Periodic Research

Morality and Fashion among Married and Unmarried Women

Mahesh B. Chauhan
Research Scholar,
Deptt. of Psychology,
Saurashtra University
Rajkot, Gujarat, India

Y. A. Jogsan
Associate Professor,
Deptt.of Psychology,
Saurashtra University
Rajkot, Gujarat, India

Abstract

The main purpose of this research was to find out the man difference between married and unmarried women. The total 80 women as a variation belonging to married and unmarried women were taken. The research tool for morality was measured by Brakely, Frank, Sulloway and Michle Shemer. Here Guajrati adaptation was used which was made by Yogesh A. Jogsan and tool for fashion were used which made by L. R. Yagnik and Kinnari Aachary. Here t-test was applied to check the significant of morality and fashion between married and unmarried women. To check the relation between morality and fashion correlation method is used. The study revealed that there was significant difference between married and unmarried women in morality. There was significant difference between married and unmarried women in morality. There was significant difference between married and unmarried women in fashion. While the correlation between morality and fashion reveals -0.52 negative correlation

Keywords: Morality and Fashion.

Introduction

Moral psychology is the interdisciplinary study of such questions about the mental lives of moral agents, including moral thought, feeling, reasoning, and motivation. While these questions can be studied solely from the armchair or using only empirical tools, researchers in various disciplines, from biology to neuroscience to philosophy, can address them in tandem. Some key topics in this respect revolve around moral cognition and motivation, such as moral responsibility, altruism, the structure of moral motivation, weakness of will, and moral intuitions. There are other important topics as well, including emotions, character, moral development, self-deception, addiction, and the evolution of moral capacities.

A famous challenge to our having free will and being morally responsible for what we do is determinism. If determinism is true, then the current state of the universe and the past together causally necessitate a unique future state. While compatibility maintains that the truth of determinism does not preclude moral responsibility, incompatibility insists that it does. One popular strategy among incompatibility is to claim they have the intuitive, common sense, or default position (Kane, 1999). This can the motivate incompatibles, shift the burden of proof onto compatibility, and so on.

Morality sometimes requires beneficence, but it can seem morally problematic to do so for an ulterior purpose, such as self-interest. While psychological egoists admit that one can care about the well-being of others, they maintain that such desires are not ultimate or intrinsic they are merely instrumental to a desire for one's own benefit. This theory has not been defended by many philosophers, but some have argued that empirical work lends it some credence (Slote, 1964; Moriollo, 1990). Despite its lack of popularity, attention has recently been drawn back to psychological egoism in light of work in social psychology, as well as the apparently weak philosophical foundation on which rejection of the view rests (Sober & Wilson, 1998).

Many of the issues dividing moral theorists rest on claims about how we come to judge things as right and wrong, as well as what motivates us to act in accordance with such judgments. Two intimately related issues in this arena are (a) the connection between moral judgment and motivation, and (b) the role of "reason" in moral motivation. We all sometimes succumb to temptation, exhibiting a kind of moral weakness when the action has moral significance. Interesting philosophical puzzles arise with such phenomena, but some have been concerned with a precise characterization of them in the first place, or wether they even exist at all.

Periodic Research

Others have focused on action that is contrary to what one intends to do (Holton, 2009). But there is some empirical evidence that neither of these exhausts the ordinary notion of being weak-willed; both factors seem to play some role, while evaluative considerations do as well (May & Holton, 2012).

Ethical theories are often tested against our immediate, pre-theoretical judgments about morally significant cases what we might call "moral intuitions." Consider, for example, the widely shared judgment that slavery is immoral or that Hitler's campaign of genocide was evil. It counts against a theory to at least some extent if it conflicts with such clear intuitions. But what drives them ? One recent line of empirical research focuses on the role of emotion as opposed to reasoning in moral judgment. In one experiment, participants recorded their moral judgments in response to various hypothetical scenarios either at a clean desk or a disgusting desk. Those who scored highly on their ability to perceive changes in their bodily state tended to rate some of the actions as more immoral (Schnall, Haidt, Clore & Jordan, 2008).

Another study found that people ranked atheists lower than Muslims, recent immigrants, and homosexuals in "sharing their vision of American society" and were least willing to allow their children to marry them (Edgell, et. al., 2006). When asked why there were so set against atheists, the answers had to do with morality: Some people view atheists as problematic because they associate them with illegality, such as drug use and prostitution that is, with immoral people who threaten respectable community from the lower end of the status hierarchy. Others saw atheists as rampant materialists and cultural elitists that threaten common values from above the ostentatiously wealthy who make a lifestyle out of consumption or the cultural elites who think they know better than everyone else. Both of these themes rest on a view of atheists as self-interested individualists who are not concerned with the common good. This distrust of atheists is shared by many scholars, including those who are otherwise seen as champions of the Enlightenment. John Locke, for instance, did not believe that atheists should be allowed to hold office. He wrote "Promises, covenants, and oaths, which are the bonds of human society, can have no hold upon an atheist" (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010).

There are other scholars who hold opposite view, arguing that religion makes people worse. Most would agree, after all, that religious fanaticism and extremism can sometimes drive people to do terrible things, and many would agree as well that certain everyday religious practices and beliefs can have a dark side Example might include the persecution of homosexuals, the murdering of heretics, and incitements to holy war. As Blase Pascal pointed out, "Men never do evil so completely and cheerfully as when they do it from a religious conviction." Some would take this further, arguing that religion in general has a corrosive effect of our moral lives. Hitchens (2007), for instance, argues that religion is "violent, irrational, intolerant, allied to racism and tribalism and bigotry, invested in ignorance and hostile to free inquiry, contemptuous of women and coercieve toward children" (Myers, 2008).

One possibility emphasizes that fact that religions make explicit moral claims that their followers accept. Through holy texts and the proclamations of authority figures, religions make moral claims about abortion, homosexuality, duties to the poor, charity, masturbation, just war, and so on. People believe these claims because, implicitly or explicitly, they trust the sources. They accept them on faith. This sort of deference is common; many of our moral and political and scientific beliefs have this sort of deferential nature, where we hold a belief because it is associated with our community or with people that we trust. Upon hearing about a welfare plan proposed by a political party, for instance, people are more likely to agree with the plan if it has been proposed by their own political party although, interestingly, they are not conscious that this is occurring, they mistakenly believe that their judgment is based on the objective merit of the program (Cohen, 2003). Most people who claim to believe in natural selection do so not because they are persuaded by the data indeed, most have no real understanding of what natural selection is but rather because they trust the scientists (Bloom & Weisberg 2007). A second way in which relation can have an effect is by emphasizing certain aspects of morality. As one case of this, Cohen & Rozin (2001) note that Christianity codifies the principal that thoughts are to some extent equivalent to actions. This is expressed in Christ's dictum : "You have heard that it was said 'you shall not commit adultery'; but I say to you, that everyone who looks at a woman with lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart." Judaism, in contrast, focuses less on intentions and more on actions. Cohen and Rozin find that this difference has an effect on the intuitions that individual Cristians and Jews have about specific situations. For instance, Christians and Jews have different moral evaluations of a person who doesn't like his parents but chooses to take good care of them nonetheless.

More generally, religions tend to emphasize certain aspects of morality that are less important to an atheist. These include what Shweder et. al. (1997) descirbe as an "ethics of divinity" : a cluster of ethical notions that rely on concepts such as "sacred order, natural order, tradition, sanctity, sin, and pollution, aims to protect the soul, the spirit, the spiritual aspects of the human agent and 'nature' from degradation." There is an especially tight connection between religion and the moralization of purity, particularly in the domains of food and sex (Grahm & Haidt, 2010).

Finally, it might be that religion has more general effect. Religion might turn the dials of compassion, Religious belief and practice might increase one's empathy and caring and love. It might also increase one's prejudice and intolerance, particularly toward those who are seen as outside of the community. Such effects might be triggered by the

messages that religions convey or might somehow emerge from the very nature of religious practice and activity.

Fast fashion brought fresh air into the textile and apparel industries and it quickly struck a chord with the consumer. From a management and economics perspective, fast fashion has been the long-awaited realization of lean retailing" with items produced in small batches and within short lead times. Moreover, fast fashion's reliance on near-shore production has given a lifeline to an otherwise dying industry in developed countries. On the other hand, fast fashion has been associated with a disposable culture and its social responsibility is constantly under scrutiny.

The literature of the subject of fashion is vast with approaches from a variety of angles, including sociological, cultural, historical as well as practical. For the purpose of this study a cross section of publications has been reviewed. Bruzzi & Gibson (2000) have contributed substantially with critical analysis of consumer behavior, fashion consumption and fashion as a subculture. They look at fashion imagery and its association with celebrities including a detailed account of catwealk show politics, outlining the importance of the presence of fashion editors and celebrities alike as well as their special seating arrangements. In terms of this thesis both celebrity endorsement as well as catwalk shows has been identified as vital tools within fashion practice. McRobbie identifies the lack of criticism within fashion journalism which has been a recurrent issue with regard to the coherent discussion and further considers fashion as a conflict free zone, both in academic terms and in the wider world of journalistic commentary. McRobbie is interested in the process that turns a fashion designer into star and suggests that strong personal networks as well as promotional efforts are responsible for that. This author clearly recognizes fashion as a driving force within fashion design yet her interests are concerned with the wider debate about internal politics and organization of fashion design thus not making a case for investigation with regard to fashion PR and its role in creating fashion media coverage.

Significance of Research

The present study is morality and fashion among married and unmarried women. It will also be helpful to understand the attitude toward fashion, types of fashion and morality in women. Besides, it will be helpful for other researchers who will be interested in this related research advance work on same topic. This study can help us to get the idea about fashion and morality i.e. Similarly we can know the causes of more fashion and poor morality.

Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of study were as under :
1. To measure the mean difference of morality among married and unmarried women.
2. To measure the mean difference of fashion among married and unmarried women.
3. To measure the correlation between morality and fashion.

Null-Hypothesis

To related objectives of this study, null hypothesis were as under:
1. There will be no significant difference in morality among married and unmarried women.
2. There will be no significant difference in fashion among married and unmarried women.
3. There will be no correlation between morality and fashion.

Variables

Variables of the Present study as under:
1. Independent variables (i) Marital status: Married women and Unmarried women
2. Dependent variables
   (i) Score receive on morality scale.
   (ii) Score receive on fashion scale.
3. Control variables
   (i) In this study only women were taken.
   (ii) Limited samples were taken for this study.
   (iii) The selection of sample only from Rajkot city.
   (iv) In this present study includes 20 to 30 years women.

Participants

The participants of the present investigation consists 80 women. Out of the 80 women, 40 are married and 40 are unmarried. They are women in different area of Rajkot City. The subject was selected through random sampling techniques.

Research Design

The present research aims to morality and fashion among married and unmarried women. For these total 80 women were taken as a participant. To check difference's t-test method is used. To check the correlation between morality and fashion of Karl Pearson's methods is used.

Instruments

Following tools were used for data collection:

Morality Attitude Scale

The scale wad developed by Brakely, Frank, Sulloway & Michle Shermer. Here Guajrati adaptation was used which was made by Yogesh A. Jogsan. The scale consists of 25 item with 5 alternative response varying from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', each be rated on 5 point scale. The maximum and minimum score obtained in the scale are 125 and 25 respectively. There reliability and validity are higher.

Fashion Attitude Scale

The scale was developed by L. R. Yganik & Kinnari Achary. The scale consists of 62 items with 5 alternative response varying from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', each to be rated on 5 point scale. The maximum and minimum score obtained in the scale are 310 and 62 respectively. There reliability and validity are higher.

Procedure

The testing was done on a group of women. The whole procedure of fill the inventory was explained to them fully and clearly. The instruction given on the inventory was explained to them. It was also made clear to them that their scores would be kept secret. It was checked that none of the subjects

Periodic Research

left any questions unanswered or that no subject encircled both the answers given against a question.

Result and Discussion

The main objectives present study of morality and fashion among married and unmarried women. A result discussion is under:

Table-1
Showing Means, S.D. and t-value Score of Morality among Married and Unmarried Women

Variable	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig. Level
Married Women	40	98.74	9.93	2.46	0.05
Unmarried Women	40	88.36	9.40		

Sig. Level 0.05 = 2.00
0.01 = 2.66
NS = Not Sig.

According to table no-1 indicates the unmarried women received low mean scores 88.36 as compared married women 98.74. The standard deviation score of married women received 9.93 and unmarried women received 9.40. The t-value was 2.46 significant at 0.05 levels. Married women were more morality compared unmarried women. So we can say that first hypothesis was not accepted.

Table-2
Showing Means Score of Fashion among Married and Unmarried Women

Variable	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig. Level
Married Women	40	201.96	14.21	4.52	0.01
Unmarried Women	40	240.40	15.50		

Sig. Level 0.05 = 2.00
0.01 = 2.66
NS = Not Sig.

According to table no-2 indicates the unmarried women received high mean score 240.40 as compared married women 201.96. The standard deviation score of married women received 14.21 and unmarried women received 15.50. The t-value was 4.52 significant at 0.01 levels. Unmarried women were more fashion compared married women. So we can say that second hypothesis was not accepted. This is conformity with the findings of Bruzzi & Gibson (2000).

Table-3
Showing the Correlation between Morality and Fashion

Variables	N	Mean	r
Morality	80	93.55	-0.52
Fashion	80	221.18	

According to table no-3 the results obtained negative co-relation between morality and fashion. It was -0.52 negative co-relations between morality and fashion. It means morality decrease fashion increase and fashion increase morality decrease.

Conclusion

We can conclude by data analysis as follows:

There were significant differences between the mean scores of two groups in morality. There was significant difference between the mean scores of two groups in fashion. The co-relation between morality and fashion is -0.52 which is negative correlations. It means morality decrease fashion increase and fashion increase morality decrease.

Limitation and Future Research

This study had several limitations that can be addressed by future research. Firsts, the participants consist only of married and unmarried women of the different area in Rajkot City. So, it is not representative of all married and unmarried women. Hence, a more representative participant might yield different result; for example, a participant from different area of Gujarat might show significant interaction effects of areas.

Suggestions

Endeavour can be executed to analyze move them 80 data of sample with efficacy to attain better results. For the accumulation of information, variegated methods except questionnaires can be adopted. Selection of sample can be accomplished with the intake of different people from different state and district to ascertain their morality and fashion. To crown the research work, other method of selecting sample can be appropriated.

Reference

Bloom, P., Weisberg, D. S. (2007). *Childhood Origins of Adult Resistance to Science. Science 316: 996-97.*

Brakely, Frank, Sulloway & Michle Shermer: *Morality Attitude Towered Scale.*

Cohen, A. B., Rozin, P. (2001). *Religion and the Morality of Mentality. J. Personal. Soc. Psychol. 81 : 697-710.*

Cohen, G. L. (2003). *Party Over Policy: The Dominating Impact of Grou Influence on Political Beliefs. J. Personal. Soc. Psychol. 85: 808-22.*

Edgell, P., Gerteis, J., Hartmann, D. (2006). *Atheists as "Other". Moral Boundaries and Cultural Membership in American Society. AM. Social. Rev. 71: 211-34.*

Graham, J., Haidt, J. (2010). *Beyond Beliefs: Religion Binds Individuals into Moral Communities. Personal. Soc., Psychol. Rev. 14 : 140-50.*

Haidt, J., Keshebir, S. (2010). *Morality. In Handbook of Social Psychology, Ed. S. Fiske, D. Bilbert, pp. 797-832. New York: McGraw Hill. 5th Ed.*

Hitchens, C. (2007). *God is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything. New York: Twelve Books.*

Holton, R. (2009). *Willing, Wanting, Waiting. Oxford: Clarendon Press.*

Kane, R. (1999). *Responsiblity, Luck and Chance: Reflections on Free Will and Indeterminisim, Journal of Philosophy, 96: 217-240.*

May, J. & R. Holton (2012). *What in the World is Weakness of Will? Philosophical Studies 157(3): 341-360.*

Mcrobbie, Angela (1998). *British Fashion Design : Rag Trade or Image Industry ? London : Routledge.*

Periodic Research

Morillo, C. (1990). The Reward Event and Motivation. The Journal of Philosophy Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 169-186.

Myers, D. G. (2008). A Friendly Letter to Skeptics and Athesists: Musings on Why God is Good and Fatith Isn't Evil. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Ruzzi, Stella & Church Gibson, Pamela (2000). Fashion Cultures - Theories, Explorations and Analysis. Oxford & New York, Routlage.

Schanall, S., J. Haidt, G. L., Clore & A. H. Jordan (2008). Disgust as Embodied Moral Judgment., Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 34 : 1096-1109.

Shweder, R. A., Much, N. C., Mahapatra, M., Park, L. (1997). The "Big Three" of Morality (Autonomy, Community, Divinity), and the "Big Three" Explanations of Sufferring. In Morality and Health, Ed., P. Rozin, A Brandt, pp. 119-68. New Yrok: Routledge.

Slote, M. A. (1964). An Empirical Basis for Psychological Egoism. Journal of Philosophy, Vol. 61, No. 18, pp. 530-537.

Sober, E. & D. S. Wilson (1998). Unto Others: The Evolution and Psychology of Unselfish Behavior. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yagnik, L. R. & Kinnari Aachary: Fashion Attitude Toward Scale, S. P. University, V. V. Nagar, Anand.