Chapter 1

PROBLEM AND IT’S SIGNIFICANCE

“If you want to make a difference in the life of our nation;
If you want to make a difference in the life of a child,
Become a Teacher
Your country needs you.”

— Baraak Obama

1.0 Introduction

Education makes a man complete and socialized. The aim of education is to make a man physically, mentally, morally and totally mature, practical, job-oriented, independent, open-minded, helpful and perfect in every field. It is through schools, that the aim of education can be achieved. In schools, the teacher plays an important role in moulding the character of the child. Teachers are the building blocks of an educational edifice. They play a vital role in educating and teaching future generations. They are perceived as the architects of the second creation. Therefore, Schools of Education, as the primary teacher training institutions, have vital roles in ensuring adequate development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for teaching.

Teacher Education refers to the policies and procedures designed to equip prospective teachers with the knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and skills they require to perform their tasks effectively in the classroom, school and wider community. A student teacher is a student in a College of Education who is undergoing training under the supervision of a qualified...
teacher educator in order to obtain a degree in Education. This term is also
often used interchangeably with "Pre-Service Teacher." It is a much
broader term to include those students who are studying the required
coursework in pedagogy as well as their speciality, but have not entered the
supervised teaching portion of their training. In many institutions "Pre-
Service Teacher" is the official and preferred title for all Education Students
who are now-a-days called as student teachers.

An effective teacher is described as one who is able to successfully
perform tasks expected of him/her. Teachers influence students not only
through the content they teach, but also through their personality traits and
the communication of these traits through behavior. Kucukahmet (1999)
points out that; teachers have the potential to influence students, both
positively and negatively, through their professional qualifications and
personality traits. According to Ingersoll (1999), the quality of a teacher is
determined by his/her personality traits, teaching applications, and level of
academic development.

According to Ali Yilmaz (2011) the characteristics to be developed in a
teacher are as follows: A teacher is:

- Empathetic, understands students’ emotions by their emotional
  maturity.
- Aware of personal and social responsibilities, upholds social values to
  keep up social maturity.
- Fair, and treats students equally and patiently is non-judgemental
  through moral judgement.
- Warm, kind, friendly, sociable, familiar, trustworthy, earns students’
  trust, humble, dynamic, disciplinarian and confident.
Encouraging, supportive, democratic, flexible, amicable, cooperative, respectful of students; values their opinions, cheerful, compassionate, and enjoys helping others.

As per the above said characteristics, it is imperative that the student teacher should have emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement. These three aspects are very important for a student teacher and hence the researcher has chosen these three areas for the present study.

The emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement are the three important aspects in the behaviour of teachers. As the students teachers are being prepared to be the pillars of the future generations their value patterns of emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement are vital. So the present study intends to measure the emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement of student teachers.

1.1 Concept of Emotional Maturity

1.1.1 The Nature of Emotions:

Feelings and emotions are strictly subjective, individual, personal, and intimate experiences. Feelings are always present in conscious liking and denote states of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, liking or disliking anything. Emotions are more complex than feelings and involve feelings, impulses to action and adjustment, bodily changes and excitement. In order to understand the educational significance of emotions and their development, it is essential to lay down a criteria for distinguishing emotional and non-emotional experiences.
a) Emotion is a stirred-up condition involving disturbance, excitement, conflict or tension in behaviour. In an emotional situation, some stimulus arouses or stirs emotions into action.

b) An emotion is brought into action by the perception of some stimulus. Psychologically it is a complex experience involving perception and widespread characteristic bodily changes in the action of muscles, glands and the autonomous nervous system.

c) Every emotional state involves an impulse to action. There is a drive toward some kind of adjustment, to obtain satisfaction, to effect destruction, to escape or to gratify a desire. The emotion subsides to the extent to which adjustments are achieved.

1.1.2 Development of Emotional Maturity

Emotional Development is one of the major aspects of human growth and development. Emotions like anger, fear, love etc. play a great role in the development of child’s personality. Not only is his physical growth and development linked with his emotional makeup, but also his intellectual, social, moral and aesthetic development are also controlled by his emotional behavior and experiences. The overall importance of emotional experiences in the life of a human being makes it quite essential to make a detailed study about emotions.

1. *Emotional development during infancy:* From his very birth, the infant cries and his bodily movements seem to give evidence of the presence of an emotional element in him.

2. *Emotional development during childhood:* In the infancy, the child is only concerned with his own well being. Therefore, the emotions are
generally aroused by the conditions which are related with his immediate well-being. But as a child grows, his world grows large and he has to respond to a variety of stimuli. During childhood, peer group relationship and school atmosphere and other environmental factors influence his emotional behaviour. A child’s emotions get linked with the new experiences and interests and his emotional behaviour gets linked with the new stimuli. At the same time the child does not react to old stimuli. For example, a child does not show anger at being dressed or bathed, neither does he show any fear of strangers.

3. *Emotional development during adolescence*: The emotional balance is once again disturbed in adolescence. The individual once again experiences the violent and intensive current of emotions with regard to emotional experiences. This is the period of intensive storm and stress. At no stage is the emotional energy as strong and dangerous as in adolescence. It is very difficult for an adolescent to exercise control over his emotions. The sudden functioning of sexual glands and tremendous increase in physical energy make him restless. Moreover, adolescents are not consistent in their emotions. During this stage emotions fluctuate very frequently and quickly, making them moody. Sometimes very happy and at other times extremely sad and all this happens in a very short time. So there is too much uncertainty in the nature of their emotional state.

4. *Emotional development in adulthood*: Emotional development reaches its maximum in adulthood. During this stage, generally all individuals attain emotional maturity.
1.1.3 Meaning and Definitions of Emotional Maturity

Etymologically the word ‘Emotion’ is derived from the Latin word ‘Emovere’ which means to stir up, to excite or to agitate. Emotional maturity implies understanding of oneself, understanding of the world and understanding of realities of life. Most of our emotional problems arise because we have not understood ourselves and our needs. Whenever there is an emotional situation, it implies an unmet need. By understanding ourselves and connecting to our feelings and needs, we can fulfill our needs as well as grow into a mature person. Emotional Maturity implies controlling one’s emotions rather than letting our emotions get the better of us. Our emotional maturity depicts our capacity to manage and to check our emotions, to evaluate others’ emotional state and to persuade their judgement and actions. A person’s emotional maturity is very much influenced by his/her relationship history. Emotional intelligence makes an important part of life, together with intellectual intelligence and relationship intelligence. Such intelligence can help one to assess emotional maturity and emotional freedom. How well we can tackle any relationship, is a major discernible factor to check our level of emotional maturity.

According to Charles E. Skinner (1949), an emotionally mature person is one who is able to keep a lid on his feelings. He can suffer in silence; he can bide his time in spite of present discomfort. He is not subject to swings in mood, he is not volatile. When he does express emotion, he does so with moderation, decency and in good order.
According to Walter D. Smitson (1974), “Emotional maturity is a process in which the personality is continuously striving for greater sense of emotional health, both intra-physically and intra-personally.”

According to Crow and Crow (1974), “An emotion is an affective experience that accompanies generalised inner adjustment and mental and psychologically stirred up states in an individual and that shows itself in his overt behaviour.”

According to Coleman (1944), “The most outstanding make of emotional maturity is the ability to bear tension. Besides, an emotionally matured person persists in the capacity for fun and recreation. He enjoys both play and responsible activities and keeps them in proper balance.”

According to Fred Mc. Kinney (1960), “The characteristics of an emotionally matured person are heterosexuality, appreciation of attitude and behaviour of others, tendency to adopt the attitudes and habits of others and capacity to delay his own responses”.

The emotional maturity is best defined as our ability to become sensitive to our environment and the people we interact with. Our perceived emotions allow us the ability to control situations and create solutions. This emotional maturity is also known as having a sense of self.

1.1.4 Characteristics / Traits of an Emotionally Mature Person

An emotional mature person is one who develops attitudes in relation to himself and his environment which will lift him above “childishness” in thought and behaviour. Grace (2009) has listed the following as characteristics of an emotionally mature people, and people with low, high and moderate emotional maturity.
Characteristics of Emotionally Mature People

- Knowing as to what one wants and how to make it happen.
- Thinking sooner than acting and having control over one’s behavior.
- Having the sense of self-reliance and the capability to take accountability for one’s life and actions.
- Having patience
- Bonding with others in a supportive and constructive manner.
- Actually caring about others and representing their concern.
- Acting honestly and living by one's principles.
- Keeping self-control and balance in all things.
- Having the capacity to tackle difficult and demanding situations.

Characteristics of People with Low Emotional Maturity

- Prone to intense attachments or enmeshments
- Lack of self-awareness of emotions or interior life (may not be aware of cutoff, reactivity, stress, or anxiety)
- Lack of awareness of, and inability to reflect and interpret, family of origin emotional process
- Identity derived from roles or constructed-adopted persona (large pseudo-self)
- Tend toward polarization in relationships, with family and others
- Lack of capacity to be emotionally neutral. Their emotional stance is irrationally negative (antagonistic) or blindly positive (loyal).
- Often functions out of projection (takes everything personally).
- Lack capacity for empathy or perspective.
- Will tend to act out the anxiety in the family.
- Disruptions in significant relationships typically results in reactivity.
• Find it difficult to self-regulate in the midst of and in the wake of a crisis.
• Will invest self in a belief system or people who reassure their beliefs or who promise salvation, status, or privilege.
• Lack ability to question or reflect upon the consequences of their behavior.
• Lack awareness of how they communicate, or how they do not “connect” with others in their speech or behavior.
• Prone to absorb the anxiety of family or relationship system resulting in blame, guilt, and psychosomatic symptomology.
• Lack appropriate sense of boundaries (can be prone to over- or underfunctioning)
• Rarely find their self or their voice.
• Have a great need for a larger relationship system for managing anxiety.

**Characteristics of People with Moderate Emotional Maturity**

• May often be too attached and prone to symptoms associated with dependency or fusion.
• When not highly anxious can separate appropriately from the family of origin and establish individual life principles and goals.
• In times of high anxiety will develop symptoms or function out of reactivity. But, they are able to self-regulate once anxiety diminishes.
• Can be aware of interior emotional process if they pay attention.
• Have an accurate level of awareness of how they are perceived by others and how their communication is being received by others.
• During times of anxiety will attack, coerce, herd, or use other methods to try and encourage conformity.
They may gossip about people and not deal directly, but they make efforts to be principled with those who are important to them.

Will unwittingly allow unhealthy and unethical behaviors as they are uncomfortable holding people responsible for what they do.

**Characteristics of People with High Emotionally Maturity**

- Highly emotionally mature people are rare. They seem to be the exception rather than the rule.
- They tend to rise to positions of leaders, teachers and healers.
- They can remain unattached to what and how others are feeling or to reactivity or emotionality.
- They have the capacity of seeing others as they are and validating them for who they are.
- They have no need to make others into something for their self-gratification, self-validation, or self-worth.
- They are clear about their principles and so stir reactions from others (both positive and negative).
- They function, and make decisions, based on their principles, ideals, and values rather than on personal need, or, on others’ personal needs, predilections, opinions, or demands.
- Their emotional field often is experienced as unique, powerful, and different. This can be attractive or experienced as a threat.
- They often form engender followings that admire or hate them. Either response may be a result of the fact that they don’t need others for affirmation or validation.
They tend to be characterized by courage and so are able to challenge rather than pamper, can hold others accountable, and can be prophetic as well as visionary.

They take responsibility for their own goals, their own position, and their own well-being rather than those of others.

In work and relationships their influence is a result of empowering, permission-giving, and collaboration rather than insisting on conformity or setting ultimatums.

1.2 Concept of Social Maturity

1.2.1 Meaning and Definitions of Social Maturity

Social maturity means knowing what to do and striving for it by following role models to reach the desired level of acceptable social behaviour. Social maturity is a long process. To be socially mature, students should be exposed to those people who are socially mature so that they can pattern their behaviour accordingly. The students can try to reach the expectations of the social system, parents, teachers, siblings and peers who matter to them. Social maturity deals with learning to properly relate to acquaintances, friends and intimate relationships. It also involves understanding how to honour and respect those in authority; civil, parental, employer or spiritual.

According to Hurlock (1950) “Social-development means attaining maturity in social-relations. It means the process of learning to confirm to group standards, morals, and traditions and becoming imbued with a sense of oneness, inter-communication and co-operation”.
Raj, M. (1996), defines “Social maturity is a level of social skills and awareness that an individual has achieved relative to particular norms related to an age group. It is a measure of the development competence of an individual with regard to interpersonal relations, behaviour appropriateness, social problem solving and judgement”. Social maturity encompasses attainments in several domains, including independent functioning, effective interpersonal communication, interaction and responsibility i.e. contributing to the well being of the society.

1.2.2 The Nature of Social Maturity

The maturity of a student is influenced by various social factors such as i) Dependence ii) Self Control iii) Stress iv) Social Maturation v) Ability to size up a Social Situation and vi) Social Adjustment.

(i) Concept of Dependence: An individual is required to modify his / her behaviour in terms of asserting his / her independence and seeking aid or relief in the socio cultural context.

(ii) Self Control: Self control as a part of social maturity is necessary for all decision making and facing the consequences. Acquiring self control is partly maturational and partly learnt behaviour. The student studying in a secondary school understands that society does not expect him to regress to childhood behaviour at this age so he attempts at coming up to the expectations of the society and this he achieves by controlling his behaviour.

(iii) Stress: Everybody has to overcome stresses. Every time there is a stress situation a mature individual mobilizes the available resources and utilizes them to the best of his ability to overcome the stress.
(iv) **Social Maturation:** Socially mature student is aware of his / her roles. During the process of social growth students learn to live up to the expectations of the society in which he / she live.

(v) **Ability to Size up a Social Situation:** Another component of social maturity is to understand and contemplate about social situation and react to it appropriately.

(vi) **Social Adjustment:** The behaviour of the individual depends on maturation. Maturation is also helpful in the process of social adjustment. The socialization plays an important role in social maturation, social learning and social adjustment. Much of the behaviour of a child is determined by the process of socialization.

### 1.2.2. Development of Social Maturity

Robert Kegan (2008) is a developmental psychologist, based at Harvard, and inspired by Piaget's stage theories; he has proposed his own stage theory as to how one becomes socially mature. Critical to understanding his theory are some concepts related to subject-object consciousness. Subject consciousness refers to self-concepts to which we are attached and thus cannot take an objective look. Object consciousness is also part of self, and was a subject consciousness in an earlier stage, but now we can detach ourselves from the underlying phenomenon and take an objective look at that part of self. It is his thesis that as babies we feel everything as self and actually have no concept of self different from that of the world. Slowly as we develop, we start identifying with our bodily sensations, reflexes, movements, desires, needs etc and our sphere of
objectivity grows bigger, while our sphere of subjectivity narrows and shrinks.

Kegan also maintains that we pass through discrete developmental stages, wherein we take a leap from one stage to another, and while stuck in that developmental stage, are not passively dividing the world and self in subject and object consciousness, but it is a dynamic process, though in equilibrium. At each leap, what was earlier subjective, becomes objective. another way to say the same is that what was concrete (my perspective and thus available to me) becomes abstract (another’s perspective and thus not available to me, but can only be imagined from abstraction).

More complex appreciations of the social world evolve into existence as a person becomes able to appreciate stuff abstractly that they used to appreciate only in concrete (obvious, tangible) forms. This is to say (using Kegan’s terms) that people are initially embedded in their own subjective perspective. They see things only from their own particular point of view and fundamentally cannot understand what it might be like to see themselves from another perspective other than their own. Being unable to understand what you look like to someone else is the essence and definition of what it means to be subjective about yourself. Being able to appreciate things from many different perspectives is the essence of what it means to be relatively objective.

Kegan suggests that as babies grow into adults, they develop progressively more objective and accurate appreciations of the social world they inhabit. They do this by progressing through five or more states or
periods of development which he labeled as 5 I’s i.e Incorporative, Impulsive, Imperial, Interpersonal and Institutional.

In the beginning, babies are all subjective and have really no appreciation of anything objective at all, and therefore no real self-awareness. This is to say, at first, babies have little idea how to interpret anything, and the only perspective they have with which to interpret things is their own scarcely developed perspective. They can recognize parent’s faces and the like, but this sort of recognition should not be confused with babies being able to appreciate that parents are separate creatures with their own needs. This key recognition doesn't occur for years. Kegan describes this earliest period as **Incorporative**. The sense of self is not developed at this point of time. There is no self to speak of because there is no distinction occurring yet between the self and the other. To the baby, there is not any reason to ask the question, "who am I" because the baby's mind is nothing more and nothing less than the experience of its senses as it moves about. In an important sense, the baby is embedded in its sensory experience and has no other awareness. Babies practice using their senses and reflexes a lot and thus develop mental representations of those reflexes. At some point it occurs to the baby that it has reflexes it can use and senses it can experience. Reflex and sensation are thus the first mental objects; the first things that are understood to be distinct components of the self. The sense of self emerges from the knowledge that there are things in the world that aren’t self (like reflexes and senses); things that I am not. To quote Kegan, "Rather than literally being my reflexes, I now have them, and "I" am something other."I" am that which coordinates or mediates the reflexes..."
Kegan correspondingly refers to this second period of social appreciation development as **Impulsive**, to suggest that the child is now embedded in impulses – which are those things that coordinate reflexes. The sense of self at this stage of life would be comfortable saying something like, "hungry", or "sleepy", being fully identified with these hungers. Though babies are now aware that they can take action to fulfil a need, they still are not clear that other people exist yet as independent creatures. From the perspective of the Impulsive mind, a parent is merely another reflex that can be brought to bear to satisfy impulses. The objectification of what was previously subjective experience continues as development continues.

Kegan’s next developmental leap is known as the **Imperial** self. The child as "little dictator" is born. In the prior impulsive self, the self literally is nothing more and nothing less than a set of needs. There isn't anyone "there" having those needs yet. The needs alone are all that exist. As awareness continues to rise, the child now starts to become aware that "it" is the very thing that has the needs. As the child is now aware that it has needs (rather than is needs), it also starts to become aware that it can consciously manipulate things to get its needs satisfied. The impulsive child was also manipulative, perhaps, but in a more unaware animal manner. The imperial child is not yet aware that other people have needs too. It only knows at this stage that it has needs, and it doesn’t hesitate to express them. The **Interpersonal** period that follows next starts with the first moment when the child comes to understand that there are actually other people out there in the world whose needs need to be taken into account along side their own. The appreciation of the otherness of other people comes about, as always by a process of expanding perspectives. The child’s
perspective in this case expands from its own only to later include both its own and those of other important people around it. It is the child's increasingly sophisticated understanding of the idea that people have needs itself which cause the leap to occur. To quote Kegan again, "I" no longer am my needs (no longer the imperial I); rather I have them. In having them I can now coordinate, or integrate, one need system with another, and in so doing, I bring into being that need-mediating reality which we refer to when we speak of mutuality." In English then, the interpersonal child becomes aware that "not only do I have needs, other people do too!" This moment in time is where conscience is born and the potential for guilt and shame arises, as well as the potential for empathy. Prior to this moment, these important aspects of adult mental life don't exist except as potentials. The interpersonal child is aware that other people have needs which it needs to take into account if it is to best satisfy its own needs. There is no guiding principle that helps the interpersonal child to determine which set of needs is most important – its own, or those of the other people. Some children will conclude that their own needs are most important to satisfy, while others will conclude that other's needs should be prioritized, and some children will move back and forth between the two positions like crazy monkeys.

As the child's sense of self continues to develop, at some point it becomes aware that a guiding principle can be established which helps determine which set of needs should take precedence under particular circumstances. This is the first moment that the child can be said to have values, or commitments to ideas, beliefs and principles which are larger and more permanent than its own passing whims and fears. Kegan refers to
this new realization of and commitment to values as the Institutional period, noting that in this period, the child’s idea of self becomes something which can be, for the first time, described in terms of institutionalized values, such as being honest. "I'm an honest person. I try to be fair. I strive to be brave." are the sorts of things an institutional mind might say. Values, such as the Golden Rule e.g., "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" start to guide the child's appreciation of how to be a member of the family and of the society. The moral, ethical and legal foundations of society follow from this basic achievement of an Institutional self. Further, children (or adults) who achieve this level of social maturity understand the need for laws and for ethical codes that work to govern everyone's behavior. Less socially mature individuals won't grasp why these things are important and why they cannot and should not simply be disregarded when they are inconvenient.

For many people, social maturity seems to stop here at the Institutional stage. Kegan himself writes that this stage is the stage of conventional adult maturity; one that many (but not all) adults reach, and beyond which most do not progress. However, the potential for continued development continues onwards and upwards. The next evolution of self understanding occurs when the child (by now probably an adult) starts to realize that there is more than one way of being "fair" or "honest" or "brave" in the world. Whereas, in the interpersonal mindset, there is only one possible right way to interpret a social event (e.g., in accordance with one's own value system), a newly developed Inter Individual mindset starts to recognize a diversity of ways that someone might act and still be acting in accordance with a coherent value system (though not necessarily one's
own value system). For example, let's consider how someone with an Institutional mindset and someone with an Inter Individual mindset might judge someone who has become a "draft dodger" so as to avoid military duty. There are precisely two ways that an institutionally minded person might look at such an action. If he or she is of the mainstream institutional mindset, draft dodging is a non-religious sort of heresy and a crime which should be punishable. If, on the other hand, he or she is of a counter-cultural institutional mindset, then judgements are reversed and draft dodging is seen as a brave action which demonstrates individual courage in the face of massive peer pressure to conform. An institutionally minded person can hold one or the other of these perspectives but not both, because he or she is literally embedded in one or the other of those perspectives and cannot appreciate the other except as something alien and evil.

A person who has achieved Inter Individual social maturity is able to hold both mainstream and counter-cultural value systems in mind at the same time, and see the problem of draft dodging from both perspectives. This sort of dual-vision will appear to be the worst kind of wishy-washiness and flip-floppery to someone stuck in a conventional Institutional mindset and maturity level. However, if you are following the progression of social maturity states, and how one states' embedded subjective view becomes something which is seen objectively alongside other points of view as social maturity progresses, you will see that such dual-vision is indeed the logical next step; what a more socially mature sort of human being might look like.

It should be noted that Mark only identifies five stages upfront, he mentions another one, which is inter-individualistic as the sixth stage. The
reason he is reluctant is because most adults presumably never reach this stage. Also Kegan himself, in this interview talks about fifth-order of consciousness, which is equivalent to the seventh stage and defines it as a self-transforming stage:

When one gets to the edge of the fourth order, one starts to see that all the ways that one had of making meaning or making sense out of one’s experience are, each in their own way, partial. They’re leaving certain things out. When people who have long had self-authoring consciousness come to the limits of self-authoring, they recognise the partiality of even their own internal system, even though like any good system, it does have the capacity to handle all the "data," or make systematic, rational sense of our experience. In the Western world, we is often called "objectivity." But just because one can handle everything, put it all together in some coherent system, obviously doesn't make it a truthful apprehension - or truly objective. And this realization is what promotes the transformation from the fourth to the fifth order of consciousness, from the self-authoring self to what we call the self-transforming self. So, one can start to build a way of constructing the world that is much friendlier to contradiction, to oppositeness, to being able to hold on to multiple systems of thinking. One begins to see that the life project is not about continuing to defend one’s formation of the self but about the ability to have the self literally be transformative. This means that the self is more about movement through different forms of consciousness than about the defending and identifying with any one form. In the move from the fourth to the fifth order, from self-authoring to self-transforming, we have to keep in mind very important distinctions between those who are in the earlier process of that transition
and those in the later stages who have actually achieved the fifth order. So, there's a critical distinction between, on the one hand, a negative postmodernism that is all about trashing any ideological form, which is only deconstructive and is all about a fatigue with and critique of the ideological, and on the other, what he calls a more reconstructive postmodernism that is not just about trashing. When we get to the other side of this four to five shift, and have moved to this more reconstructive or transformative side, then there's a whole capacity for reconnecting to these ideologies and recognizing that each of them is partial. We are building relationships among them rather than holding on to one and projecting the other. It's a much more positive spirit.

To clarify things a bit, in his later analysis, Kegan has replaced the stages of social maturity with orders of consciousness.

In, *In Over Our Heads*, Kegan stops using the five stages described above in favour of the newer “orders of consciousness” scheme.

a) **First order** consciousness corresponds (roughly) to Incorporative and Impulsive stages and describes awareness which is fixed upon sensation and movement and impulse. It is awareness but it is not really yet a self.

b) **Second order** consciousness corresponds roughly to the Imperial self stage. It is awareness of self as a singular point of view without any real comprehension of others as independent selves in their own right.

c) **Third order** consciousness corresponds to Interpersonal and Institutional self stages, and describes a sense of self which is aware of both self and other as independent needful beings all of which are (or ought to be) guided by a consistent set of values.
d) A final fourth order of consciousness is also described which corresponds to the Interindividual self stage in which self-determination, tolerance and acceptance of formerly rejected aspects of self and society becomes possible.

The idea is that all people pass through these various stages as they develop, but not all people make it to the end of the line. Adolescence is typically characterized by the transition from second order to third order consciousness, but not all adolescents end up achieving third order consciousness by the time they become adults. Similarly, adulthood is typically characterized by the movement from third order consciousness into fourth order consciousness, but many adults do not make this transition either. Nevertheless, the institutions we live under (in America and in the West) tend to make demands on us as though we have all achieved fourth order consciousness.

Kegan clearly talks about a fifth order of consciousness and thus a seventh stage of social maturity.

1 The **incorporative** stage is all about the initial formation of a self concept that is different from world and the dawning of the subjective self or subjectivity.

2 The **impulsive** stage is all about impulses that drive the self and with which one starts identifying.

3 The **imperial** stage is all about leveraging ones own interests vis-a-vis those of significant others. Here, there is awareness of others and interaction with them, but only as agents or obstacles- thus the persons are objectified and not treated as persons.
4 The **interpersonal** stage is all about treating significant others as real people who can have as many desires, needs etc as oneself can. For the first time empathy comes into picture.

5 The **institutional** stage is all about some values which one can abstract and make as guidelines for ones life. One realizes that people can have different values, but thinks that one's own value system is the best/correct one.

6 The inter-individual stage is all about appreciating that others can have different, yet equally valid value systems and for the first time one can be said to take the true perspective of another individual.

7 The **self-transforming** stage is all about becoming aware that there are multiple value-systems suitable for different occasions and to become comfortable with contradictions in the value systems.

8 The eighth stage would have to do with finding an integrity or **integral perspective** wherein one finds that the value-systems one is using is holistic, despite contradictions and is able to resolve the apparent contradictions. One would see one as an object and there would be no subjectivity involved at all.

1.3 **Concept of Moral Judgement**

1.3.1 **Morality and Theories of Morality**

The word morality comes from the Latin word 'moralis' which means custom relating to principles of right and wrong in behaviour. According to Jean Piaget (1932) “All morality consists in a system of rules and the essence of all morality is to be sought in the respect which the individual acquires for these rules”. However meaning of morality can be
looked at from several standpoints such as that of the individual, the societal, the national and the international. While understanding morality there is always a possibility of confusing it with religion and even to equating it with religion. This is because traditionally morality has been a part of religion or even based on it in many parts of the world. But morality is different from religion except in countries where religion happens to be the basis of the social structure and political administration.

**Theories of Morality**

A theory of morality is one, which seeks to give a justification for the actions of individuals. Actions, which cannot be justified, thus, are considered immoral. Every theory of morality will have a number of premises or fundamental assumptions as to 'what is moral and what is not'. While trying to justify people's actions, morality has been viewed by various philosophers and thinkers differently. As a result of classifying their views, certain major theories have emerged. Important among them are the "Absolute Theory", "The Relativistic Theory" and "The Subjectivistic Theory". These are considered important because all other points of view are either included in these or can be considered as fusion of them.

- **Absolute Theory of Morality**: This is also called the universal theory of morality. Some of the chief contributors of this theory are Plato and Kant. According to this theory moral virtue transcends the limits of the time and place. A moral virtue in one culture at one time of human civilization is no less moral in another culture. Accordingly moral virtues are universal in character. The concept of morality, being universal, suggests that there are certain moral values like honesty, integrity, charity, love, feeling of fraternity etc., which any body is and ought to
be justified in practicing and the non-practice of which is to be considered not moral.

- **Relative Theory of Morality:** It is a theory based on the observation that there are cultural variations in the moral systems of different cultures and on the assertion that these differences ought to exist. The standpoint of the relativistic has been well defined by Malvin Ragder - If men are reared in one culture, they will adhere to one set of moral norms, if reared in another culture, and they will adhere to another set. There is no common standard to all cultures and all ages and there is nothing outside a culture than can serve as a standard. What is right when related to one culture frame may not necessarily right when related to another. "All right and wrong, moral and immoral action are relative, they all vary with the circumstances; there is no absolute immorality".

- **Subjective Theory of Morality:** It holds the view that there is no standard of morality at all. Subjectivism disbelieves in the existence of any (absolute or relative) standards of morality apart from the happiness it yields to the moral agent or the misery it removes from man. The three philosophies of morality; Absolutism, Relativism and Subjectivism differ from each other widely on the concept of standard in morality. Absolutism believes in an absolute standard of morality. Relativism rejects any absolute standards but still believes in the relative standards, whereas subjectivism strongly opposes those standards and believes that there are no such studies.
1.3.2 Meaning and Definitions of Moral Judgement

The term "moral judgement" can refer to four distinguishable things. First, there is the activity of thinking about whether a given object of moral assessment (be it an action, person, institution or state of affairs) has a particular moral attribute, either general (e.g. rightness, badness) or specific (insentivity, integrity). Secondly, there is the state that can result from this activity: the state of judging that the object has the attribute. Thirdly, there is the content of that state: what we, rather than our judging it judge. And fourthly, the term can be read as commendatory, referring to a moral virtue that we might also call "moral discernment" or "moral wisdom".

Definitions of Moral Judgement

Rest, (1979). “Moral judgement is defined as the process by which a person decides what is morally right. That is, the structure a person relies on, to assign rights and responsibilities to oneself and others, is based on the way one interprets moral judgements.

Jean Piaget (1965) proposed that moral judgement is the result of a process of sequential development in the child’s reasoning abilities.

Bebeau, Rest and Narvaez, (1999), “Moral judgement is judging which action is morally right or wrong. Once a person is aware that various lines of action are possible, one must ask which line of action is more morally justified”.

Mackenzie (1828) opines that whenever a subject is willing to do some act he has a particular viewpoint. The viewpoint is the subject of moral judgement. The subject of moral judgement is to inquire about the person who declares the moral judgement. The subject of moral judgement
is rational or the ideal self and it pronounces judgement upon the motive and intentions of others no less than his own.

**Models of Moral Judgement**

Rest et al. (1999) have presented a four component model of moral judgement. The four component model represents the internal “processes” necessary for a moral act to ensue: moral sensitivity, moral judgement, moral motivation and moral action. These components are not personality traits or virtues; rather they are major units of analysis used to trace how a person responds in a particular social situation. The model depicts an “ensemble of processes,” not a single, unitary one. Therefore, the operation of a single component does not predict moral behavior. Instead, behaving morally depends upon each process and the execution of the entire ensemble. Each process involves cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects that function together in fostering the completion of a moral action. Moral judgement is the second component of the Four Component Model.

**Table 1.1**

The Four Component Model  
[Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, (1999)]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Sensitivity</td>
<td>Interpreting the situation, role taking how various actions would affect the parties concerned, imagining cause-effect chains of events, and being aware that there is a moral problem when it exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgement</td>
<td>Judging which action would be most justifiable in a moral sense - purportedly DIT research has something to say about this component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Motivation</td>
<td>The degree of commitment to taking the moral course of action, valuing moral values over other values, and taking personal responsibility for moral outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Character</td>
<td>Persisting in a moral task, having courage, overcoming fatigue and temptations, and implementing subroutines that serve a moral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Levels of Moral Judgement

Kolberg's (1984) theory specifies six stages of moral development, arranged in three levels.

**Level I: Preconventional/Premoral:** Moral values reside in external, quasi-physical events, or in bad acts. The child is responsive to rules and evaluative labels, but views them in terms of pleasant or unpleasant consequences of actions, or in terms of the physical power of those who impose the rules.

**Stage 1: Obedience and punishment orientation**
- Egocentric difference to superior power or prestige, or a trouble-avoiding set.
- Objective responsibility.

**Stage 2: Naively egoistic orientation**
- Right action is that which is instrumental in satisfying the self's needs and occasionally others’.
- Relativism of values to each actor's needs and perspectives.
- Naive egalitarianism, orientation to exchange and reciprocity.

**Level II: Conventional/Role Conformity**

Moral values reside in performing the right role, in maintaining the conventional order and expectancies of others as a value in its own right.

**Stage 3: Good-boy/good-girl orientation**
- Orientation to approval, to pleasing and helping others.
- Conformity to stereo-typical images of majority or natural role behavior.
- Action is evaluated in terms of intentions.
**Stage 4: Authority and social-order-maintaining orientation**

- Orientation to "doing duty" and to showing respect for authority and maintaining the given social order for or its own sake.
- Regard for earned expectations of others.
- Differentiates actions out of a sense of obligation to rules from actions for generally "nice" or natural motives.

**Level III: Post-conventional/Self-Accepted Moral Principles**

Morality is defined in terms of conformity to shared standards, rights, or duties apart from supporting authority. The standards conformed to be internal, and action-decisions are based on an inner process of thought and judgement concerning right and wrong.

**Stage 5: Contractual/legalistic orientation**

- Norms of right and wrong are defined in terms of laws or institutionalized rules, which seem to have a rational basis.
- When conflict arises between individual needs and law or contract, though sympathetic to the former, the individual believes the latter must prevail because of its greater functional rationality for society, the majority will and welfare.

**Stage 6: The morality of individual principles of conscience**

- Orientation not only toward existing social rules, but also toward the conscience as a directing agent, mutual trust and respect, and principles of moral choice involving logical universalities and consistency.
• Action is controlled by internalized ideals that exert a pressure to act accordingly regardless of the reactions of others in the immediate environment.

• If one acts otherwise, self-condemnation and guilt result.

The Origin of Moral Judgements: Haidt’s Model

One of the most radical and provocative of these accounts was proposed by Jonathan Haidt. According to Haidt’s “social intuitionist” model, emotional capacities involving affect and intuition do almost all of the work in generating moral judgements (Haidt, 2001). Reason, on the other hand, is relegated to the role of a lawyer or public relations agent, whose job is to offer public, post-hoc justifications for judgements after they have been made. Figure 1.1 is a simplified depiction of the Model Haidt defends.

![Fig. 1.1 : Haidt’s Social Intuitionist Model](image)

The first step in the process leading to moral judgement, in this model, is the perception of a morally relevant event. The second box represents “moral intuitions,” which rapidly and spontaneously appear in consciousness in response to the witnessed moral situation. The person experiencing these intuitions normally lacks any awareness of having gone through a process of reasoning to arrive at them. Rather, Haidt characterizes these intuitions, which he holds to be the fundamental
determinants of moral judgement, as affective reactions – quick flashes of
disgust or anger, for instance. Often, the entire process stops once the
intuition gives rise to a judgement. However, when circumstances require
the person to justify his / her judgement, he / she will engage in conscious
reasoning in order to produce a justification. This post-hoc reasoning
process usually supports the affective intuition, but will occasionally
override the initial affective judgement - and it may even occasionally affect
the system responsible for affective intuitions. Since neither reasoning nor
the downstream effects of reasoning need always occur, we’ve represented
them with dotted arrows in Figure 1.1 In support of this model, Haidt offers
an extensive array of empirical findings. Among the most striking of these is
a study in which participants were presented with vignettes, like the one
that follows, which engender substantial affect but which are carefully
designed to rule out most of the justifications that participants are likely to
come up with. Julie and Mark are brother and sister. They are traveling
together in France on summer vacation from college. One night they are
staying alone in a cabin near the beach. They decide that it would be
interesting and fun if they tried making love. At the very least, it would be a
new experience for each of them. Julie was already taking birth control
pills, but Mark uses a condom too, just to be safe. They both enjoy making
love, but they decide not to do it again. They keep that night as a special
secret, which makes them feel even closer to each other. What do you
think about that? Was it okay for them to make love? (Haidt, 2001) Haidt
found that participants typically answer “immediately,” insisting that the
behavior was wrong. When asked why, they begin “searching for reasons”.
But the most obvious reasons to oppose incest, like the risk of pregnancy,
the higher probability of having a child with birth defects, or acquiring an unsavory reputation, do not apply in this case. When the experimenter, playing the devil’s advocate, points this out, the typical participant will readily acknowledge the point, but will still not withdraw his initial judgement. Rather, he will insist that his judgement is correct even though he cannot offer any reasons in support of that judgement. The conclusion that Haidt draws from this phenomenon, which he calls “moral dumbfounding,” is that reasoning typically plays no role in the production of moral judgement. In another important experiment, Wheatley & Haidt (2005) hypnotized participants and told them to feel disgust when they encountered the emotionally neutral words ‘take’ or ‘often’. Participants were then asked to judge vignettes in which people behaved in morally problematic ways or in entirely unproblematic ways. Half of the participants were given versions of the vignettes with the hypnotic cue word included, while the other half received nearly identical versions of the vignettes with the hypnotic cue word omitted. This is one of the morally problematic vignettes: Congressman Arnold Paxton frequently gives speeches condemning corruption and arguing for campaign finance reform. But he is just trying to cover up the fact that he himself [will take bribes from / is often bribed by] the tobacco lobby, and other special interests, to promote their legislation and this is the morally neutral one : Dan is a student council representative at his school. This semester he is in charge of scheduling discussions about academic issues. He tries to take/often picks topics that appeal to both professors and students in order to stimulate discussion. The presence of the hypnotic cue word in the morally problematic scenarios led the participants to assess the transgressions
significantly more harshly, while in the unproblematic scenarios, the presence of the cue word led a significant number of participants to judge that the agent’s actions were morally questionable! Participants were asked for comments at the end of the study and, Wheatley and Haidt report, “the post hoc nature of moral reasoning was most dramatically illustrated by the Student Council story. Rather than overrule their feelings about Dan, some participants launched an even more desperate search for external justification. One participant wrote: ‘It just seems like he’s up to something.’

Another account of moral judgement in which emotion plays a major role has been proposed by Joshua Greene. However, on Greene’s account, reasoning also plays a role in the production of moral judgement in an important class of cases. Greene et al. (2001) administered FMRI (Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging) scans to participants while they made judgements about how people should behave when confronting a number of moral dilemmas. The dilemmas were divided into two groups. The first group involved “impersonal” moral situations like the classic “trolley problem,” where one must choose whether to flip a switch to divert a runaway trolley from a track on which it will run over five individuals to a track on which it will only kill one. The second group of dilemmas, the “personal” moral situations, included cases like the “footbridge problem” – a variation on the trolley problem where, rather than flipping a switch, one must decide whether to push an overweight man off a footbridge to stop a trolley that will kill five people if it is not stopped. The FMRI scans revealed that brain areas associated with emotion were much more active during contemplation of the personal moral dilemmas. In addition, most people judged the actions described in the personal moral dilemmas to be less
permissible, and those who did judge them to be permissible took longer to make their judgements. Greene et al. believe this last finding to be a type of interference effect, where participants must suppress their tendency to judge the action impermissible. Though Greene does not offer an explicit psychological model, his interpretation of these data suggests a model that would look something like Figure 1.2.

In this model, personal moral dilemmas trigger emotion systems, which then play a major causal role in producing a moral judgement. Impersonal moral dilemmas, however, leave the judgement to reasoning systems. The role of reasoning in personal dilemmas is either diminished or entirely absent – the dotted lines in Figure 1.2 represent the claim that reasoning can play a minor role in personal moral dilemmas. Although Greene’s model accords reasoning a more substantial role than Haidt’s, a central feature of both models is the heavy emphasis on the causal efficacy of emotion in the production of moral judgements. Despite the findings of Greene and Haidt, many reject the idea that reasoning processes should be given second billing.
Marc Hauser (2006) has recently argued that emotional response cannot be the primary means by which we produce our moral judgements. His own proposal is that we possess an innate, tacit capacity for moral judgement that is in many ways parallel to our capacity for language. Hauser argues that humans are endowed with an innate ‘moral grammar’, akin to the linguistic Universal Grammar posited by Chomsky and his followers (Hauser, 2006). As in language development, this innate moral grammar provides information regarding core principles common to all moral systems. That information enables children to use cues from their environment to extract and internalize the specific moral rules present in whatever culture they are born into, even in the face of impoverished stimuli. In addition, like the linguistic faculty, the innate moral faculty operates unconsciously, quickly, and automatically. Thus, as in Haidt’s account, moral judgement is primarily intuition-based. However, Hauser denies that these intuitions are affective. Hauser’s view is inspired by a passage in A Theory of Justice in which John Rawls (1971)suggests the use of a linguistic analogy for morality. Hauser proposes that humans are “Rawlsian creatures” who produce moral judgements in the following manner. First, the perception of a morally significant event triggers an analysis of the actions involved. That analysis, though fast and unconscious, is a complex cognitive process in which many factors must be considered. In an important sense, it is a reasoning process – albeit not a conscious one. The analysis, in turn, is used to form a permissibility judgement. Emotions are triggered only after this judgement has occurred, and are relevant mainly for controlling our behavioral response to the
perceived act. As in Haidt’s model, conscious reasoning may also come in after the initial intuitive judgement.

The figure below lays out the central features of Hauser’s view.

![Fig. 1.3 : Hauser’s “Rawlsian” Model of Moral Judgement](image)

Hauser contrasts the Rawlsian position with the position of those, like Haidt, who portray humans as “Human creatures” whose emotions play a causal role in the production of moral judgements and whose reasoning capacity comes in only after the fact, and also with those, like Piaget and Kohlberg, who suggest that humans are “Kantian creatures” whose moral judgements are largely or entirely subserved by conscious reasoning. In arguing against the Human creature view, Hauser notes that “neither we nor any other feeling creature can just have an emotion. Something in the brain must recognize – quickly or slowly – that this is an emotion-worthy situation” (Hauser 2006). Before emotions can play any role, Hauser argues, a complex analysis of the relevant event must occur that scrutinizes the consequences, intentions, and participants involved. We must determine who did what, and why. Only then will we be equipped to make the remarkably fine-grained moral discriminations that we make. One piece of evidence that Hauser invokes in support of his view is the fact that very slight alterations to a given situation can result in a sharp shift in permissibility judgements. Importantly, it is often difficult to account for
such shifts by appeal to differences in emotional response. Greene in his study found that emotion centers of the brain are activated during contemplation of the footbridge variant of the trolley problem. Greene hypothesized that this increased emotional reaction is responsible for our judgement that pushing the man is impermissible. Mikhail and Hauser, on the other hand, hypothesized that our innate moral grammar encodes a rule to the effect that using someone as a means to an end is wrong. Thus, pushing the man off the footbridge is impermissible because it wrongly uses the man as a means, while flipping the switch in the standard trolley case is permissible because the death of the person on the other track is a mere side-effect of the intended act of saving the live. Mikhail presented participants with two ingenious variations on the footbridge case intended to test this hypothesis. In one case, Ned has the option of flipping a switch to divert a trolley from a track with five hikers to a looping side track containing one overweight man. If the overweight man were not present, the trolley would loop back around to the initial track and kill the five, but the overweight man is heavy enough to stop the trolley before this occurs. Thus, the overweight man is a means to saving the five. In the second case, Oscar faces a situation which is identical, except that instead of an overweight man the looping side track contains a heavy weight and a single slim hiker. The hiker is not heavy enough to stop the trolley, but the weight is; the hiker is simply in the wrong place at the wrong time, and his death will be a side effect of (rather than a means to) saving the five. If the footbridge case is impermissible not because of its “personal” nature but because someone is used as a means, participants should judge Ned’s flipping the switch to hit the overweight man impermissible as well. This is
in fact what Mikhail’s study found. In a separate study, Hauser found that, while about 90% of his participants considered deflecting the trolley in the standard trolley case to be permissible, only 50% found it permissible in Ned’s case (Hauser 2006). This poses a problem for purely emotion-driven accounts; why should flipping a switch to hit an overweight man on a looped track be more emotion-triggering than flipping a switch to hit a thin man on a looped track? Though Hauser found an impressive difference between these two cases, the response on the Ned case is still quite a far cry from the response on the standard footbridge case, where only 10% deemed pushing the man off the footbridge to be permissible. However, this does not necessarily undermine Hauser’s hypothesis that emotional activation plays no causal role in permissibility judgements. Hauser notes that up-close and personal moral dilemmas may trigger our moral faculty differently than action-at-a-distance cases. Consider two cases due to Peter Unger (1996). Most people judge it impermissible to leave a bleeding man lying on the side of the road even though taking him to the hospital would cause $200 worth of damage to your car’s upholstery. However, few people consider it obligatory to donate $50 to UNICEF, even if doing so would save 25 children’s lives. Hauser argues that we sense a moral difference in these two cases because “in our [evolutionary] past, we were only presented with opportunities to help those in our immediate path…. The psychology of altruism evolved to handle nearby opportunities, within arm’s reach” (Hauser 2006). A similar explanation may apply to the difference between Ned’s case and the footbridge dilemma. We are inclined to think that Hauser has marshalled a persuasive defense for the claim that much complex cognitive analysis of the situation must take place
prior to making the subtle and fine grained moral discrimination that people actually make. Moreover, since these discriminations are made quickly and people typically cannot give a convincing account of the considerations involved, most of the mental processing involved must be unconscious, much as it is when we make grammatical judgements. We are, however, not persuaded by Hauser's contention that emotions enter the process only after moral judgements are made. The argument that Hauser offers for this aspect of his theory is indirect and far from conclusive, and the Wheatley and Haidt experiment provides some impressive evidence that, sometimes at least, emotions come first and moral judgements follow.

1.4 Need and Rationale of the Study

A few empirical studies have been published, that investigate the emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement of college students teachers. The research outlined in this study attempted to identify and understand the emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement levels of students. An effort was made to identify the differences between the level of emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement, and selected independent variables, such as gender, age, religion, location of residence, marital status, type of family, siblings, family annual income, stream at graduation level, teaching methodology at B.Ed. level, moral instruction at school level, and academic achievement.

Cognitive developmental researchers have conducted many research studies on emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement over the last 30 years. This collective body of research is a part of a broader
effort to research each of the cited areas as separate phenomena and then to study the interactions between them.

There are theorists who postulate that some non-intellectual dimensions of human beings are independent domains of giftedness or intelligence. In particular, emotional giftedness or intelligence sometimes including moral or ethical sensitivity; intra-personal and inter-personal intelligence; wisdom and leadership have been suggested as separate forms of giftedness or intelligence. It should be said that these are not completely “non-cognitive,” and each has a cognitive component and includes some underlying degree or level of intellectual skills and abilities.

According to Goleman (1995), emotional intelligence is not a concept opposite of IQ but rather a separate independent sphere of competency. Using Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) initial definition of emotional intelligence, Goleman specifies five major elements of emotional intelligence including self-awareness (knowing one’s emotion); handling feelings (managing emotions); self-motivation, mastery, and control (motivating oneself); empathy (recognizing emotions in others); and social competence (handling relationships). Later, the definition was elaborated as “the ability to perceive and express emotion accurately and adaptively, the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge, the ability to use feelings to facilitate thought, and the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and in others” (Salovey & Pizarro, 2003). Salovey and Pizarro assert that the concept of emotional intelligence is valuable in that it provides a theoretical framework to deal with individual differences in the emotional areas, as well as extend traditional views of intelligence by unifying both cognitive and emotional domains of human ability.
Researchers and theorists in the field of gifted education have proposed concepts that are similar or related to emotional intelligence. For example, Dabrowski’s overexcitabilities (Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977; Piechowski, 1979) include the emotional area as one distinguishing feature of giftedness along with four other separate modes of mental functioning, namely, psychomotor, sensual, imaginational, and intellectual. The five modalities of over excitabilities (OEs) constitute varying developmental potentials of human beings that ultimately determine the level of development that individuals can fulfil and affect one’s perceptions and responses to information and experience (Piechowski, 1979). Emotional OE is defined as “the emotional mode of attachments and affectional bonds with others, empathy, the despair of loneliness, the joy of love, the enigma of existence and human responsibility” (Piechowski, 1979). Piechowski (1991) asserts that emotional giftedness grows out of emotional over excitabilities (OE) when individuals have a will to change themselves and help others. Mayer and associates (Mayer, Perkins, Caruso and Salovey, 2001) articulated the connection between emotional giftedness (usually referred to as emotional OE) and emotional intelligence as the fact that both concepts deal with awareness of, attention to, understanding of, and controlling of feelings. They also suggest that emotional giftedness can be partly identified by measures of emotional intelligence. Before the popularity of emotional intelligence in the 1990s, Gardner (1983) proposed the existence of seven intelligences (to which he has added more, such as natural, spiritual, and existential) consisting of linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, inter-personal, and intra-personal. Of these separate intelligences, inter-personal and
intra-personal intelligences, called personal intelligences, are about the capacity to interact effectively with other people via understanding their feelings, emotions, intentions, and motivations, and the capacity to regulate one’s own life through accurate self-understanding of emotions and abilities. Gardner (1999), as well as others (see Mayer et al., 2001), acknowledged that inter-personal and intra-personal intelligences are comparable to Goleman’s (1995) emotional intelligence in that the three have to do with knowledge, awareness, and control of one’s own and others’ feelings, and empathy with and sensitivity to emotional states.

As a form of giftedness, Sternberg (2000) defines wisdom as the application of tacit knowledge in relation to intra-personal (e.g., good ends for oneself), inter-personal (e.g., good outcomes for others), and extra-personal interests (e.g., fits environmental contexts). The major function of wisdom is to balance all these three interests with consideration of the common good. Wisdom is similar to emotional intelligence in that it involves tacit knowledge about oneself and others, but is also like practical intelligence because it only applies to the context of normal daily life (beyond the context of ability tests, achievement tests, or novel creative situations) of individuals.

Piaget’s insights about how knowledge develops in successive layers not to thinking maturity, but rather to social maturity. The questions to ask now are:

- Are there successive layers of social maturity (e.g., appreciation of the social world and of emotions and how to manage them) that people experience as they develop?
- If so, what are those successive layers of social maturity?
What sorts of problems arise when you get stuck in a particular stage of social maturity and fail to mature further?

These first two questions are addressed in "The Evolving Self", while the third question is addressed in Kegan's follow-up book, "In Over Our Heads".

What Kegan has to say in "The Evolving Self" can be summarized in this manner:

- Social maturity does evolve or develop in successive layers just as does cognitive maturity, progressing from the most simple understanding to more and more complex understanding of the social world.
- More simple appreciations of the social world and of human emotions are fundamentally inaccurate, and not a good fit for the actual complexity of the social world, but they nevertheless represent the best people can do at any given moment.
- More complex appreciations of the social world evolve into existence as a person becomes able to appreciate stuff abstractly that they used to appreciate only in concrete (obvious, tangible) forms. This is to say (using Kegan's terms) that people are initially embedded in their own subjective perspective. They see things only from their own particular point of view and fundamentally cannot understand what it might be like to see themselves from another perspective other than their own. Being unable to understand what one looks like to someone else is the essence and definition of what it means to be subjective about one self, for example, being able to appreciate things from many different perspectives is the essence of what it means to be relatively objective.
New layers of social/emotional development occur as people become able to finally see themselves in increasingly larger and wider social perspective. For example, the moment one is able to understand for the first time what another person is thinking or feeling, one has made a sort of leap forwards, out of subjectivity (one being trapped in one’s own perspective) and into a view of the world that is a little more objective. If one can understand what someone else is thinking and feeling, one can also imagine oneself as one must look through their eyes and one’s self-understanding becomes that much more objective. This sort of expanded awareness represents an emergence from embeddedness in one’s own subjective perspective and the growth of one’s ability to see things from multiple perspectives at once.

This process of becoming progressively less subjective as you mature, and thus more able to appreciate the complexity of the social world, repeats itself multiple times in a given life span (assuming people do continue to mature as they age and don’t simply get stuck). Each new layer of awareness; each expansion of perspective that a person grows is simultaneously both more objective; offering a better, wider perspective on the social world than did the prior understanding), and also less objective than the understanding that logically follows next.

Where does this progression end? Theoretically, it ends in some kind of Buddha-like state of enlightenment, where everything that can be understood objectively is understood objectively and there is no more subjectivity to be embedded in anymore. More practically, it ends when we reach the level of social maturity that most of our peers achieve. Few people ever become more socially mature than the majority of their peers.
Research on moral sensitivity emerged in the early 1980s through a research and measurement design movement led by Dr. Muriel Bebeau at the University of Minnesota (Rest & Narvaez, 1994). Moral motivation, and the fourth component, moral character, have generated relatively little research to date.

Many scientists and researchers often ponder the idea of moral philosophy. Where does moral judgement come from and how are the rules defined? Are moral judgements a result of reasoning through a particular situation or are they a result of an emotion and based on feelings? People can argue either position. However, recent studies have pointed towards moral judgement stemming from emotion and intuition rather than reasoning. One such study used hypnosis to show that moral judgement can be influenced with emotions.

Nado, Kelly, and Stich (2006) pondered both sides of the debate on whether moral judgement stems from rationality or emotions. There are research-backed responses to both. One argues that all judgements are based on some form of reasoning. Another argues that reason is the slave of passions. Researchers concluded that there is still a lot to be learned about moral judgement. The analysis of how people make their moral judgements is still a young debate and more research needs to be conducted.

Many researchers have focused on moral judgement coming from reasoning. However, a meta-analysis was conducted (Green & Haidt, 2002) involving both psychology and cognitive neuroscience research that focused on moral judgement. They discovered that although reasoning can play a significant role in moral judgement, there is more evidence that
intuition and emotion determine moral judgement. They also found through brain imaging that many areas of the brain contribute to making moral judgements.

Wheatley and Haidt (2005) researched how hypnosis has an effect on moral judgement. In the study, 64 highly hypnotizable participants received a series of group-hypnosis sessions. During these sessions, participants were given a posthypnotic suggestion to feel disgusted when reading a particular word either `take` or `often.` Post-hypnotic suggestions are designed so that the participant does not remember the instructions until prompted to remember. Results of the research showed that when participants were asked to judge specific situations, they showed more disgust when the specific word was used in the description. When the word was present they rated moral transgressions as more morally wrong. The researchers concluded that intuition and feelings can influence moral judgements. Although the topic of moral judgement is still up for debate, recent research shows advancement in determining what leads humans to make certain moral judgements. Hypnosis enables researchers to access the subconscious mind to help them understand the non-reasoning ability of the human mind. Hypnosis is a great tool to use in determining whether moral judgement is based on reason or emotions.

So, in the light of all these, the researcher felt the need of assessing emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement of the student teachers.

The following research questions reflect the purpose of the study and were derived from the current literature on emotional maturity, social
maturity and moral judgement of the student teachers. The research questions give direction for the study and the data analysis.

1. To what extent do the student teachers possess emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement.

2. Is there any influence of the following independent variables i.e gender, age, religion, location of residence, marital status, type of family, siblings, family annual income, stream at graduation level, teaching methodology at B.Ed. level, moral instruction at school level, and academic achievement on the dependent variables i.e. emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement of student teachers.

1.5 Conclusion and Chapterisation

In this chapter, the researcher presented the conceptual background of independent variables of study i.e., emotional maturity, social maturity and moral judgement and the need and rationale of the study. In the next chapter the researcher will present a review of the related literature based on the needs of the present study.

The chapterisation of the study is:

Chapter 1 : Problem and its Significance
Chapter 2 : Review of Related Literature
Chapter 3 : Plan and Procedure of the Study
Chapter 4 : Analysis and Interpretation of the Data
Chapter 5 : Summary, Findings, Conclusions, Educational Implications and Suggestions.
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