MORAL VALUES AND EMOTIONAL MATURITY AMONG ADOLESCENTS COMING FROM DIFFERENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

Shubhangi G. Gharote ,
Research Student, RTMNU,
Nagpur University, Nagpur

Abstract :

The present study attempts to evaluate the role of Moral Values and Emotional Maturity among adolescents' boys and girls coming from high and low socio–economic background. School going children of age 13-15 years participated from Nagpur City. The effective sample size was kept at 92 by using Purposive sampling technique and three scales, one of Emotional Maturity Scale, Moral Value Scale and Soico-Economic Background Scale were administered. Simple Factorial design with N= 23 subjects in each frequency cell was used. Gender and Socio economic status (SES) were treated as independent variables and each was varied at two levels. With the Mean and Standard Deviation, two-way Analysis of Variance was used. Among the Moral values there were four sub factors –Lying, Dishonesty, Stealing and Cheating Behaviors It was observed that adolescents coming from high socio-economic background (HSES) had shown significantly better emotional maturity and moral values than those coming from low socio-economic background (LSES) except on the behavior of cheating, no significant relationship was found. Girls had shown significantly better emotional maturity and moral values of honesty, truthfulness, and less on Stealing and Cheating than the Boys. It was also found that in the process of developing emotional maturity and moral values among the adolescents Gender and SES functioned independently. Thus there is a need to create awareness among parents, teachers, educators, and counselors about the importance of the moral values and emotional maturity among the adolescents that will develop better mental health and better quality of life.

Keywords: Emotional Maturity, Moral Values, Gender, Socio-Economic Background, Adolescents

Introduction:

In studying adolescent development, Arnett (1998), report that adolescence can be defined biologically, as the physical transition marked by the onset of puberty and the termination of physical growth, cognitively, as changes in the ability to think abstractly and multi-dimensionally, or socially, as a period of preparation for adult roles. Major pubertal and biological changes include changes to the sex organs, height, weight, and muscle mass, as well as major changes in brain structure and organization. The study of adolescent development often involves interdisciplinary collaborations, Researchers in neuroscience or bio-behavioral health might focus on pubertal changes and brain structure and its effects on cognition or social relations. Sociologists interested in adolescence might focus on the acquisition of social roles (worker or romantic partner) and how this varies across cultures or social conditions (Cote, 1996). Developmental psychologists might focus on changes in relations with parents and peers as a function of school structure and pubertal status (Simmons & Blyth, 1987). Behavior of adolescent is directly related to the society in which he lives so the socio-economic status directly affects his perceptions, cognitions, emotions and social behavior and goals and personality development. The people of lower socio-economic status have more frustrations, have more experiences of failure, and have limited goals of life (Anderson & Armstead, 1995). People from higher socio-economic status feel satisfied and honored and are ambitious. Middle socio-economic status people suffer from extreme anxiety and pessimistic attitudes when they find that they are not getting ahead in school, business or social life. This makes them self-dejected. The socio- economic status (SES) of an adolescent is most commonly determined by combining parents' educational level, occupational status and income level (Jeynes, 2002). Studies have repeatedly found that SES affects students' outcomes (Majoribanks,1996; Hochschild, 2003) In contrast, others have argued that a lack of resources is at the root of low socio-economic status that affects health. Resources are conceptualized as concrete objects, conditions, and supports that are valued by individuals or society (Hobfoll, 2001).

It has been hypothesized that individuals who are low in SES have heightened responses to stressors, in part, because they lack a reserve capacity of resources for dealing with stress (Gallo & Matthews, 2003). Adolescents growing up in families under economic stress or with a single parent may be poorly supervised and often gain autonomy too early (Hymel et al. 1990).

Review Literature:

Jose, Resmy and Sujatha, R. (2012) made a comparative study on emotional maturity among adolescents boys and girls which revealed that adolescent girls have higher emotional maturity than adolescent boys and there was a significant association between emotional maturity and selected variables like gender, aggregate marks in previous year, educational status of father, mother and monthly income. Gupta ,N.& Srivastava, N. tried to explore emotional maturity in relation to socio-economic status among urban adolescents the results revealed that girls were found to report more flexibility and adaptability than boys while boys were found to report more emotional –regression and faulty social adjustment than girls. Faulty social adjustment was reported more among low socio-economic status respondents while no other significant results were found on any other dimensions of Emotional Maturity across SES(socio-economic status). Sudha,B. & Nagar,N. (2004) examined school adjustment among secondary school boys and girls in relation to their socio-economic status, parent child interaction and emotional maturity. It was found that the students having high parent-child interaction have significantly better school adjustment and emotional maturity. Rawat, C. & Singh, R .(2017) formulated to find out if gender difference has any impact on the emotional maturity of adolescents. The results revealed that boys were more emotionally progressive, socially adjusting, had adequate personality and were more adjusting than girls, the reason for the significant difference across gender was observed due to patriarchal system, gender bias, family climate, traditions and other confounding factors. Duhan, Punia, and Jeet (2017) conducted a study on emotional maturity of adolescents in relation to their gender and found that male adolescents were more moderately emotionally mature than females. Emotional maturity of adolescents was found positively correlated with the occupation of the father and their level of education. Hassan, A. E. H. & Elfeky A. A. F. (2015)**.** The aims of this study are determining the influences of social adjustment as predictor of moral values and academic achievement. The level of social adjustment and moral values among special education students were highly significant. Karmakar,R.(2015) examines the relationship between parenting style and internalization of moral values of children and adolescents . For adolescents, authoritarian parenting style is positively linked to external and interjected regulation and authoritative parenting style is positively associated with identified and integrated regulation. The reverse trend is evident for children.

Aim of the Study:

The study aims to find out the effect of socio economic status and gender on moral values and emotional maturity of adolescents.

Objectives:

Following objectives were framed or formulated as a guideline for the present study:

1.   To measure emotional maturity of the adolescent subjects and search whether boys and girls differ significantly from each other or not.

2. To search the extent to which the high socio-economic status subjects (HSES) and low socio-economic status subjects (LSES) differ from each other on emotional maturity.

3. To measure lying among the subjects and search the extent to which boys and girls differ from each other.

4. To examine whether the subjects coming from HSES backgrounds and those coming from LSES background differ from each other significantly or not, on lying measure.

5. To assess dishonesty among the subjects and search whether boys and girls differ from each other significantly or not.

6. To examine the extent to which the subjects coming from LSES background and those coming from HSES background differ from each other, on dishonesty measure.

7. To measure stealing behavior among subjects of study and search whether the boys and girls differ from each other.

8. To measure stealing behavior among the subjects and examine whether the subjects coming from HSES backgrounds and those coming from LSES backgrounds differ from each other.

9. To measure cheating behavior among the subjects and examine whether boys and girls differ significantly or not.

10. To study whether HSES and LSES subjects differ from each other on cheating measure or not.

Hypotheses:

Assuming that the other factors are kept constant it is hypothesized that,

1. Emotional maturity is significantly better among the girls to that of the boys.

2. The subjects coming from HSES background develop significantly better emotional maturity than the subjects coming from LSES backgrounds.

3. Boys exhibit significantly more lying behavior than the girls.

4. Lying tendency is significantly more among those coming from LSES background than those coming from HSES background.

5. Dishonesty is exhibited significantly more by boys than girls.

6. The subjects coming from LSES backgrounds exhibit significantly more dishonesty than the subjects coming from HSES background.

7. Stealing characteristics are significantly more among the boys than the girls.

8. Stealing characteristics are significantly more among the subjects coming from LSES background than those coming from HSES background.

9. Cheating behavior is more predominant among the boys than the girls.

10. The subjects coming from LSES background exhibit significantly more cheating behavior than those coming from HSES background.

Method: Methodology offers the description of sample, procedure, tools, research design and statistical analysis that will be used to serve the purpose of the present study.

Sample:

Purposive sampling technique was used in the study only those school going children were included whose age range was 13 years to 15 years. The subjects were selected from localities of Nagpur city. Mean age of the subjects was 13.70 years. Initially the data were collected from 110 boys and 114 girls. Thus, the initial sample of the study was 224. However, the subjects were to be distributed into 4 classified groups, as a factorial design was used. So, by using P=40 and P=60 criterion for socio-economic status, the subjects were distributed in the four classified groups. In this distribution it was found that there was unequal cell frequency among the groups. The minimum cell frequency found in a group was 23 so in order to keep equal cell frequency it was decided to keep 23 subjects in each group. In some of the groups there were more than 23 subjects so the greater number of subjects was deleted randomly and the effective sample of the study was kept 92. Of these 50% were males and 50% were females. So, the study was carried out by using the data collected from 92 subjects only.

Tools used for data collection:

Simple but standardized tools were used for collecting data.

Moral value scale:

This scale was constructed and developed by Sengupta and A. K. Singh. The scale consists of 36 items only. These 36 items are related to 4 different behavioral characteristics namely lying, dishonesty, stealing, and cheating. Related to each behavioral characteristic there were 9 items. Instead of measuring lying they measure non-lying behavior. Instead of dishonesty they reflect honest behavior and hence this is called a moral value. All the 36 statements are associated with a two point scale namely, Yes or No, here more score indicates high moral value.

Emotional maturity scale:

This scale was constructed and developed by Roopa, K. S., and Saira Banu, Daragad. The scale consists of 69 items, each item is provided with a four point scale namely, Always, Sometimes, Rarely and Never. In this scale also more the score better the emotional maturity. The scale was constructed on 7 different factors namely 1.Ability to deal, 2. Ability to adapt to change, 3. Freedom from symptoms of tensions, 4. Satisfaction in giving, 5.Relations to others, 6.Capacity to sublimate and 7. Capacity to love.

Socio economic status scale:

This scale was constructed and developed by D. S. Janbandhu. It was revised in the year 2019 in collaboration with Shubhra Nandi and now the authors of the scales are Janbandhu and Shubhra Nandi. The scale consists of 14 items only. They are related to social, economic and educational aspects of the individual and its family. It's a short scale. However it provides economic index, educational index, and a global index of socio-economic status.

Procedure of data collection:

First the subjects were contacted on phone. After taking their appointment the investigator visited the subject, rapport was established and instructions were given to the subject for emotional maturity scale and moral

value scale. The subject was given sufficient time to write the reactions. Filled copies were collected and lastly copy of socio-economic status scale was handed over to the subject to be filled.

Variables under study:

There are two independent variables in the study –Gender and Socio-economic status   There are five dependent variables- Emotional Maturity, Moral values of -Lying, Dishonesty, Stealing and Cheating.

Research design:

In present study a 2x2 factorial design was used. Gender and Socio-economic status were treated as independent variables and each was varied at two levels namely boys and girls and high and low socio-economic levels. The cell frequency N=23 was kept equal in the four classified groups.

Statistical treatment of data:

First the data were treated by Mean and Standard deviation and then two way Analysis of Variance was used.

Discussion:

Results were discussed considering their statistical values and findings of some of the earlier studies.

Result and discussion:

In present study a 2x2 factorial design was used. So there were four classified groups. For forming the classified groups' boys were denoted by A1 and girls were denoted by A2; the subjects coming from low socio-economic status were indicated by B1 and those coming from high socio-economic status were represented by B2, so the four classified groups could be visualized as A1B1, A1B2, A2B1, and A2B2.

In group A1B1 boys coming from low socio-economic status were included.

A1B2 in this group there were boys coming from high socio-economic status

A2B1 here there were girls coming from low socio economic status.

A2B2 girls coming from high socio-economic status were in this group.

Means and standard deviations obtained on five dependent variables were first computed. They are presented in the following table.

Table 1 Means and SDs obtained by four classified groups on emotional maturity and four different values

Groups		A1B1	A1B2	A2B1	A2B2
Emotional Maturity	$\bar{X}$	109.91	118.74	126.00	136.91
	S	11.48	10.56	9.76	9.62
Lying	$\bar{X}$	2.91	4.48	6.04	8.09
	S	0.73	1.08	0.93	0.79
Dishonesty	$\bar{X}$	3.78	4.96	6.04	6.83
	S	1.00	1.11	0.88	1.03
Stealing	$\bar{X}$	3.30	4.70	6.30	7.78
	S	0.97	1.18	1.15	1.00
Cheating	$\bar{X}$	4.00	4.13	5.00	5.00
	S	1.09	0.97	1.38	1.17

A1=boys **A2**=Girls **B1**=Low Socio-economic status **B2**=High socio-economic status

The first dependent variable was emotional maturity. Examination of means and SDs obtained by the four classified groups clearly indicate that the distribution of scores in each of the four classified groups was more or less normal. On emotional maturity, more the score better the emotional maturity. According to this among the four classified groups gr. A2B2 appears to be superior among them (Mean=136.91, SD=9.62). The other group which had shown better emotional maturity is group A2B1 (Mean=126.00, SD=9.71). The lowest mean value was obtained by group A1B1 (Mean=109.91, SD=11.48). Difference between the lowest and the highest mean is large so there is every possibility that the groups might differ significantly from each other regarding emotional maturity however only on the basis of means and SDs conclusions cannot be drawn. Hence emotional maturity data of four classified groups were treated by two way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Summary of ANOVA is given in the following table

Table 2 Summary of Two way ANOVA for emotional maturity measure

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F
A: Gender	6361.14	1	6361.14	59.11**
B:SES	2019.14	1	2019.14	18.76**

AxB:	6.79	1	6.79	0.06
Within	9470.09	88	107.61	
Total	17857.16	91		

*Significant at 0.05 level ** significant at 0.01 level

Main effect A represents gender varied at two levels. It was thought that boys and girls differ significantly from each other on emotional maturity measure. Main effect A brought out significant results (F=59.11, df=1 and 88, p<0.01). Since the main effect is significant it means that the boys and girls differ significantly from each other on emotional maturity measure. From the means obtained by the broad groups of boys and girls it is clear that girls had shown significantly better emotional maturity that the boys. These results are in line with the assumption of study.

The subjects were classified on the basis of their socio-economic status (SES). SES is represented by main effect B. from the summary table it is seen that main effect B yielded an F value of 18.76 which for 1 and 88 df is significant at 0.01 level. It means that the difference in the means obtained by HSES and LSES groups is so large that it cannot be attributed to the factor of chance only. When the means obtained by broad groups namely LSES and high SES, it is found that the subjects coming from HSES background had shown significantly better emotional maturity than those subjects coming from LSES background.

Interaction AxB is non-significant (F=0.06, df=1 and 88, p>0.05). It means that in the process of developing emotional maturity among the subjects gender and SES functioned independently.

Among the moral values one measure was lying. In case of lying the score obtained was inversely related to the lying behavior. It means more the score less the lying. On lying behavior means and SDs obtained by the four classified groups are given in table 1. A glance at the means and SDs shows that distribution of scores in each of the four classified groups is more or less normal. The glance also reveals that mean values obtained by the four classified groups differ remarkably from each other. For example Gr. A2B2 obtained a mean of 8.09 and the SD is 0.79. This group obtained the highest mean value among the four groups. The lowest mean value was obtained by group A1B1 (Mean=2.91, SD=0.73). The difference between the highest and the lowest mean value is very large. Even the other two groups had shown remarkably large difference in their mean values. For example Gr. A1B2 had a mean of 4.48 and SD of 1.08 whereas Gr. A2B1 obtained a mean of 6.04 and SD was 0.93. The large difference in the means clearly indicate that the groups might be differing from each other significantly. When treated by two way ANOVA the following results were obtained.

Table 3 Summary of two way ANOVA for lying measure

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F
A: Gender	261.14	1	261.14	326.67**
B:SES	74.88	1	74.88	93.67**
AxB:	1.32	1	1.32	1.65
Within	70.35	88	0.80	
Total	407.68	91		

** Significant at 0.01 level

Main effect A brought out significant results. Main effect A represents gender varied at two levels, it has obtained an F value of 326.67 which for 1 and 88 df is much larger than what is required to be significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that boys and girls differ significantly from each other regarding lying measure. Among the boys lying behavior was significantly more predominant than that of the girls.

Main effect B represents socio-economic status varied at two levels. It was believed that the subjects coming from LSES background exhibit significantly more lying behavior than the subjects coming from HSES background. Main effect B yielded an F value of 93.67 which for 1 and 88 df is significant at 0.01 level. It means that the HSES and LSES subjects differ significantly from each other significantly. From the mean values it could be seen that the subjects coming from LSES background had shown significantly more lying tendency than the subjects coming from HSES background. These results are in line with the assumption of study.

Interaction AxB was non-significant (F=1.65, df=1 and 88, p>0.05). It tells us that while developing lying behavior gender and SES functioned independently.

Another measure of moral value was dishonesty. Here also the scores obtained were inversely related to the factor. Means and SDs obtained by the four classified groups on dishonesty measure are displayed in table 1. It could be noted that more score indicates more moral behavior, in other words less dishonesty.

Group A2B2 obtained a mean of 6.83 and the SD was 1.03. This is the highest mean value obtained by the group among the four classified groups. Relatively better honesty was exhibited by Gr. A2B1 it has a mean of 6.04 and SD was 0.88. Lowest mean value was obtained by group A1B1 (Mean=3.78, SD=1.00,). The difference in the mean is large. Even from face value of means and SDs one can say that the groups might differ significantly from each other. However only on the basis of descriptive statistics inference cannot be drawn. Hence dishonesty data were treated by two way ANOVA. Summary of two way ANOVA for dishonesty measure is given in the following table

Table 4 Summary of two way ANOVA for dishonesty measure

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F
A: Gender	98.10	1	98.10	96.85**
B:SES	22.01	1	22.01	21.73**
AxB:	0.88	1	0.88	0.87
Within	89.13	88	1.01	
Total	210.12	91		

** Significant at 0.01 level

From the summary it is clear that the boys and girls differ significantly from each other on dishonesty measure. This could be observed from the F value yielded by main effect A. As it is known that main effect A refers to gender varied at two levels. Main effect A brought out significant results (F=96.85, df=1 and 88, p<0.01). It means that the difference in the means obtained by broad group of boys and broad group of girls has not occurred by chance only. Results of the study show that the girls were significantly more honest than the boys.

Depicting the association between SES and dishonesty it was assumed that the subjects coming from HSES exhibit better honest behavior than the subjects coming from LSES. Results of study shows that the HSES and LSES subjects differ significantly from each other with regards to dishonesty measures. Main effect B is associated with an F value of 21.73, which for 1 and 88 df is significant beyond 0.01 level. From the mean values it is clear that the subjects coming from HSES background had shown significantly more honest behavior than the subjects coming from LSES background.

Interaction AxB was non-significant (F=0.87, df=1 and 88, p> 0.05). It tells us that in the process of developing honesty or dishonesty among the subjects' gender and socio-economic status functioned independently. Results of the study are in accordance with the assumptions.

The third factor of moral behavior was stealing. It should be noted that here also there is an inverse relation between the scores obtained and the factor of stealing. It means more the score less the stealing behavior. Mean and SD obtained by the 4 classified groups on stealing measures are presented in table 1. From the mean s and SD it is clear that on stealing measure distribution of scores were more or less normal in all the four classified groups. As expected the group of girls had shown relatively better moral behavior on stealing measure. For example the highest mean value on stealing measures was obtained by Gr. A2B2(Mean=7.78, SD=1.00). This is the group of girls coming from HSES background. Even the girls coming from LSES background had shown relatively better moral value on stealing measure. Group A2B1 obtained a mean of 6.30 and SD is 1.15. As usual group A1B1 exhibited less moral value on stealing measure. Mean obtained by group A1B1 is 3.30 and SD is 0.97. There is large difference between the highest and the lowest mean values obtained by the groups. It appears that the groups are more likely to differ significantly from each other regarding stealing measure. To be on the safer side to draw conclusions the stealing data were treated by two way ANOVA. Summary of two way ANOVA is given in the following table.

Table 5 summary of two way ANOVA for stealing measure

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F
A: Gender	213.04	1	213.04	182.87**
B:SES	47.35	1	47.35	40.64**
AxB:	0.04	1	0.04	0.04
Within	102.52	88	1.17	
Total	362.96	91		

** Significant at 0.01 level

Boys and girls differ remarkably and significantly on stealing measure. It could be seen from the results obtained by main effect A. summary of ANOVA tells us that main effect A brought out an F value of 182.87 which for 1 and 88 df is significant at 0.01 level. Naturally difference in the means obtained by the

broad groups of boys and girls is so large that it cannot be attributed to the factor of chance only. From the mean value it is clear that the girls have shown significantly better moral value on stealing measure. Results are aligned with the assumption of study.

Main effect B represents the factor of SES. It was varied at two levels namely HSES and LSES. It has brought out significant results (F=40.64, df=1 and 88, p<0.01). It means that the broad groups LSES and HSES differ significantly from each other on stealing measure. Careful examination of means tells us that the subjects coming from HSES background had shown significantly better moral value on stealing measure.

In case of stealing measure also gender and SES failed to function in collaboration with each other. It could be seen from the F value obtained by interaction AxB. Interaction AxB had an F value of 0.04 which for 1 and 88 df is much less than what is required to be significant at 0.05 level.

The last factor studied in present investigation was cheating. It was thought that cheating is more prevalent among the boys than the girls. Here also it must be remembered that the scores obtained on cheating measure are inversely related to the moral value. It means more the score less the cheating behavior. Means and SD obtained by the four classified groups on cheating measure are presented in table 1. It could be seen that there are two groups which obtained identical mean values. These groups are A2B1 and A2B2. Gr. A2B1 had a mean of 5.00 and SD of 1.38. Gr. A2B2 obtained a mean of 5.00 and SD is 1.17. The other two groups also obtained more or less similar mean values, for example Gr. A1B1 had a mean of 4.00 and SD was 1.09, Gr. A1B2 obtained a mean of 4.13 and SD was 0.97. It seems that the groups might not differ significantly from each other as the difference in the means is not large. However to be on the safer side for drawing the inference cheating measure data were treated by two way ANOVA. Summary of ANOVA is given in the following table

Table 6 Summary of two way ANOVA for cheating measure

Source of variation	SS	Df	MS	F
A: Gender	20.10	1	20.10	14.91**
B:SES	0.10	1	0.10	0.07
AxB:	0.10	1	0.10	0.07
Within	118.61	88	1.35	
Total	138.90	91		

** Significant at 0.01 level

Though the difference in the means was not very large boys and girls were found differing significantly from each other on cheating measure. Main effect A which represents the factor of gender brought out significant results (F=14.91, df=1 and 88, p<0.01). It clearly shows that there is significant difference in the cheating measure of boys and girls. The boys had exhibited significantly more cheating behavior than the girls. In other words regarding cheating measure the girls had shown better moral values than the boys.

Main effect B represents factor of SES. It was varied at two levels. From the summary it is seen that main effect B failed to bring out significant results (F=0.07, df=1 and 88, p>0.05). It means that the LSES and HSES groups failed to differ significantly from each other regarding cheating measure.

Interaction AxB was also non-significant (F=0.07, df=1 and 88, p>0.05). It shows that in the development of cheating behaviour gender and SES failed to function in collaboration with each other.

Results of the study show that though most of the hypotheses got strong support from the results there are a few hypotheses which remained insatiate. In case of all the five factors interaction effects were non-significant.

Summary and conclusions:

In present study emotional maturity and moral values are measured and an attempt has been made to find out how they are influenced by gender and socio-economic status.

In the study 92 subjects of age group 13-15 took part. Male female ratio was 1:1. They were administered Emotional maturity scale by Rupa and Saira Banu, Moral value scale by Sengupta and A. K. Singh. For measuring socio-economic status SES scale by Janbandhu and Nandi was administered. In the study a 2x2 factorial design was used. The data were treated by mean, SD and two way ANOVA. On the basis of the results following conclusions were drawn.

1. Emotional maturity was significantly more among the girls than the boys.

2. The subjects coming from HSES background exhibited significantly more emotional maturity than the subjects coming from LSES backgrounds.

3. Lying was significantly more among the boys than the girls.

4. The subjects coming from LSES background had shown significantly more lying behaviour than the subjects coming from HSES background.

5. Dishonesty was significantly more among the boys than the girls.

6. Dishonesty was exhibited significantly more by the subjects coming from LSES background than those coming from HSES background.

7. Stealing was significantly more among boys than the girls.

8. Stealing behavior was found significantly more among the subjects coming from LSES background than the subjects coming from HSES background.

9. Cheating behavior was significantly more predominant among the boys than the girls.

10. HSES and LSES subjects failed to differ significantly from each other regarding cheating.

11. Regarding all the factors interaction effects were non-significant.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The study was limited to the area of Nagpur City.

2. The present study was limited to 92 adolescents of age group of 13 to 15 years.

3. The scales used to collect data, may have its own limitations.

4. The present study being a descriptive one, selecting a representative sample of the entire population was not practicable.

SUGGESTIONS FOT FURTHER STUDY

1. Research suggests that the future study could be done in the metropolitan cities, various cultures, communities, religion and caste.

2. The family members should also be included in further studies in this area.

3. The study should also be conducted on special children, Joint/Nuclear family, children with family discord (e.g. single parents, divorced parents, etc.).

4. Researcher suggests that there is a need to create awareness among parents, teachers, educators, and counselors about the importance of the moral values and emotional maturity among the adolescents

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Certain specific training programmes should be conducted by teachers at both levels (senior secondary and college), so that teachers can directly take-up responsibility in providing moral education to their students.

2. Development and strengthening of healthy moral values and emotional maturity among students should be a very important function of the school, which would help in solving problems of students and maintain discipline.

REFERENCES

1. Arnett,J.(1998). Learning to stand alone: The contemporary American transition to adulthood in cultural and historical context. *Human Development*, 41(5-6), 295-315.

2. Arthur, J. (2007). Educational Psychology. *New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.*

3. Anderson & Armstead (1995). As cited in Lupien, S., King, S., Meaney, M., & McEwen, B. S. (2001). Can poverty get under your skin? Basal cortisol levels and cognitive function in children from low and high socioeconomic status. *Development and psychopathology*, *13*(3), 653-676.

4. Bailen, N. H., Green, L. M., & Thompson, R. J. (2019). Understanding Emotion in Adolescents: A Review of Emotional Frequency, Intensity, Instability, and Clarity. *Emotion Review*, *11*(1), 63–73.

5. Chaudhary, N., & Uppal, A. (1996). Achievement motivation and emotional maturity of adolescents staying at home and orphanage. *Indian Psychol. Res*, *46*, 27-32.

6. Côté, J. E. (1996). Sociological perspectives on identity formation: The culture–identity link and identity capital. *Journal of adolescence*, *19*(5), 417-428.

7. Crow, L. D., & Crow, A. (1973). Educational psychology. *New Delhi: Eurasia Publishing House Private Limited*, 248.

8. Duhan, K., Punia, A. and Jeet, P. (2017). Emotional maturity of adolescents in relation to their gender. *International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR)*, *7* (1), 61-68.

9. Dorothea, P., Ferns, I., & Thom. (2001). Moral development of black and white South African adolescents: Evidence against cultural universality in Kohlberg's theory. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *31*(4), 38-47.

10. FitzMaurice, K. E. (2012). The Secret of Maturity. *FitzMaurice Publishers*.

11. Gallo, L. C., & Matthews, K. A. (2003). Understanding the association between socioeconomic status and physical health: do negative emotions play a role? *Psychological bulletin*, *129*(1), 10.

12. Gupta , N. and Srivastava,N. (2016). Emotional maturity in relation to socio-economic status among urban adolescents. , *Research journal of commerce and behavioral science* , 5(8), 28.

13. Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence. *New York: Bantam*.

14. Hassan, A. E. H. & A. A. F. (2015). Influences Social Adjustment as Predictors of Moral Value and Academic Achievement. *The American Journal of Innovative Research and Applied Sciences*, 1 (1), 1-5.

15. Hochschild, Jennifer L. 2003. Social Class in Public Schools. *Journal of Social Issues* 59(4), 821-840.

16. Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied psychology*, *50*(3), 337-421.

17. Hymel et al (1990) as cited in Lempers, J. D., & Clark-Lempers, D. (1990). Family economic stress, maternal and paternal support and adolescent distress. *Journal of Adolescence*, *13*(3), 217-229.

18. Influences on Moral Development | Adolescent Psychology (2022) https://courses.lumenlearning.com/adolescent/chapter/influences-on-moral-development/…

19. Jeynes, William H. (2002). Examining the effects of parental absence on the academic achievement of adolescents: the challenge of controlling for family income. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 23(2).

20. Jose, R. and R.Sujatha (2015). A comparative study on emotional maturity among adolescent boys and girls. *International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health, 4*(2), 269-272.

21. Jobson, M. (2020): Emotional maturity among adolescents and its importance. *Indian journal of mental health*, 7(1).

22. Karmakar, R. (2015). Does Parenting Style Influence the Internalization of Moral Values in Children and Adolescents? *Psychological Studies,* 60, 438–446

23. Majoribanks, K. (1996). Family Learning Environments and Students' Outcomes: A Review. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* 27(2), 373-394.

24. Rajan, C. and Joseph, H.(2019) Self esteem and emotional maturity among adolescents. *International Journal of Nursing Care,* 7(1), 279.

25. Rawat,C. & Gulati, R.(2019).Influence of Home Environment and Peers Influence on Emotional Maturity of Adolescents. *Integrated Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 15-8.

26. Rawat, C., & Singh, R. (2017). Effect of Family Type on Emotional Maturity of Adolescents. *Journal of Human Ecology*, *57*(1-2), 47-52.

27. Simmons, R.(2017). Moving into adolescence: The impact of pubertal change and school context. *Rutledge*

28. Simmons, R. G., Burgeson, R., Carlton-Ford, S., & Blyth, D. A. (1987). The impact of cumulative change in early adolescence. *Child development*, 1220-1234.

29. Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1), 2307-0919.

30. Sudha B, and Nagar, N. (2004). School adjustment among boys and girls of secondary schools in perspective of their socio-economic status, parent child interaction and emotional maturity. *Artha: Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1), 65