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Abstract

Volumes and volumes of philosophy have been written about the concepts of values, morals, and ethics. These concepts date back thousands of years to Aristotle, Socrates, and Kant. Every person has their own innate virtues. They are unique to each individual person, and describe what they deem to be vital in their personal behaviour. Virtues are personal judgements that compare possiblebehaviours with an innate understanding of right and incorrect.

Regarding the issue that influences child’s growth and development is his rearing of nurturance at home. The mother is said to be the first teacher of child. Her behavior with the child in all situations and interactions of life, inaway, shapes the future development of child’s personality. Similarly, the father or any other person who comes in the life of a child assigns the factor model’s the behavior of the child. There may be different kinds of relation ships that may develop between the child and the parent depending up on the disciplinary practices that the parent prefers and apply. In this paper we aim to compare the rapport between parental mind-set and moral reasoning among young people.
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1. Introduction
1.1 Parental approach
Parental approach is of crucial significance in the development of children’s moral judgement. Since the child loves his parents, he identifies himself with them, imitatetheir behavior and learn to make an adjustment with his life as they do. Though the later
influences modify the child’s behavior and mind-sets, they do not completely eradicate these early influences. Psychological literature emphasizes this fact. Parental mind-set may be put under these headings:

(i) Authoritarian–Democratic Mind-set
(ii) Accepting–Rejecting Mind-set
(iii) Over Protecting Mind-set

1.2 Morality
The term morality covers the vast arena of human conduct that examines our interaction with other human beings. Morality touches every aspect of our life, every moment of our life. Our morality governs all of our contacts with members of our family, with our co-workers, with our religion, and with all aspects of our government. Morality determines our mind-set to politics, to war and peace, to our children, to our parents and to spiritual questions such as life after death. When we discuss morality we do not talk about an obtuse philosophical concept, we talk about the totality of our everyday existence. If we want to be effective in our interaction with other human beings, it behoves us to understand the concept of morality with all its nuances and implications. A clear understanding of morality is of extreme importance to all of our interactions with our environment and thus, to our attainment of happiness.

1.3 Moral Learning In The School

It would be a mistake to assume that all the moral learning that goes on outside the school is unreflective and uncritical while all that goes inside it is always educational in the full sense. Some parents undoubtedly work to promote moral education of a rational kind. Whereas, much of moral learning inside the school is of unreflective nature. Moral learning that takes place inside the school is the consequence of the way in which teachers organize the work of the pupils, react to the behaviour of the individuals, use punishment, exercised discipline, handle their classes etc. Moral mind-sets are caught from every interaction of teachers and pupils.

School contributes to this kind of unreflective moral learning both by its deliberate attempts and through unconscious absorption. Most of us have seen teachers saying “be quite when I tell you to do so”. “We must not talk when we are in the class room” and the like. All such injunctions provide wrong kind of basis for morality, for they all are based upon awe of authority of the teacher. It is a kind of moral teaching which has earlier been referred to as indoctrinatory and authoritarian.

Then there are many hidden sources of moral learning in school. Many mind-sets, values etc. are assimilated by pupils in a largely unconscious manner. The moral values, mind-sets that a teacher holds and the manner in which he holds these, will be communicated to his pupils whether he wishes or not. The individual teachers’ values will be plain from the way in which he sets about his business in the classroom, the kinds of relationships he develops with his pupils, the way he organizes the learning, the way he refers to their mistakes etc. his use or abuse of punishment; in general, his whole approach to the job of teaching. The teacher who, without question or explanation, requires a pupil who has not done his homework to write it out ten times
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by the next day, is clearly promoting a different kind of moral learning from the one who asks whether any circumstances at home made it difficult for him to do it.

From all these sources, both inside and outside the school, children will acquire moral mind-sets, beliefs and habits of behaviour. All moral learning must be converted into moral education. We must accept that every pupil will have a content to his moral learning and that we must as teachers contribute to such content, and also provide it a ‘form’ of moral education. Let us now see how we can provide the content and form of moral education to the moral learning that the child has already obtained.

2. Literature Review

Morton, KellyR;Worthley, JoannaS.(2006) suggested that refinement of the four-component model can advance by specifying potential relationship between the components and novel operationalization’s of these components across professional groups. The data in the study address the necessity of both moral motivation and moral sensitivity for moral reasoning and suggest that moral motivation impacts moral reasoning only indirectly through moral sensitivity. The lack of a direct association between moral motivation and moral reasoning without accounting for moral sensitivity means that ideals that lead to prioritization of moral values do not necessarily enhance moral decision making. In addition to moral ideals and values on one must also have emotional regulations skills, perspective-taking skills, as well as the desire and ability to synthesize multiple viewpoint to arrive at principled solutions to moral dilemmas.

Maria Paula et. al. (2013) investigated the development of children’s sympathy, moral emotion attributions, and moral reasoning in two cultures: Chile and Switzerland. One hundred seventy-six children in two age groups (i.e., 6 and 9 years old) were asked to report their sympathy. Moral emotion attributions and moral reasoning were measured using two hypothetical moral transgressions (i.e., omitting a prosocial duty, stealing from another child). Younger Chilean children reported higher levels of sympathy than younger Swiss children. Across cultures, older children attributed more moral emotions than did younger children. Younger Swiss children used more moral reasoning following judgements about rule violations than did younger Chilean children.

Lori Olafs on et. al. (2013) examined differences between university students who were caught and sanctioned for cheating, students admitting to cheating but who were not caught, and students reporting that they had never cheated. Our findings showed that no cheaters are older, have better grade point averages, and have more sophisticated moral and epistemological reasoning skills. Qualitative analyses revealed that denial of responsibility and injury were the most common neutralization techniques and differed between the sanctioned and self-reported cheaters. We discuss the need to examine the extent to which reasoning skills have a causal impact on cheating behaviors.

According to the Dario Bacchini et. al. (2013), moral rules are universal, not contingent on rules and authority, and are activated by avoiding harm to other people. Not all individuals, however, interpret moral events in terms of domain in a similar manner. The hypotheses of the present research were: (i) a high exposure to deviant
context will affect the manner in which adolescents interpret moral events and their involvement in antisocial behaviour; (ii) the moral attribution style will directly affect involvement in antisocial behaviour and mediate the relationship between deviant context and antisocial behaviour. Four hundred fifty-three adolescents completed self-report questionnaires about their involvement in antisocial behaviours, their friends' involvement, and their exposure to community violence as a witness. Moral versus non-moral attribution (MNMA) was evaluated through a questionnaire consisting of hypothetical scenarios of moral violations followed by questions related to the above-mentioned criteria. Findings, obtained testing a model, were consistent with the hypotheses. Adolescents who live in violent contexts and attend deviant friends tend to interpret moral violation in terms of non-moral domains and are more engaged in antisocial behaviours. Results are discussed with respect to the literature about normativeness of deviance and its consequences.

3. Hypotheses of the Study
Torealizethis objectivethefollowingnull-hypotheshavebeenframed.
H1: There is no significant relationship between permissiveness provided by the teachers and moral reasoning among youngsters.
H2: There is no significant relationship between acceptance provided by the teachers and moral reasoning among youngsters.
H3: There is no significant relationship between rejection exercised by the teachers and moral reasoning among youngsters.
H4: There is no significant relationship between control imposed by the teachers and moral reasoning among youngsters.

4. Research Methodology Sample
Populationforthepresentinvestigationinvolvedallthe pre-adolescent students studying in VII class in different schools of Lucknow and neighboring cities. Toselectthesampleforthepresent studyalistofallschoolssituatedinslectedecities would be obtained from District Education Office. From this list five schools would be selected randomly. Then from each school 50 students studying in VII class would be again randomly selected using lottery method.

Statistical Techniques Used
There are various statistical techniques for analyzing data. To choose an appropriate technique of statistical analysis is the challenging task to a researcher. It has two main functions:
1) Interpretation of results
2) Presentation of data
The major types of tests are employed for analyzing data so as to interpret the results. These are:
1) Parametric statistics or tests
2) Non-Parametric statistics or tests

The present study consists of the well-defined population as well as the sample was representative. So, parametric statistical techniques were used for analysis of data. Which are as under?

- Mean and standard deviation
- t-test for measuring the significance of the difference between the two means scores.
- Pearson’s coefficient of correlation to find the correlation between different variables.

5. Analysis And Interpretation Of Data

Hypothesis No. 1: “There is no significant relationship between Permissiveness provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters”

Table 1: Correlation of Permissiveness provided by the teachers with Moral Reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of School Environment</th>
<th>Value of r with Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness provided by Teachers</td>
<td>0.6369</td>
<td>Significant at .01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 1 indicates that the value of r is 0.6369 which further indicates a significant positive correlation between Permissiveness provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters. It means that there is a significant positive relationship between Permissiveness provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning of the subjects under study. One can infer that higher the Permissiveness provided by the teachers better will be the Moral Reasoning among the students. So, Hypothesis No. 1 stating that there is no significant relationship between Permissiveness provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters is rejected and it can be reframed as: There exists a significant relationship between Permissiveness provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among pre-adolescents.

Hypothesis No. 2: “There is no significant relationship between Acceptance provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters.”

Table 2: Correlation of Acceptance provided by the teachers with Moral Reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of School Environment</th>
<th>Value of r with Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance provided by Teachers</td>
<td>0.5945</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that the value of r is 0.5945 which further indicates a significant positive correlation between Acceptance provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters. It means that there is a significant positive
relationship between Acceptance provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning of the subjects under study. One can infer that higher the Acceptance provided by the teachers better will be the Moral Reasoning among the students. So, our Hypothesis No. 2 stating that there is no significant relationship between Acceptance provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among pre-adolescents is rejected and it can be reframed as: There exists a significant relationship between Acceptance provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters.

Hypothesis No. 3: “There is no significant relationship between Rejection exercised by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters.”

Table 3: Correlation of Rejection exercised by the teachers with Moral Reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of School Environment</th>
<th>Value of r with Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rejection provided by Teachers</td>
<td>-0.7539</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that the value of r is -0.7539 which further indicates a significant negative correlation between Rejection provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters. It means that there is a significant negative relationship between Rejection provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning of the subjects under study. One can infer that higher the Rejection exercised by the teachers lesser will be the Moral Reasoning among students. So, Hypothesis No. 3 stating that there is no significant relationship between Rejection exercised by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among pre-adolescents, is rejected and it can be reframed as: There exists a significant negative relationship between Rejection exercised by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among pre-adolescents.”

Hypothesis No. 4: “There is no significant relationship between Control imposed by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters.”

Table 4: Correlation of Control imposed by the teachers with Moral Reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of School Environment</th>
<th>Value of r with Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control provided by Teachers</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result shown in table 4.7 indicate that the value of r is -0.13 which further indicates that there is no significant correlation between Control imposed by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters. It means that there is no significant relationship between Control provided by the teachers and Moral Reasoning of the subjects under study. So, Hypothesis No. 4 stating that there is no significant
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relationship between Control imposed by the teachers and Moral Reasoning among youngsters” is accepted.

6. Discussion
The findings of the present investigation is that creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement and permissiveness as dimensions of school environment are significantly and positively correlated with moral reasoning.

The results of the present investigationalso indicatethatacceptingmind-setofparents hasapositiveeffectonthe development of moral reasoning among youngsters and the group of youngsters with parents having high acceptingmind-set were found to be better on moral reasoning as compared to not well accepted group of subjects. At the theoretical backdrop it appears that true development of the child cognitive or moral has a direct relationship with the mind-set of the parents. The more accepting behaviour of parents helps in the nurturance of moral reasoning among their wards because acceptance as such is considered to be a foundation for moral behaviour. Morality implies putting oneself into others’ shoes and therefore promotes consideration towards which is an essential component of morality. Parents can bring about certain desirable changes in the child’s behaviour only when they show a kind of belongingness, care, acceptance and concern for the child. It is only parents’ deep embeddedness with the children that they can help the child develop into a human being without which education will be relegated to mere literacy. Even social psychologists hold that child develops behavior desirable or undesirable by imitating the behaviour of significant others. So when the child feels that his/her parents are considerate towards him, the child also internalizes the same through imitation.

7. Conclusion
Creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, permissiveness and acceptance as dimensions of school environment were found to be significantly and positively correlated with moral reasoning among youngsters, whereas rejection has been found to be negatively correlated with moral reasoning. When different types of parental mind-sets were studied in the context of moral reasoning among youngsters, the accepting mind-set on the part of parents was found to have a positive significant effect on the development of moral reasoning among the subjects, whereas concentrating mind-set of parent s was found to have no effect on such development and avoiding mind-set of parents was found to have negative effect on the development of moral reasoning among youngsters.
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