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With a view to understand the problem as stated in the previous chapter in general and to reach certain definite, tenable hypotheses for empirical investigation in particular, it is necessary to explore its theoretical background. If we wish to argue that one of the increasingly important tasks of education is to help the children develop appropriate understanding and judgment to cope with the variety of moral choices they have to face in today’s complex world, then it follows that every teacher, regardless of his subject specialism or the age range with which he is primarily concerned, must play a part in the moral education of his pupils. Morality is an area which permeates the whole of life of the school. Moral issues may be dealt with formally as part of the curriculum, but they are just as pervasive in the informal or hidden aspects of the curriculum, for example, the organization of the school and in teacher-pupil relationship. To promote moral education, whether formally or informally, requires a similar understanding of the child’s level of development and personality make up.

2.1 CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT AND MORAL DEVELOPMENT

The term development suggests a progressive change towards some more complex level, a change usually of an irreversible nature. But whether it is possible to predict the end state of any developmental process depends on what is it that is developing. We can more or less predict with certainty that under appropriate conditions a caterpillar will develop through specific stages into a Butterfly of a particular kind. The implication here is that there is some pre-existing genetic structure which determines the end state, the culmination of the whole process and also that there is a gradual unfolding which under normal circumstances is not arrested or reversed.

This model of development taken from plant or animal biology can be applied upto a point to aspects of man’s biological development, but the same criteria cannot
hold for man's social, intellectual or moral growth, precisely because of the very factors that distinguish him, as a human being, from other organisms.

Thus, Hirst and Peters (1971) hold that development is necessarily an evaluative concept, rather than a purely descriptive one, when applied to human beings when we talk of a morally developed person, we are presupposing some idea of what it means to be morally mature. This, in turn, depends upon the view of morality that one can justify, and finally upon the view of a man that one adopts.

The development of knowledge and values start immediately in the process of socialization. Teaching like prohibition of telling lies and stealing are given in their childhood. Primary moral-values education is different from the development of values in adults.

Many psychologist believe that the process of reinforcement creates a sense of reward or punishment. Teachers teach small children to differentiate between right and wrong. This process keeps going on continuously. They are satisfied with just imposing pseudeo-morality on the child who is taken for granted later. Ultimately, he has to accept actual moral-values to enable all-round development of personality.

A teenager is unable to develop value system on his own values even if he want to create such a system. Experienced fundamentalists believe that a person should at least have ability enough to take decisions according to his prudence what is actual philosophy of moral-values, generally a five or ten years old child does not have enough moral ability to lay out principles on his own.

It is necessary to discuss all the possible options. Children should have the ability to discuss effective logic, possibility and planning. But the ability of discussion on the importance and efficacy of planning options does not develop during teenage or even after this stage and sometimes it is not developed in any stage at all.

**Principles of Development of Moral-Values**

Morality and its development has been a psychological thought for centuries. The development of moral values is related to the process by which children are able to differentiate between right and wrong, good or bad etc. The special focus of
research in the development of moral values is the development of moral prudence and character.

Moral knowledge includes the principle of learning, moral result, behaviour of children and how they adopt. Moral Character, situational necessity, ethics, related activity shows actual behaviour. Following psychologist has given principles of Moral Development.

(i) Piaget

Piaget expounded his principles of moral development by asking children questions based on short stories and hearing their logic. According to him, morality was social rule, equality and justice for all. He found that children are affected by the imposition of social rule, and parents behaviour. Feeling of justice is developed in children from social experiences. Piaget discovered two stages of moral development in children of 4-12 years of age. The first or elementary stage – the heteronomous morality or external morality i.e. following the moral values suggested by others as seen in children of 4-7 years of age. The second stage was self-control morality or internal morality found in 10-12 years of age. In this stage the child develops and obeys the internal moral values.

(ii) Kohlberg Lawrence

He expounded principles of moral development on the basis of the examining the answers which he gave to the children, teenagers and youth to solve their moral problems.

First Level: Prior to Morality

Moral values are seen in outer, partly physical activity and wrong deeds. A child is responsible for the value and regulations and analysis the established standard. This level has two stages. The first stage is obedience and punishment oriented which protects us from the things related to more power or reputation or problem solving. The second stage is undeceitful egoism which fulfills mechanically one’s own needs and each others needs. There is awareness of relativism of values of one another’s needs.
Second Level: Confirmation of Introduction

At this stage, only moral values are inclined in performing right work, organizing traditional process and others ambitions.

Third Level: Self Accepted Moral Principles

Morality has been defined as the confirmation of divided human rights or responsibility with favourable privileges. The level is based on the confirmation of the level, internal determination of doing a work, decision of right or wrong and inner thought process.

Principle and Discernment

Morality is not only based on a permanent law but also based on discernment as a directive agent which pressurizes us to do the work without being affected by other activities in our environment.

(iii) Bandra and Walter

Bandra expounded a social behaviour approach for the social activities, socialization and development of personal principles. He said that moral development and decision can be clearly understood through the performance of agents of socialization. According to him, suitable sample shows adaptability in different conditions of moral behaviour.

(iv) Karl Roger

Teenage is the right time for possible development of personal values. It is the time when a child learns to be self-dependent. He believes in himself at this stage and develops his moral values and becomes capable enough to take decisions regarding what is right or wrong.

2.2 VARIOUS APPROACHES OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

There are three main psychological approaches to theorizing about moral development:
i) The psychoanalytical approach

ii) The learning theory approach

iii) Cognitive-developmental approach

These three views to moral development describe a set of stages through which children and adolescents go as they grow and develop. The psychoanalytical approach as manifested in Freud’s monumental work, sees morality as conforming to cultural standards through a process of internalization. Learning theories, as reflected in the work of Bandura, Eysenck, assume that moral behaviour is the result of reinforcement, rewards or punishment, and that much moral conduct is a result of a child’s modelling himself on an admired adult. Individual differences in moral behaviour are explained in terms of differences in conditionability (Eysenck, 1964). As seen with the Psycho-analytical approach, morality or moral conduct is seen as conformity to some sort of cultural or social norm. Cognitive developmental theorists, on the other hand (Piaget 1932, Kohlberg, 1964) view moral development as an active, dynamic, constructive process leading to a state where the individual is able to act according to moral principles which he either accepts because he understands them and agrees with them or which he has worked out for himself.

(i) The Psychoanalytical Approach

According to the principles of psychoanalytic theory, morality is part of the individual’s conscience, or super ego. Freud postulated that the individual is born with the id, a manifestation of the pleasure principle. The id represents instincts and passions and is unrestrained and is completely internal to the world of the self. Later as the individual begins to differentiate himself or herself from the environment, the ego develops. The ego becomes an important organizer of the self and brings the reality of the outside world to the id. The superego next develops out of the ego, coincident with resolution of the Oedipal-Complex during the so-called phallic period. The child forms as identification with his or her parents, accepts their values, and internalizes these values as controls. In this way, parents are the origin of the individual’s moral system, and their influence lasts for a life-time.
The super ego then functions to keep the individual from committing wrongful acts. If a person is tempted to transgress, he or she will begin to experience feelings of guilt. To avoid the guilt, the individual resists temptation. Thus the superego, which continues to be further elaborated during the period of latency from ages 6 to 11, becomes the child’s mechanism for self-control. Where earlier the child depended on parents to exert overt control, the parents prohibitions now become the child’s. The superego becomes in effect the agent of society, “The moral arbiter of conduct” inhibit the potentiality immoral impulses of the id.

The value of Freud’s theory of moral development lies in the fact that it draws attention to the importance of both aggression and attachments during the early years. This theory deals with the rather negative notion of taking the voice of prohibition into ourselves, but also the positive one of modelling our behaviour on that of an admired figure, albeit at an unconscious level. The theory thus deals with emotional aspects of moral development which later views, such as those of the learning theorists and of the cognitive developmentalists, tend to neglect.

The exact basis of the Freudian identification mechanism is unclear and indeed the subject of considerable controversy. Nevertheless, Freud’s theory has stimulated extensive research on the effects of parental behaviour on the child’s moral development.

*Peters (1960)* raised some important issues which recent research has attempted to shed light on. He asks whether certain child rearing techniques lead to compulsive rule following habits, blocks or breakdowns at some later stage and whether a particular kind of training in early childhood tends to encourage blind conformity in rules, regardless of circumstances.

(ii) **Learning theory approach**

Learning theorists with a behaviourist bent tend to argue that to postulate some kind of hypothetical construct like the conscience or superego to explain moral conduct is totally misguided. Since, after all, such a mechanism cannot be observed and must therefore remain hypothetical. Assuming that moral behaviour is learnt, they set out to explain its acquisition in terms of the laws and processes of learning used to
explain other kinds of behaviour such as retention and the acquisition of skills and the learning of habits. In their view, there is no need to call upon either hypothetical mental structures, such as the conscience, or cognitive structures and stages as suggested by developmental psychologists.

Moral behaviour can be explained in their view by three sorts of mechanism, reinforcement and rewards, punishment or the threat of it and modelling or imitation. Following the Skinnerian pattern of operant conditioning, behaviour can be modified or shaped by the use of reinforcement techniques. Such techniques are based upon animal learning under laboratory conditions and there is no dearth of evidence to demonstrate their success. Skinner successfully trained rats to operate levers and to learn mazes, he taught pigeons to turn in a circle and to play with a ping pong ball by administering food rewards at appropriate intervals, to reinforce the desired response. Children, he claims, can also be taught to adopt the kind of conduct their parents deem desirable or morally correct (such as telling the truth, helping others, being polite and considerate) as a result of parental praise and approval. Similar techniques are advocated by some psychologists for helping teachers to cope with deviant or disorderly behaviour in the classroom.

Behaviour can similarly be shaped by punishment or negative reinforcement in the form of verbal rebuke, physical punishment, sarcasm, the withholding of privileges in other words any treatment a child finds unpleasant or disagreeable. The desired effect of punishment is either to inhibit the undesired behaviour by operant conditioning techniques or within the framework adopted by Eysenck, to arouse feelings associated with pain, fear or anxiety in the hope that, by association, the undesired behaviour will in future be refrained from.

Learning theorists like Bandura and Walters (1963) say that morality is learned initially through modelling and imitation. They claim that imitation plays an important role in the learning of deviant as well as conforming behaviour which is well substantiated by cross cultural and laboratory studies. Cross cultural evidence (Bronfenbrenner 1970) demonstrates the fact that children not only learn from what they are told to do by adults, but also from what they see the adults doing. And not only do they learn by watching real adult models, symbolic models on film, television or in books have a similar effect.
In social learning theory, it is the internalization of cultural norms as values of right or wrong that determines the moral development of the child. In this approach, values are relative and are tied to the culture in which one is born and grows up later, during adolescence, peer group interaction are important because adolescents look to peers for support and validation. But it is parents who are vehicles for the cultural transmission of what is moral. In this way, social learning and psychoanalytic theories are alike. They both attribute origins of morality to the internalization of values passed on from parents.

Learning theories is applicable only to moral training rather than to any other aspect of morality. They omit to deal with moral feeling, reasoning or judgment. Their explanations fall into a mechanistic paradigm, where children are regarded as passive learners, responding or reacting to the influence of others rather than acting and interpreting the world around them and progressively learning to form their own standards and apply their own standards and apply their own moral principles according to the different demands of prevailing conditions.

(iii) Cognitive Developmental Approach

Cognitive developmental approach was fully stated for the first time by John Dewey. The approach is called cognitive because it recognizes that moral education like intellectual education, has its basis in stimulating the active thinking of the child about moral issues and decisions. It is called developmental because it sees the aims of moral education as movement through moral stages. The emphasis of this approach is on the thought processes underlying moral development which emerge in a sequence of stages much in the same manner as the stages of intellectual development. As development progresses, the moral thinking processes in each stage are integrated into those in the next higher stage, the emerging stage being an integration of old and the new.

Dewey postulated three levels of moral development:-

(I) Premoral and pre-conventional level of behaviour motivated by biological and social impulses with results for morals.
(II) **The conventional level of behaviour** in which the individual accepts with little critical reflection the standard of his group.

(III) **The autonomous level of behaviour** in which "conduct is guided by the individual thinking and judging for himself whether a purpose is good and does not affect the standard of his group without reflection".

In the field of moral development it is unfair not to mention the name of Arnold Gessel. Gessel (1940) observes that moral development is a maturational process which unfolds itself as the child grows in age. He emphasized that there are three distinct stages of moral conduct:

(I) The first is characterized by obedience to authority, adult instructions and commands.

(II) The second by rigid adherence to rules even in the absence of authority figure.

(III) The third shows personal morality which is autonomous in character.

These three stages of morality occur at different age levels. About Gessel it may be mentioned that unlike Piaget and Kohlberg he tells more about what children think instead how they think.

Piaget and Kohlberg have been the chief advocates of the cognitive-developmental approach to analyzing the child’s moral development. Their thinking about moral stages was theoretical.

The investigator is more concerned with cognitive developmental theorist (Piaget, Kohlberg) who consider moral development as an active dynamic constructive process in accordance with certain well understood principles adopted by the individual for himself.

### 2.3 PIAGET'S THEORY OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Jean Piaget is among the first psychologists whose work remains directly relevant to contemporary theories of moral development. He focused specifically on the moral lives of children, studying the way children play games in order to learn more about children’s beliefs about right and wrong. According to Piaget, all
development emerges from action that is to say, individuals construct and reconstruct their knowledge of the world as a result of interactions with the environment.

**Piaget's Stages of Moral Development**

Jean Piaget made the first effort to define stages of moral reasoning in children through actual interviews and through observations of children. Piaget developed a stage theory of the child's conformity to and understanding of rules. These stages are:

1. **Sensorimotor stage (0-2 years approximately)**

   Upto age two, the child plays with marbles in an apparently ruleless fashion and as might be expected, is unable to verbalize rules.

2. **Pre-operational stage (2-4 years approximately)**

   The child imitates aspects of the rule-regulated behaviour of older children, but remains idiosyncratic and socially isolated until about next stage.

3. **The Concrete Operational Period (6-10 years approximately)**

   At about this time the child regards rules as unchangeable, as though they were given by some divine source. New rules or changes in old rules are seen as unfair, even if all agree to them.

4. **Formal Operational period (10 to 12 years onwards)**

   Children tend to alter rules to fit unique situations and may invent new rules to cover special circumstances. Rules are perceived as a changeable and as the product of evolution during late childhood and early adolescence.

   The child's developing sense of justice was measured by telling children stories about persons who engaged in various wrong doings. The child was then asked why the acts were wrong or, in some instances, which of two acts was more wrong and why this was so. On the basis of these findings, Piaget labelled two stages of morality.
(I) Morality of constraint or moral realism (Rules are rigidly followed).

(II) Morality of cooperation (Rules are viewed as being determined by reciprocal agreements).

Piaget's own thinking was influenced by the ideas of both Durkheim, in a sociological context, and Kant, from a philosophical perspective. To Durkheim, Piaget was indebted for the emphasis he placed on the social context of morality. For Durkheim (1961) claimed that we are moral beings only in so far as we are social beings and was concerned with the individual's relationship with society through his attachment to it, with society's discipline on him and with the individual's eventual autonomy within a social structure. Piaget considered the distinction between "heteronomy" and "autonomy" of the "will" as given by Kant. On the basis of this distinction he distinguished between conventional morality and rational morality. When the children are at the stage of heteronomy of the will, their conduct is dependent upon approval of others. They refrain from some undesirable conduct because of fear of disapproval of significant others, and for fear of being found out. This is conventional morality. But when the individual reaches a stage of autonomy of will (which in fact is rarely reached) one's moral behaviour and conduct become spontaneous and are directed by their own moral choices.

Piaget's main aim was to explore the nature of children's moral judgements and to do this, he worked in Geneva with individual children, talking to them and questioning them on three broad areas: (i) their attitudes to rules; (ii) their judgment of right and wrong, and (iii) their assessment of justice and fairness. On the basis of his longitudinal and cross-sectional studies he established that moral judgment is not determined by rewards, punishment or imitation rather it is a developmental process through gradual cognitive restructuring. First of all Piaget (1932) stated that "all morality consists in a system of rules and the essence of all morality is to be sought for in the respect which the individual acquires for those rules". Piaget was concerned not only with the child's practice of rules (his moral conduct) but also with the way the child perceives these rules as a restraint on his actions. In such investigations, Piaget chose rules children follow in pursuing the game of marbles. The characteristic of this game is that it is played only by children, and rules followed in this game are seldom passed on by adults but learnt from other children during the game itself.
Piaget observed that very young children have no regard for rules at all. Up to the age of six or seven they become more and more aware of the rules of the games; and regard these rules as fixed or immutable. This is children's heteronomy. As this stage obeying rules laid down externally is unquestionable. At a later stage, the child begins to realize that these rules of the games are meant only to regularize the game. They are not sacrosanct, and if need be, these can be modified by mutual consent of other players. This is the time when autonomy begins to emerge. At about eleven or twelve years of age the child gets an insight into how the rules are formulated. One of the main factors of child’s growing autonomy at this age is his sociability, his desire to cooperate with others. Downey and Kelly (1982) remark that, “where rules were seen, at an earlier age, as emanating from some authority figure, respect for them was unilateral rather than mutual. It is only when children experience relationship with their peers meeting together as equals that stage is set for growth of autonomy.” In Piaget’s view cooperative activities between peers and their mutual understanding constitute the essential condition for the autonomy to develop. For example, Arun, a ten year old studied by Piaget, provided the following critique of a rule made up by a child playing marbles: “it isn’t a rule! It’s a wrong rule because it’s outside of the rules. A fair rule is one that is in the game”. Arun believed in the absolute and intrinsic truth of the rules, characteristic of early moral reasoning. In contrast Anil, aged thirteen, illustrates an understanding of the reasoning behind the application of rules, characteristic of later moral thinking. When asked to consider the fairness of a made-up rule compared to a traditional rule, Anil replied “It is just as fair because the marbles are far apart” (making the game equally difficult).

Piaget interviewed children regarding acts such as stealing and lying. When asked what a lie is, younger children consistently answered that they are “naughty words”. When asked why they should not lie, younger children could rarely explain beyond the forbidden nature of the act “because it is a naughty word”. However, older children were able to explain “because it isn’t right”, and “it wasn’t true”. Even older children indicated an awareness of intention as relevant to the meaning of an act. “A lie is when you deceive someone else. To make a mistake is when you make a mistake.” From his observations, Piaget concluded that children begin in a “heteronomous” stage of moral reasoning, characterized by a strict adherence to rules and duties, and obedience to authority.
Piaget was concerning children's judgment of right and wrong. Here too Piaget finds progression from heteronomy to autonomy. At an earlier stage of child's growth, some thing is right if the adults approve of it, and wrong, if disapproved. This is the stage of heteronomy at which children judge actions on the basis of material consequences rather than on the basis of intention behind them. For example, we may compare two individuals - a boy who forcibly takes away a full packet of biscuits in order to give to a hungry man on the street, and another, who steals one or two biscuits when the shopkeeper is searching something else. Children at heteronomous stage will judge the first act to be more wrong morally than the second. Piaget terms this stage of the formation of moral judgment as "moral realism" which can be explained in terms of child's ego-centricity. A child at the egocentric level is limited in his ability to distinguish himself and his own feelings with those of others. He is capable of seeing things only from his own point of view and cannot conceive that other points of view are also possible. He cannot internalize rules and apply them in a flexible manner. The child's moral judgment begins to be more flexible only when he comes out of his egocentricity and starts viewing more than one aspects of a situation at a time. In the above example of stealing an older child would argue that though it is bad to steal but not so bad if one steals to save the life of others. Consideration for others assumes an important part in this stage as he moves from heteronomy to autonomy.

Piaget was also concerning children's sense of justice and fairness. The development of this aspect also is dependent upon mutual respect between peers. While for a young child fairness means equal (same) treatment to all, the older children include considerations of needs and deserts etc., in the definitions of fairness. For the latter, fairness involves equal treatment only when needs and deserts are the same. Under this concept of moral development which is based on mutual respect and consideration for others, the children start seeing the world through other people's eyes. At this stage of autonomy or rational morality and stops being tied to conventional morality. This is, in fact, the type of moral development that teachers at secondary stage should make efforts for.

In brief, we can say that Piaget talks of two kinds of morality - the conventional morality and the rational morality. In conventional morality the children
tend to follow obedience to adults commands and uncritical adherence to rules which have come to them from authority. They obey these from the fear of being found out. On the other hand, when children are able to formulate or accept the rules after critical analysis of these, they may be said to have reached rational morality. They follow such rules not for the sake of fear of others but because they accept the rules as their own. Application of such rules is not rigid and immutable but modifiable through mutual agreement. It must be noted here that flexibility in the application of rules does not at all mean expediency since rational morality involves considerations for others flexibility never means serving the personal ends.

Children do not practice either conventional morality or rational morality to the exclusion of the other, but move from one to another by a process of maturation and cognitive, restructuring. Piaget's 'stage theory' implies that order of moral development is invariant. That is, for the very young child rules are sacrosanct, immutable and rigid. They are externally laid down for him and cannot be questioned, but as he grows older he finds that rules have a purpose to serve and they are modifiable. At still later stage of moral development the child attains autonomy and can formulate rules with universal applicability under certain conditions. However, Piaget clearly sees that rate of development is not the same. Age is only a very rough guide. Some children progress more rapidly than others. It is only sequence of stages that is fixed and not the rate of progression through the stages. In fact Piaget was the first thinker and investigator who viewed moral judgement as developmental and as a cognitive restructuring process, occurring as a result of his interactions with social and physical environment.

Appraisal of Piaget's Views

The great value of Piaget's work on moral judgments lies both in the methods he used to investigate children's thought processes and in the fact that he was the first to view moral thought as a developmental and restructuring process depending largely on child's growth towards abstract thinking and interaction with his environment and with those with whom he comes into contact. Important questions, left unanswered, by his own work have stimulated further research. For example, although he demonstrates that children move from one stage to another in a fixed sequence, he does not examine the conditions which might facilitate or impede this progress, nor
does he explain why some children are apparently arrested in growth before they reach the stage of autonomy. And although teachers and educationists have drawn widely upon Piaget’s work for guidance in planning work for children, Piaget himself never suggested ways in which parents or teachers might help children to develop further. Thus Piaget offers no deliberate guidance to teachers concerned with their responsibility for the moral education of their pupils. However, he did lay the foundations for later investigators to build upon.

### 2.4 KOHLBERG’S THEORY OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Lawrence Kohlberg modified and elaborated Piaget’s work, and laid the ground-work for the current debate within psychology on moral development. Consistent with Piaget he proposed that children form ways of thinking through their experiences which include understandings of moral concepts such as justice, rights, equality and human welfare. Kohlberg followed the development of moral judgment beyond the ages. Studied by Piaget, and determined that the process of attaining moral maturity took longer and was more gradual than Piaget had proposed.

Lawrence Kohlberg, a psychologist belonging to the University of Harvard is known for putting forward theory of the development of moral judgment in the individual, right from the years of early childhood. He has based his theory of moral development on the findings of his studies conducted on hundreds of children from different cultures.

He differs from the popular view that children imbibe the sense and methods of moral judgment from their parents and elders by way of learning. According to him as soon as we talk with children about morality, we find that they have many ways of making judgments which are not internalized from the outside, and which do not come in any direct and obvious way from parents, teachers and even peers (Kohlberg, 1968). Going further he clarified that internal or cognitive processes like thinking and reasoning also play major role in one’s moral development, i.e. the way children make moral judgment depends on their level of intellectual development as well as on their upbringing and learning experiences. For studying the process of moral development in human beings, Kohlberg first defined moral development as the development of an individual’s sense of justice.
Kohlberg identified three levels of moral development, each containing two stages as shown in table.

**Table 2.1**

**Kohlberg’s Six Stages of Moral Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>Pre-moral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage-1</td>
<td>The stage of obedience for avoiding punishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-2</td>
<td>The stage of conforming to obtain rewards and favour in return.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>Conventional Morality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage-3</td>
<td>The stage of maintaining mutual relations and approval of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-4</td>
<td>The stage of obedience for avoiding censure by higher authority or social system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>Self Accepted Moral Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage-5</td>
<td>Stage of conforming to the democratically accepted law and mores of community welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-6</td>
<td>Stage of conforming to the universal ethical principles and the call of one’s conscience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the heart of Kohlberg’s theory is the concept of “stages”. Stages refer to the structure of reasoning and imply the following characteristics:

1. Stages are “structured wholes”, organized systems of thought. This means that individuals are consistent in their level of moral judgment.
2. Stages form an invariant sequence. Under all conditions except trauma, movement is always forward, never backward. Individuals never skip stages, and movement is always to the next stage. This is true in all cultures.
3. Stages are hierarchical integrations. “Thinking of a higher stage includes or comprehends within it lower-stage thinking”. There is a tendency to function at or prefer the highest available stage.

It is important to note that a later stage is “higher” than an earlier one because it can more adequately organize the multiplicity of facts, interests and possibilities life holds in store. Another important point about the concept of stages is that children do not develop cognitive stages, the way they learn specific skills, knowledge and attitudes. Even though stages depend on experience for their formation, they are not direct reflections of the child experience for their formation, they are not direct reflections of the child’s culture and external world. Mental structures are not merely products of society, they develop as a result of the interaction between the child and the world. This interaction leads to a restructuring of the child’s cognitive organization rather than to the direct imposition of the culture’s pattern on the child.

A stage of moral judgment is reflected in the overall pattern of an individual’s responses to moral dilemmas. Neither researchers nor teachers can determine a person’s stage or moral thinking on the basis of answers to a single dilemma. Kohlberg did not study children’s game playing, like Piaget but rather probed for their responses to a series of structured situations or moral dilemmas. In his research Kohlberg interviewed a large number of boys and girls ranging from 6 to 16 years of age (Kohlberg, 1963). During the interviews, the children and the adolescents heard 10 stories in which a moral dilemma was posed. Kohlberg was not particularly interested in the specific alternatives selected, but rather in the reasons given for the choice. The reasons given reflect the subject’s way of thinking about the situation and therefore, reveal the thought processes underlying moral development. The particular choices, on the other hand, reflect the content of moral values, which is not of primary interest to Kohlberg. On the basis of answers he received from various dilemmas, Kohlberg proposed that people pass through six stages of moral judgment or reasoning. He grouped these six stages into three levels:
(i) **The Preconventional level**

The child begins to make judgment about what is right or wrong, good or bad. However, the standards by which he measures the morality are those of others. He is persuaded to take such judgment either to avoid punishment or to earn rewards.

(ii) **Conventional Level**

At this stage also, children’s moral judgment is controlled by the likes and dislikes of others, the conventions, rules and regulations and the law and order system maintained within society. Stealing or merely killing would thus be judged wrong because it is considered wrong by society at large and by the legal system. In this way, the conventional level of morality may be regarded as the level where the child identifies with authority.

(iii) **Post Conventional Level**

This marks the highest level of attainment of true morality as the controlling force for making moral judgments now rests with the individual himself. He does not value a thing or conform to an idea merely because of considerations of the views of others, conventions or the law and other system of society but because it fits into the frame work of his self accepted moral principles.

**The Six Moral Stages Identified by Kohlberg**

When people consider moral dilemmas, it is their reasoning that is important, not their final decisions, according to Lawrence Kohlberg. He theorized that people progress through three levels as they develop abilities of moral reasoning.

1. **Level-I : Preconventional**

   (Approximate age 4-5)

   **Stage-I : Punishment and Obedience Orientation**

   (Motivation: To avoid punishment by others).
What is Right?

To avoid breaking rules backed by punishment, obedience for its own sake, and avoiding physical damage to persons and property.

**Reasons for doing right:**

Avoidance of punishment and the superior power of authorities.

Social perspective of stage: Ego-centric view perspective

Does not consider the interests of other or recognize that they differ from the actors, does not relate two points of view. Actions are considered physically rather than in terms of psychological interests of others.

**Stage-II : Instrumental Relativist Orientation**

(Approximate 6-9 years)

(Motivation : To gain rewards for others)

What is right?

Following rules only when it is to someone’s immediate interest: acting to meet one’s own interest and needs and letting others do the same. Right is also what’s fair, what’s an equal exchange, a deal, an agreement.

**Reasons for doing right:**

To serve one’s own interests in a world where you have to recognize that other people have their interest, too.

Social Perspective of stage : Concrete individualistic perspective:
Aware that everybody has his own interest to pursue and these conflict, so that right is relative (in the concrete individualistic sense).

2. **Level-II**: Conventional

(Approximate age 10-15 years)

**Stage-III**: Good Boy – Good Girl Orientation

(Motivation: To avoid disapproval of others)

What is right?

Living upto what is expected by people close to you or what people generally expect of people in your role as son, brother, friend, etc. "Being good" is important and means having good motives, showing concern about others. It also means keeping mutual relationships such as trust, loyalty, respect and gratitude.

*Reasons for doing right:*

The need to be a good person in your own eyes and those of others. Your caring for others. Belief in the Golden Rule; Desire to maintain rules and authority which support stereotypical good behaviour.

Social perspective of stage: Perspective of the Individual in Relationship with other individuals.

Aware of shared feelings, agreement and expectations which take primacy over individual interests. Relates points of view through the concrete Golden Rule, putting yourself in the other guy's shoes. Does not yet considered generalized system perspective.
Stage-IV: Law and Order Orientation or Social System and Conscience

(Approximate age 15-18 years)

(Motivation: To maintain law and order because of concern for the community).

What is right?

Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed. Laws are to be upheld except in extreme cases where they conflict with other fixed social duties. Right is also contributing to society, the group or institution.

Reason for doing right:

To keep the institution going as a whole, to avoid the breakdown in the system. "If everyone did it," or the imperative of conscience to meet one’s defined obligations.

Social perspective of stage: Differentiates societal point of view from Interpersonal Agreement or Motives.

Takes the point of view of the system that defines roles and rules. Consider individual relations in terms of place in the system.

3. Level-III: Post Conventional or Principled or Morality of Self-Accepted Moral Principles

(Approx. Age 18-20 years)

Stage-V: Social Contract or Utility and Individual Rights

(Motivation: To gain the respect of an individual or community)
What is Right?

Being aware that people hold a variety of values and opinion, that most values and rules are relative to your group. These relative rules should usually be upheld, however, in the interest of impartiality and because they are the social contract. Some non-relative values and rights like life and liberty, however, must be upheld in any society and regardless of majority opinion.

**Reasons for Doing Right**

A sense of obligation to law because of one’s social contract to make and abide by laws for the welfare of all and for the protection of all people’s rights. A feeling of contractual commitment, freely entered opinion, to family friendship, trust and work obligations. Concern that laws and duties be based on rational calculation of overall utility, “The greatest good for the greatest number.”

Social Perspective of Stage: Prior to Society Perspective

Perspective of a rational individual aware of values and rights prior to social attachment and contract. Integrates perspectives by formal mechanisms of agreement, contract, objective impartiality, and due process. Considers moral and legal points of view, recognizes that they sometimes conflict and finds it difficult to integrate them.

Stage-VI : *Universal Ethical Principle Orientation*

(Motivation : To avoid self condemnation for lapses)

What is right?
Following self-chosen ethical principles. Particular laws of social agreements are usually valid because they rest on such principles. When laws violate these principles, one acts in accordance with the principle. Principles are universal, principles of justice, the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

*Reasons for Doing Right*

The belief as a rational person in the validity of universal moral principles, and a sense of personal commitment to them.

Social perspective of stage: Perspective of a moral point of view:

From which social arrangements derive. Perspective is that of any rational individual recognizing the nature of morality or the fact that persons are ends in themselves and must be treated as such.

Kohlberg attempts to explain how individual pass from one stage to the next by drawing on the notion of cognitive conflict and introduces the “one stage above” principle further developed on a practical level of Turiel (1966). His thesis is that when children are presented with arguments one stage above the level they have reached the conflict or mismatch in the arguments will prompt them to attempt a resolution of the problem and thus help them towards the next stage of moral argument. It is this principle that both Kohlberg and Turiel hope which will form a fundamental guideline for any programme of moral education in the school.

There have been two stand points in Kohlberg’s educational work. One has involved incorporating in the classroom curriculum a concern for the discussion of moral issues and the stimulation of moral growth. The other has involved restructuring the school environment to allow for greater democratic participation by the students in the school’s governing process.
On the basis of his experiences with discussion oriented programmes of moral education, Kohlberg has concluded that moral change is most likely to occur when the discussions succeed in arousing cognition conflict among the participants. A participant who is exposed to views based on moral reasoning higher than his or her own may become ensure of the adequacy of the original position and begin to consider the merits of other positions. The participant does not simply end with positions, but begins the process of restructuring his or her own ways of reasoning about moral issues.

Although moral discussion programmes have succeeded in stimulating moral growth, it is clear that by themselves they do not constitute a curriculum for moral education. They are generally not integrated into the larger curriculum nor do they aim to affect the students educational experience in more than a limited way. Kohlberg has clearly stated that his goal is to develop a more encompassing programme of moral education. Kohlberg believes that the “hidden curriculum” offers a rich opportunity for education to involve students in moral learning.

Kohlberg has embarked on two experiments in educational democracy. The first was within the context of a prison, the second was with an alternative school within an urban high school. Both experimental programmes are being evaluated for their effect on the moral development of their participants.

Limitations of Kohlberg’s theory

Some critics have suggested that Kohlberg’s philosophy of morality represents a western cultural bias and wonder if such a theory of justice as morality can lay claim to being universal. Most prominent among such critics has been Carol Gilligan, who “In a Different Voice” (1982), suggested that Kohlberg’s approach is biased against females. According to Gilligan, woman “appear to be deficient in moral development when measured by Kohlberg’s scale, because they make moral judgments that are concerned with the activity of care which seem to exemplify the third stage of his (Kohlberg’s) six stage sequence”. According to Gilligan males score higher on Kohlberg’s test than females because they make more justice-oriented judgments, which are clarified as higher stages.
According to Carol Gilligan morality consists of two independent components: justice and care. These components represent specific ways of seeing moral problems, each showing different patterns of development. The distinction made between a justice and a care orientation pertains to the ways in which moral problems are conceived and reflects different dimensions of human relationships that give rise to moral concern. A “justice” perspective draws attention to problems of inequality and oppression and holds up an ideal of reciprocity and equal respect. A “care” perspective draws attention to problems of detachment or abandonment and holds up an ideal of attention and response to need. Two moral injunctions - not to treat others unfairly and not to turn away from someone in need - capture these different concerns. From a developmental standpoint, inequality and attachment are universal human experiences; all children are born into a situation of inequality and no child survives in the absence some kind of adult attachment. These two factors of equality and attachment characterize all forms of human relationship, and all relationships can be described in both sets of terms - as unequal or equal and as attached or detached. Since we all are vulnerable both to oppression and to abandonment, two moral streams - one of justice and one of care - recur in human experiences.

Gilligan reproaches Kohlberg for only paying attention to justice in his theory of moral development. Because of this she argued, Kohlberg neglecting the care, aspect of morality and at the same time is guilty of sex bias from Gilligan's viewpoint. Care is a feminine way of judging. Since Kohlberg reconstructs all moral development in terms of justice, little or no light is shed on the moral development of women.

While criticizing Kohlberg's theory, Gilligan's explanation of morality and moral development are the subject of an extensive interdisciplinary discussion. The main issues of her discussion are:

1) Differences between the sexes concerning morality;
2) The distinction between an ethic of justice and an ethic of care;
3) The adequacy of thinking in terms of care versus judging in terms of justice.
On one front Carol Gilligan exposed the false basis to claim that Kohlberg had satisfactorily described the stages of moral development. She suggests that a qualitatively different way of dealing with moral problems which emphasizes contextual and relational realities is used frequently and that this approach ought to be considered more seriously by ethicists.

On the other front, the emergence of new reproductive technologies prompted some people to ask what was happening to our understanding of the nature of human life. The experience of some people treated for infertility has given rise to the expression of moral reservations which reflect both emotional responses and a re-ordering of ethical principal. The way of integrating both forms of morally significant understandings so that our decision incorporate all the means at our disposal.

The most important limitation of Kohlberg’s theory is that it deals with moral reasoning rather than with actual behaviour. Many individuals at different stages behave in the same way, and individuals at the same stages often behave in different ways (Faust, 1978). In a classic study of moral behaviour, Hartshorne and May (1928), presented children of various ages with opportunities to cheat or steal, thinking they would not be caught. Very few behaved dishonestly in every case. This study showed that moral behaviour does not confirm to simple rules, but is far more complex. Similarly, the link between children’s moral reasoning and moral behaviour may be quite weak. Children may have learned to say certain things about moral decisions at various ages, but what they do is another matter.

**Relationship among major theories**

The theories of Piaget and Kohlberg share many basic components and deal with two related aspects of development. For both theorists, development results from disequilibrium a mismatch between the child’s view of the world and the way the world really is unless children are exposed to facts of views that differ from their own world view, they will not develop. This accommodative process has its limits, though, because development is also effected by maturational processes. Thus it would do no good to try to teach the pre-operational child to think like the formal operational child. One can however, help pre-operational children advance when they begin to use concrete operations by allowing them to explore and operate on the world, while at
the same time challenging their reasoning and pointing out, in a concrete way, the inaccuracies in their preoperational way of thinking.

Moral dilemmas, too, can be used to advance a child’s level of moral reasoning, but only one stage at a time. Kohlberg believes, that the way children progress from one stage to the next is by interacting with others whose reasoning is one or at most two stages above their own. Thus in dealing with children, teachers must first try to determine their approximate stage of moral reasoning. Once a child’s level of moral reasoning is established, other moral problems can be discussed and the teacher can challenge the child’s reasoning with explanations from the next higher stage. After the child’s reasoning advances to this stage, the teacher can advance again. Kohlberg’s level of moral development are roughly parallel to Piaget’s stages of cognitive development. In general, one should not expect children to go from conventional to post-conventional moral reasoning until they have gone from concrete to formal operational thinking. In short, reaching Piaget’s stages of cognitive development is necessary, but not sufficient, for reaching Kohlberg’s stage of moral development.

2.5 MODELS OF MORAL EDUCATION

A model of moral education can be a way of thinking about the process of caring, judging and acting in an educational setting. A model of moral education may include “A theory or a point of view about how people develop morally, and a set of strategies or principles for fostering moral development (Hersh et al, 1980). So a model helps both to understand and practice moral education.

The investigator has mentioned five main models which are more relevant in the present context:

(1) The Rationale Building Model

Rationale building model has been given by James Shaver (1976). Though it casts light on all the three aspects of morality, its main concern is with the realm of judging. Shaver’s model provides an inspiration and guidance for teachers who wish to begin moral education programme. Shavers is more directly concerned with
teacher’s moral decision making. So this model seeks to pose such basic questions as ‘What is a value?’ ‘What is a moral value?’ ‘How do the values of a democratic society relate to decisions teachers make in class? How can teachers help their students develop more meaningful ways of dealing with moral issues?

Shaver’s model suggests ways of thinking about value and moral education. Instead of making prescriptions, Shaver’s conceptual framework is related to “Jurisprudential model”. Like cognitive developmental model and value analysis, the rationale building approach emphasizes the role of critical reflection on the part of teachers and students alike in moral education.

2. The Consideration Model

The consideration model is made by Mc Phail. This model is a complementary process of moral education in which focus is on the person’s life style of relating to self and others. This model seeks to demonstrate that in practice living for others is rewarding and motivating and can be described in real sense as living for oneself. More specifically it focuses on freeing individuals from destructive impulses which pretend as individually – to ego-centricity and narcissism, to selfishness etc. According to Mc Phail moral education must work towards liberation of individual from shackles of fear and distrust, to empower the student to give and receive love, atleast in the sense of brotherly love.

3. Value Clarification Model

Some people strongly believe that human or moral values can be and should be taught to students alongwith and like other curricular content such as history, literature, religion or natural sciences. They, therefore, advocate that value education or more especially the moral education should find a distinct place in curriculum of children. The adherents of such belief consider values as objective, fixed, eternal or unchanging. For this reason values for them are like a “bag of virtues” and hence can be instilled, inculcated or learned through modelling, repetition or reinforcement.

It is clear that values cannot be considered as fixed and unchanging, universally true then indoctrination as a way of moral education has been discarded.
on the grounds that since indoctrination is quite a distinct process from education, indoctrinative approach to morality can never be accepted as truly educational. So Raths et al (1978) offered a model of moral education which is open-ended on the other extreme. The advocates of value-clarification have explicit assumption about the nature of values as well as how the learning of values can take place.

Value clarification is the process of making such decisions that concern us. Instead of asking young people to act according to the traditional values given to us by culture in a dull way, we should be telling them that their task is to recreate those values continuously in their own time. Giving students a process of valuing is giving them something that should serve them well and long.

“There is an assumption in our value theory and the teaching strategies that grow from it that human can arrive at values by an intelligent process of choosing, prizing and behaving.”

4. **Value Analysis Model**

Value analysis model pays greater attention to pedagogy. It helps students learn a highly systematic step-by-step process for making moral decisions. Above all, the model is connected with judging. However, regarding the other two components of morality, caring and acting, value analysis is silent.

Kohlberg too suggests that in arriving at a decision of any value conflict an individual should place various moral beliefs in logical hierarchy. For example, a person may value both property rights and human life in a decision in which the violation of property rights leads to the saving of human life. The value of life commands a higher priority than the value of property. The value of friendship and honesty, authority and truth and royalty and justice may similarly conflict. In order to resolve such conflicts an individual must recognize which values are fundamental and which are derivatives.

5. **The Social Action Model**

The main aim of the social action model is to bring the desire social change by actively participating in different programmes of citizens concern which have already
been well deliberated upon and considered socially good. This model is developed by Fred Newmann to teach students how to influence public policy by developing in them the environmental competence. Environmental competence involves actions to effect specific consequences on the environment.

Morality according to Newmann does not merely comprise the caring and judging dimension, but rather actual morality consists in the ability to effect the desirable social changes by acting as a moral agent. A moral agent, according to Newmann is one “who deliberates upon what he or she ought to do in a situation that involves possible conflicts between self interest and interest of others or between rights of parties in conflicts”. Newmann suggests that without ignoring other competences, development of environmental competence should be one of the main aims of the school.