has been shown that there are no differences in the stages with regard to sex or with the medium of instruction.

The implications derived from the findings are of practical value in suggesting a framework for the decision making for the syllabus for Moral Education by the educators.
and researchers. It is hoped that the study will be of utility value in school education for teachers and educators, to plan for the various activities, to frame the moral education syllabus and for the value oriented system of education as propounded by our 'New Education Policy' of our Prime Minister, Mr. Rajeev Gandhi.