

Development of Moral Reasoning among Adolescents in Relation to their Home Environment Regarding Social Isolation and Reward Factors

Dr. Vipasha Rana¹, Dr. Vanita Anand²

^{1,2} Asst. Prof., Maharaja Surajmal Institute

Email – ¹vipasarana@msi-ggsip.org, ²vanitaanand@msi-ggsip.org

Abstract: The present article is based on a research study undertaken to find out the development of moral reasoning among adolescents in relation to their home environment regarding social isolation and reward factor. 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 findings of the present study, therefore, would be extremely helpful in providing better guidance to the students, as well as their parents.

Key Words: Social Isolation, Reward, Autocratic Parents, Laissez-faire Parents, Democratic Parents.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Parents are the first teachers of the children, and the pressure of our times imposes upon every parent to develop all that is expected of a good student and a good teacher. At the outset there may be parents who are very harsh disciplinarians. Such parents do not tolerate even slightest deviation of child's activity and behaviours from what they consider as an ideal behaviour. Their sole effort is to develop their child in their own image.

There may be another kind of parents who just allow complete freedom to the child and impose no restriction on the child even if the child behaves in anti-social ways. Such parents adopt what is called a laissez-faire policy. They avoid any kind of interference in child ways. The children of such parents often grow as most unscrupulous and usually become criminals in later life.

Third kind of parent may be those who feel a genuine concern for the child's development. They show due love and affection and freedom which is necessary for the proper development of the child's personality. They avoid all kinds of "extremes" and develop a democratic / interactive behaviour pattern with their children. It is these children who reciprocate their parents model and to become democratic individuals who can feel for others who can act as shock absorbers in society.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:

To study the difference between democratic, laissez – fair and autocratic parenting regarding social isolation and reward factors.

3. 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 formed to conduct the study.

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

4. MEANING OF SPECIFIC TERMS:

- **Social Isolation:** It indicates "Use of isolation from beloved persons except family members for negative sanctions.
- **Reward :** It includes "Material as well as symbolic rewards to strengthen or increase the probability of desired behaviour".
- **Autocratic Parents:** These parents are very harsh disciplinarians such parents do not tolerate even slightest deviation of child's activity and behaviour from what they consider as an ideal behaviour.
- **Laissez- faire Parents :** These parents allow complete freedom to the child and impose no restriction on the child even if the child behaves in anti-social way. They avoid any kind of interference in child ways.

- **Democratic Parents:** These Parents show due love and affection and freedom which is necessary for the proper development of the child’s personality. They avoid all kinds of “extremes” and develop a democratic/interactive behaviour pattern with their children.

5. 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 two types of test and inventories were administered. These tests and inventories were chosen keeping in new the objectives of the study. These were.

- 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.

6. RESEARCH DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

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

- t – Test
- Correlations
- ANOVA

7. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND THEIR INTERPRETATION:

The data gathered according to the procedure would have remained merely a meaningless heap of facts, without moulding it into a definite shape. To give data the desired shape and direction, they were processed and analyzed statistically. Various statistical techniques for analysis of data were selected, keeping in view, the nature of the data and the objective of the study.

TABLE – 1
FACTOR – A (Social Isolation)

Comparison of Moral Reasoning among three categories of Social Isolation {Autocratic (G1), Democratic (G2) and Laissez-faire (G3)} Duncan's Mean Test

Groups	Mean	S.D.	G1 vs G2	G1 vs G3	G2 vs G3	F-value
G1 (N=104)	304.03	80.98				0.31
G2 (N=94)	311.85	88.23				
G3 (N=102)	303.40	78.92				

Table 1 determines that there is no significant difference between moral reasoning scores of social isolation (autocratic, democratic and Laissez-faire). The results are presented in table 1 above. The moral reasoning scores of the three groups were subjected to Analysis of variance which yielded an F-value equal 0.31 which is statistically not significant. This shows that there is no significant difference on moral reasoning scores of children of autocratic parents, democratic parents and Laissez-faire parents. In order to determine the significant difference between means of groups taken two at a time, the groups were subjected to Duncan's Test. This test was administered to find out t-ratio between G1 and G2, G1 and G3, G2 and G3. The results of Duncan's test show that there is no significant difference among these groups.

TABLE – 2
FACTOR — B (Reward)

Comparison of Moral Reasoning among three categories of Reward {Autocratic (G1), Democratic (G2) and Laissez-faire (G3)} — Duncan's Mean Test

Groups	Mean	S.D.	G1 vs G2	G1 vs G3	G2 vs G3	F-value
G1 (N=107)	371.91	46.81	*	*		219.64**
G2 (N=91)	323.55	44.77			8	
G3 (N=102)	221.98	63.50				

* Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

Table 2 determines the significant difference between moral reasoning scores of reward (autocratic, democratic and Laissez-faire). The results are presented in table 2 above. The moral reasoning scores of the three groups were subjected to Analysis of variance which yielded an F-value equal 219.64 which is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant difference on moral reasoning scores of children of autocratic parents, democratic parents and Laissez-faire parents. In order to determine the significant difference between means of groups taken two at a time, the groups were subjected to Duncan's Test. This test was administered to find out t-ratio between G1 and G2, G1 and G3, G2 and G3. The results of Duncan's test show that there is significant difference between G1 and G2, G1 and G3, G2 and G3. Therefore we can say that the null hypothesis is rejected. In the light of this result, we can say that the children of Laissez-faire group on reward differs significantly from the children of autocratic parents and democratic parents on moral reasoning. Interestingly we can hold that the higher the reward given to the child by the parents, the higher the moral reasoning score.

8. CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY:

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. The higher the reward given to the child by the parents the higher the moral reassuring score. Social solution do not affect the moral reasoning of the child. 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.

REFERENCES:

1. Ahuja, Dr. Malvinder & Sharma, Dr. Nidhi (2004). A Study of Academic Achievement of Adolescents in Relation to Parental Involvement and Aspiration. Indian Education Review. Vol. 40(1-2).
2. Best, John W. & Khan, J.V. (1986). Research in Education. New Delhi Prentice Hall. 5th Ed.
3. Bhargava, I. (1986). Development of Judgement among Children at Concrete and Formal Operational Stages and its Relationship with the Variable of House and Educational Environment. Ph.d. Edu. Punjab University. Fourth Survey.
4. Bajpai, A. (1990). An Experimental Study of an Educational Intervention Curriculum for Value Development and its Facilitative Effect upon the Level of Moral Judgement of Children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (Ed) B.R.D. University. Lucknow. U.P. India.
5. Chakarbharti, M. (1997). Value Education. New Delhi : Kanishka.
6. Chisty, S.B.H. (1991). Teaching of Moral Education. The Primary Teacher. Vol. 16(2).30-33.
7. Dagar, B.S. and Dhull, I. (1994). Perspectives in Moral Education. New-Delhi: Uppal Publishers.
8. Chatruvedi, Archana (2001) . Personal Pattern, Moral Values and National Awakening among Students Studying in Schools of Different Cultural Associations. Indian Journal of Educational Research., Vol. 20(2).
9. Downey, M.& Kelly, A.V. (1982). Moral Education. London: Harper and Row.
10. Dusek, J.B. (1987). Adolescent Development and Behaviour. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
11. Devi, B. (2000). The Degradation of Moral Values among the Youth in Manipur. ECHO, a quarterly publication of Manipur University Student's Union. Vol. 9(4). 23-24.
12. Daniel, T.L. Shek (2007). A Longitudinal Study of Perceived Differences in Parental Control and Parent-Child Relational Qualities in Chinese Adolescents in Hong Kong. Journal of Adolescent Research Vol. 22(2). 156-185.
13. Gupta, N.L. (1986). Value Oriented Education. Ajmer: Krishna Brothers.
14. Gethanath, P.S. (1988). A Study of Moral Judgement in Relationship to Some Selected Variables. M.B. Buch (Ed.) Fifth Survey of Educational Research. Vol. 2.
15. Gupta, S.P. (2005). Statistical Methods. Sultan Chand and Sons. New Delhi.