TÍTULO: Condiciones socioeconómicas e impacto del estilo de enseñanza en el razonamiento moral de los niños que asisten a la Escuela de Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistán.

AUTORES:

1. Sajjad Anwer Malik.

2. Babak Mahmood.

3. Sajida Parveen.

4. Muhammad Shahzad Iqbal.

RESUMEN: La socialización de los niños está asociada en gran medida con las características socioeconómicas y los estilos de enseñanza. El impacto de estas características en el razonamiento moral se mide en esta investigación. Los estudiantes, 60 hembras y 60 varones fueron seleccionados al azar de escuelas públicas y privadas y fueron entrevistados en una encuesta. Los resultados fueron analizados mediante diferentes técnicas estadísticas. El análisis univariado se realizó con estadística descriptiva y el análisis bivariado con estadística inferencial. Se utilizó el Sistema SPSS. Se encontró que no existe asociación entre el género y el razonamiento moral de los estudiantes, pero otras características socioeconómicas influyeron mucho en el razonamiento moral de los estudiantes.

PALABRAS CLAVES: Género, tipo de escuela, área geográfica, estilo de enseñanza, razonamiento moral.

TITLE: Socio-economic conditions and impact of teaching style on moral reasoning of School going children of Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

AUTHORS:

1. Sajjad Anwer Malik.

2. Babak Mahmood.

3. Sajida Parveen.

4. Muhammad Shahzad Iqbal.

ABSTRACT: The socialization of children is greatly associated with socio-economic characteristics and teaching styles. The impact of these characteristics on moral reasoning is measured in this research. School going students, 60 females and 60 males were selected from both public and private schools randomly and were interviewed in a survey. Results were analysed by different statistical techniques. Univariate analysis was done with descriptive statistical techniques and bivariate analysis was done with inferential statistics. SPSS was used. It is found that there is no association between gender and moral reasoning of school going students, but other socio-economic characteristics greatly influenced the moral reasoning of school going students.

KEY WORDS: Gender, type of school, geographical area, teaching style, moral reasoning.

INTRODUCTION.

In early ages, the socialization of the children was the prime responsibility of the family but with the passing of time, this responsibility was shifted to schools and teachers. Now, teachers are responsible to train the students both professionally and morally (John, 2014).

A study was conducted to examine the usefulness of parent socialization models for understanding teachers' influence on student adjustment in middle school.

Teachers were judged with respect to their modeling of motivation and to Baumrind's parenting dimensions of control, maturity demands, nurturance, and democratic communication. Students adjustment was defined in terms of their social and academic goals and interest in class, classroom behavior, and academic performance.

Based on information from 452 sixth graders from two suburban middle schools, results of multiple regressions indicated that the five teaching dimensions explained significant amounts of variance in student motivation, social behavior, and achievement. High expectations (maturity demands) were a consistent positive predictor of students' goals and interests, and negative feedback (lack of nurturance) was the most consistent negative predictor of academic performance and social behavior (Alex, 2000). The role of motivation in mediating relations between teaching dimensions and social behavior and academic achievement also was examined; evidence for mediation was not found. Relations of teaching dimensions to student outcomes were the same for African American and European American students, and for boys and girls (Wentzel, 2002).

Numbers of studies were conducted to find out the outcomes of different teaching on moral reasoning. This research was designed to examine the teaching methods, especially directing, discussing and delegating teaching styles on moral reasoning of school going students in context of socio-economic conditions of respondents. The results of this research can be used to form the policies to make these styles more effective for the personality development of students and to understand this impact with connection to socio-economic characteristics.

DEVELOPMENT.

Review of literature.

Caffarella & O'Donnell (1987) supported the coordination of the learning contract into the showing procedure as one method for building up a self-guided way to deal with learning in advanced

education. An investigation of alumni understudies in grown-up training proposed that the utilization of the learning contract design has justify as a technique for creating understudy obligation regarding the learning procedure (Atkinson, 1995). Additionally, the investigation found that the understudies were proceeding to utilize self-coordinated learning aptitudes in that a portion of the understudies had changed the manner in which they were directing (Caffarella & O'Donnell, 1987).

An investigation of the effect of both educating and learning styles upon scholarly accomplishment by Conti & Welborn (1986) observed learning style to be unimportant while directing style has a huge effect in understudy accomplishment. Information for the examination was assembled on 256 wellbeing experts taking courses in unified wellbeing instruction at a Texas college. Investigation of covariance uncovered that couple of noteworthy contrasts in accomplishment were because of learning style as estimated with the Canfield Learning Style Inventory. "Information of the understudy's general learning style may not be of colossal esteem every one of the components inside an inclination territory were similarly effective in helping understudies accomplish".

Baxter (2013) suggests tips for motivating understudies to take an interest in talk:

1. Make it clear from the principal day that investment from all understudies is normal (This should be possible in the syllabus or verbally in class).

2. Next, make support in dialog a piece of the understudies' review.

3. Finally, disclose to understudies that dialog is an aptitude that will be helpful in their professions, and that learning it currently will work well for them into what's to come.

Decision making occurs as understudies build up objectives, actualize plans, and work through issues without anyone else. The educator gives them the power and duty to take care of their own issues, which may incorporate managing colleagues who are slacking off. Acknowledgment

regularly incorporates laud, decent evaluations, and different prizes given to understudies who function admirably autonomously, meet due dates and create great work (Yeager & Beck, 1994). Chang (1994) found that most educators reason at the "traditional level". Research has discovered that educators with more elevated amounts of good thinking consider a greater number of perspectives than the individuals who have bring down levels of good thinking (Durkheim, 2007).

Methodology.

The objective the study was to measure relationship between Socio-economic conditions and impact of teaching style on moral reasoning of School going children of Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan. For this purpose, a survey was conducted in school of Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan. Two public and two private schools were selected randomly. Simple random sampling technique was used to select the sample of school going students. Sample size was 120 students, 60 from public and 60 from private schools were selected for equal participation of both sectors.

Data was collected through interview schedule. The collected information was analysed through SPSS. Descriptive analysis was used to measure the univariate and through inferential statistics techniques bivariate relationship was measured.

Results and Discussion.

This section discusses the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and the impact of teaching styles on moral reasoning. Like all empirical researches, in this study univariate analysis helped us to find the frequency and percentage of respondents in various categories and with the help of this information bivariate analysis is done and the detailed bivariate analysis is given below.

Table 1: classification of the respondents on basis of Gender.

Gender	F	%
Male	60	50.0
Female	60	50.0
Total	120	100.0

Table 1 shows distribution of the respondents based on gender. Number of female and male respondents was equal. This design helped to avoid any gender biases and obtain the opinion of both male and female students. Equal number of male and female students of various schools were respondents of this study. These schools consisted of both private and public schools. Table below explains this classification of schooling in detail.

Table 2: Classification of the respondents concerning to their type of school.

Type of school	F	%
Public	60	50.0
Private	60	50.0
Total	120	100.0

Table 2 shows the classification of the respondents on basis of school type. To obtain the concise picture, public schools and private schools both had equal representation. It means that 50% of the respondents belonged to each category. This table shows that researcher obtained data from 60 students of public schools and 60 students of private schools. All these respondents were studying in different classes. Below is classification of respondents on basis of classes in detail.

Table 3: Classification of respondents concerning to their geographical background.

Studying class	F	%
Rural	27	22.5
Urban	93	77.5
Total	120	100.0

Table 3 shows distribution of the respondents on basis of their geographical belonging. This study obtained data related to two categories rural and urban. This study conducted Faisalabad city shows that most of the respondents 77.5% were urban dwellers and only 22.5% were living in rural areas. Table below shows distribution of the respondents on basis of parental education.

Table 4: Impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children (n = 120).

Thinking	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	S.D.	Rang
	F	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%			
Respect towards others	72	60.0	20	16.7	10	8.3	11	9.2	7	5.8	4.16	.52	1
Personal responsibility	68	56.7	18	15.0	13	10.8	12	10.0	9	7.5	4.03	.64	2
Conflict resolution	24	20.0	54	45.0	20	16.7	13	10.8	9	7.5	3.59	.90	12
Better attendance	66	55.0	17	14.2	15	12.5	11	9.2	11	9.2	3.97	.92	3
Patience	26	21.7	52	43.3	19	15.8	17	14.2	6	5.0	3.63	.99	10
Kindness	65	54.2	20	16.7	10	8.3	12	10.0	13	10.8	3.93	1.02	4
Sharing	28	23.3	40	33.3	28	23.3	19	15.8	5	4.2	3.56	1.05	13
Self-restraint	60	50.0	22	18.3	13	10.8	10	8.3	15	12.5	3.85	.98	5
Calm articulation	56	46.7	23	19.2	10	8.3	14	11.7	17	14.2	3.73	1.12	8
Community contributions	33	27.5	49	40.8	18	15.0	11	9.2	9	7.5	3.72	1.04	9
Fairness	58	48.3	25	20.8	12	10.0	10	8.3	15	12.5	3.84	1.06	6
Honesty	50	41.7	30	25.0	15	12.5	13	10.8	12	10.0	3.78	1.03	7
Compassion	30	25.0	42	35.0	30	25.0	9	7.5	9	7.5	3.63	1.12	11

Table 4 discusses the distribution of respondents based on impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children. Using Likert scale student's response was gathered for various categories. When asked that do you have respect for the others, 60% student strongly agreed, 16.7% agreed and 8.3% were neutral. Only a small number, 9.2% disagreed while 5.8% strongly disagreed. Mean value

for this variable is 4.16 with standard deviation .52. This shows that majority of respondents 76.7% agreed that they have respect towards others.

In response to the question related to personal responsibility, 56.7% students strongly agreed, 15.0% student agreed, and 10.8% students were neutral. While on the other hand, 10.8% student and 7.5% student strongly disagreed that they fulfil their moral responsibility.

When questions related to conflict resolution was asked, 20% percent student strongly agreed, 45% students agreed and 16.7% were neutral. Only10.8% students disagreed and 7.5% strongly disagreed. Mean value for this variable was 59 with standard deviation .90. Related to better attendance 55.0% strongly agreed and 14.2% agreed that they have better attendance. 12.5% for neutral and 9.2% disagreed and 9.2% from you disagreed that they have better attendance. Mean value for this variable was 3.97 which standard deviation .92.

In response to questions related to patient's 21.7 percent and strongly agreed and 43.3% agreed and 15.8% were neutral that they are patient. 14.2% students disagreed, and 5.0% students strongly disagreed that they are patient. Mean value for this variable was 3.63 with standard deviation. 99. The rank of this variable is 10. On the question of kindness 54.2% strongly agreed and 16.7% agreed that they are kind. Only 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed that they are kind. Mean value for this variable is 3.9 when the standard deviation 1.02. When asked about sharing 23.3% respondents strongly agreed 33.3% agreed that they share. 23 % persons responded for neutral. 15.8% students disagreed and 4.2% strongly disagreed that they share anything. Mean value for this variable was 3.56 with standard deviation 1.05.

In response to questions related to self-restraint, 50.0% students strongly agreed, 18.3% agreed and 10% were neutral. While 8.3% disagreed and 12. 5% strongly disagreed. Mean Value for this variable was 3.85 with standard deviation 0.98.

In response to question related to compassion, 25 % respondents strongly agreed, 35% respondents agreed and 25% work neutral. 7.5 % agreed and 7.5 % strongly disagreed that they are compassionate. Mean value for this variable is 3.63 which standard deviation 1.12.

In response to question related to calm articulation, 46.7% respondents strongly agreed, 19.2% respondents agreed, and 8.3% students were neutral. Only 14.2% respondents disagreed and 1.6% strongly disagrees that their articulation is clam and composed. Mean value for this variable was 3.73 with standard deviation 1.12.

When asked about community contributions, 27.5% students strongly agreed, 40.8% students agreed, and 15.0% students were neutral. Only 9.2% disagreed and 7.5% strongly disagreed that they contribute in the community. On the question of fairness as members of society, 48.3 strongly agreed, 20.8% agreed that they are fair in their behavior. Only 8.3% and 12.5% students disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively about their fairness in society. Mean value for this variable was 3.84 with standard deviation 1.06.

In response to question related to honesty 41.7% students strongly agreed, 25% students agreed, and 12.5% students were neutral. Around 10.8% students disagreed, and 10% students strongly disagreed that they are honest. Mean value for variable honesty was 3.78 with standard deviation 1.03.

Hypothesis: Male students will be having more impact of teaching styles on thinking as compared to female students.

Table 5: Relationship between gender and impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children.

Gender	Impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Female	14	17	29	60
	23.3%	28.3%	48.3%	100.0%
Male	11	13	36	60
	18.3%	21.7%	60.0%	100.0%
Total	25	30	65	120
	20.8%	25.0%	54.2%	100.0%

Chi-square = 1.64   d.f. = 2   P-value = .439^{NS}

Gamma =0.190   P-value = .223^{NS}

NS = Non-Significant.

Table 5 shows the relationship between Gender and impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children. Gender and impact of teaching styles on moral thinking are cross tabulated found that there is no significant impact of teaching styles with respect to gender.

It was found that 23.3 percent of female said that impact of teaching style is low while 28.3 percent impact is medium, and 8.3 % impact was high. While on the other hand, 18.3 % at impact is low, suicide pact is medium and 60% student said that impact is high. Value for the given relationship is 1.64 with the difference of two. P value for the given relationship is 0.4 39. Gamma value is 0.190 with p value. 223. This shows that the relationship between Gender and impact of moral thinking on school going children is not significant. The styles of teaching equally affect male and female students, or in another word, that means, that style is effective in males, it is also effective for females.

Hypothesis: Students of private schools will be having more impact of teaching styles on moral thinking as compared to public school's students.

Table 6: Relationship between school type and impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children.

School type	Impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children			Total
	Low	**Medium**	**High**	
Public school	15	19	26	60
	25.0%	31.7%	43.3%	100.0%
Pvt. School	10	11	39	60
	16.7%	18.3%	65.0%	100.0%
Total	25	30	65	120
	20.8%	25.0%	54.2%	100.0%

Chi-square = 5.73   d.f. = 2   P-value = .057*

Gamma =0.339   P-value = .024*

* = Significant.

Table 6 represents the cross-tabulation and chi square and gamma test values for relationship between school type and impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children. There are two types of schools' private schools and public schools that were included in the study. For the scales of low, medium and high, the impact of teaching has been measured. It was found that 25% students in public schools said that impact is low, 31.7% students claimed that impact is medium, while 43.3% students said that impact is high.

From the private schools, 16.7% students claimed impact is low, 18.3% said impact is medium and 65% said that impact is high. Value of chi square for the relationship between given variables is 5.73 with P value 0.57. Value of the gamma function for the variables is 0.339 with p-value .024. This shows that there is significant relationship between two variables. Private school students have larger impact as compared to public schools.

Hypothesis: Students of urban areas will be having more impact of teaching styles on moral thinking as compared to rural students.

Table 7: Relationship between geographical background and impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children.

Geographical background	Impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Rural	7	11	9	27
	25.9%	40.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Urban	18	19	56	93
	19.4%	20.4%	60.2%	100.0%
Total	25	30	65	120
	20.8%	25.0%	54.2%	100.0%

Chi-square = 6.67   d.f. = 2   P-value = .035*

Gamma =0.365   P-value = .032*

 * = Significant.

Table 7 discusses the relationship between geographical background and impact of distinct teaching styles on moral of students.

Geographical background was measured using two categories urban and rural. Impact of distinctive styles of teaching has been cross-tabulated with these two categories rural and urban. There were 26% students of rural area who claimed that impact of distinctive styles of teaching is low. While 40.7% rural students said the impact is medium and 33.3% students claimed that impact is high. On the other hand, 20.8% urban students claimed that impact of teaching styles is low. 20.4% students supported that impact is medium, while a sizeable number of students 60.2% claimed that impact is high. Value of chi square test for this relationship was 6.67 with p Value .035. The value of gamma function for the given test was 0.365 with P value .032. This shows a significant relationship between two variables. Cross tabulation results also maintain that Impact of teaching styles on rural students is 33.3% while on urban students is 60.2% which is almost double. It shows that impact of various teaching styles was more visible in urban students.

Main findings of the study.

In this portion, the main findings of the research were discussed.

Socio-economic characteristics have very important role in social sciences as they influence the perception of people greatly. Main characteristics were gender, type of school, and geographical background. 60 female students and 60 males were selected for collection of data. Similarly, to represent the students of both private and public schools 60 students were selected from private schools and 60 were selected from public students. 27 respondents belonged to rural area and 97 were from urban area, which showed poor enrollment of rural area.

There is not a single element to measure the morality. Numbers of indicators were used to measure the opinion of students about the concept of morality. When students were asked: do you have respect for others? 72 respondents strongly agreed, 11 disagreed and 10 were neutral about the statement. 68 respondents strongly agreed with that they have the sense of personal responsibility, 13 were neutral and 9 strongly disagreed with the statement. 24 respondents strongly agreed with the statement that they have the ability for conflict resolution, 54 agreed with the statement while 20 were neutral. 66 respondents agreed with that they have better attendance, 15 were neural while only 11 were disagreed with the statement.

Out of total, 52 respondents were agreed that they have patience while 19 were neutral whereas only 6 disagreed with the statement. The attribute of kindness is found in 65 respondents, 10 have neutral opinion about this characteristic and 13 said they do not have these characteristics in their personalities. 40 agreed that they share their things with other 28 were neutral and 19 disagreed with the statement. 60 respondents strongly agreed that they have self-restraint, 13 were neutral and 15 were disagreed with the statement. 56 respondents showed strongly agreement towards the question of calm articulation while 10 were neutral and 14 were disagreed with the idea. 49 showed agreement

about the question of community contribution whereas 18 were neutral and 9 were disagreed with the statement. More than 50 respondents said that fairness and honesty are the attributes of their personality while 42 agreed that they are compassionate.

There is non-significant relationship on moral thinking on gender basis. There is significant relationship between school type and impact of teaching style on moral thinking of school going students. A significant relationship was found between geographical background and impact of teaching styles on moral thinking of school going children.

CONCLUSIONS.

Participants were of both genders male and females. Equal numbers of students were taken from public and private schools. Most of the respondents belonged to urban areas. This indicates that respondents belonged to diverse socio-economic background.

A significant association was found in all three directing, discussing, and delegating teaching styles and moral reasoning of school going students. The significant association also found in socio-economic characteristics such as school type, and geographical area and moral thinking of school going children whereas there is a non-significant relation between gender of the respondent and moral reasoning.

Suggestions.

Following, suggestions are made on the basis of research finding:

i. Govt. should provide access to education to the students of rural areas and also give them financial assistance. So, they can equally contribute to the development of country.

ii. Public schools have to pay more attention on moral reasoning of their students. For this purpose, seminars, training, and workshops should be arranged by government for both teachers and students.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Alex, S. (2000). Analysing policy for sustainable livelihoods. Brighton: Institute of Development studies.

2. Atkinson, A. B. (1995). "Income Distribution in Europe and the United States. University of Oxford, Nuffield College. Economics Group.

3. Baxter, J. E. (2013). Engendering Households in the Prehistoric Southwest. Barbara J.Roth, ed., Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 2010, 332pp;. The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology, 145-146.

4. Caffarella, R. S., & O'Donnell, J. M. (1987). Self-directed adult learning: A critical paradigm revisited. Adult Education Quarterly, 37(4), 199-211.

5. Chang, F. Y. (1994). School teacher's moral reasoning. In J. R. Rest, & D. Narvaez, Moral development in the professions: Psychology and applied ethics (pp. 71-83). Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ.

6. Conti, G. J., & Welborn, R. B. (1986). Teaching-Learning Styles and the Adult Learner. Lifelong Learning, 9(8), 20-24.

7. Durkheim, É. (2007). The rules of sociological method (1895). In S. Edles, & L. Desfor, Classical and Contemporary Sociological Theory: Text and Readings (pp. 95–102). Pine Forge Press.

8. John, M. J. (2014). Sociology. (15, Ed.) Pearson Education.

9. Wentzel, K. R. (2002). The Contribution of Social Goal Setting to Children's School Adjustmen. In A. Wigfield, & J. S. Eccles, Development of Achievement Motivation (pp. 221-246). Maryland: Elsevier. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/B978012750053-9/50011-5

10. Yeager, N. M., & Beck, J. D. (1994). The Leader's Window : Mastering the Four Styles of Leadership to Build High-performing Teams. New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Sajjad Anwer Malik. CEO Mumtaz Educational System Pvt. Limited. Faisalabad, Pakistan.

2. Babak Mahmood. Department of Sociology, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan.

3. Sajida Parveen. Parveen Sajida PhD scholar, Department of Sociology, Govt. College University, Faisalabad.

4. Muhammad Shahzad Iqbal. Department of Management Sciences, National Textile University Faisalabad, Pakistan. Correspondence email: shahzad.iqbal@ntu.edu.pk