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INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction to the Chapter

Man as social being is entrenched with the faculty of moral understanding that enables him to live harmoniously with each other in the society. The process of judgement of right from wrong which humans are largely capable of, and the study of morality have always fascinated philosophers, theologians, behaviourists and social thinkers across the timeline in the history. Moral norms and rules are known to exist since the earliest known civilizations in the world and the psychological exploration into the same has begun only less recently.

The recent comparative studies in the domain of moral psychology and ethics reveals that the moral orientation in the modern societies is undergoing a drastic drift and the world societies are becoming more and more individualistic at a faster pace. Moral Competence of individuals is vital in maintaining moral well-being of the society and decline of it may lead to social disintegration and disharmony. Hence, understanding of the Moral Competence and factors of Moral Competence bears very high significance. Though there are several studies in the various aspects of morality, there are relatively lesser studies found integrating the factors influencing moral information processing in the individual and Moral Competence. Therefore, an in-depth understanding of the factors of Moral Competence will be highly valuable and relevant from both academic and social point of view. This study focuses on identifying the factors influencing Moral Competence and hence could aid in predicting Moral Competence to a larger extent. Results from the study may also assist in building a healthy moral society and thus will also help to ensure moral rectitude, supporting
societal orderliness and peace. The study will also be significantly helpful in identifying the key factors influencing Moral Competence and thus may help in developing focussed modules for psychological intervention.

This chapter explains in brief the background of the study and the various theoretical perspectives on the variables included in this study. This study majorly focuses on exploring the effect of Metaphysical Beliefs, Religio-Spiritual Institutional Affiliation, Psychological Values, Personality Traits and Emotional Intelligence on Moral Competence and attempt is made here to consolidate the relevant major theories and perspectives pertaining to the variables of this study.

1.1. Background of the Study

With the revolution in the field of information technology and advent of media resources available at finger tips, incidents happening around the globe are accessible even to laymen population these days. The large number of incidents reported daily in the media, if analysed from an ethical viewpoint- is a matter of severe concern and if seen through a psychologist’s eye -bears wider scope of in-depth research. The various reports appearing in the daily media were either not known earlier or are newly emergent with the change in the social structure and individual motives. This research got ignited from a spark of concern resulted while contemplating on the facts and figures published by the National Crimes Records Bureau, Govt of India (2012), regarding the incidents of various crimes in the country in the past few years (See Appendix D). It is observed that, despite improvements and innovation in the modes of crime prevention and systematization of the law enforcement agencies in the country, most major forms of crimes and incidents of anti social behaviour are
increasing at a faster pace disproportionate to the increase of population and the measures implemented by the law enforcement agencies in the country to prevent crime. The situation is not different in the global context too (Varghese & Raj 2014a).

Upon analysing the record of incidents of crime in India from 1953 to 2012\(^1\) (See Appendix D: Table 1.1 and Table 1.2), i.e., at the time of initiation of this study, it was observed that major forms of crimes had a drastic increase in its rates over the period of time. On analysing the data from 2003 to 2012; it was seen that crimes involving murder has increased by 5.25\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.2), crimes involving Attempt to Murder increased by 35.44\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.3), incidents of Rape increased by 57.27\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.4), crimes involving Kidnapping and Abduction increased by 138.05\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.5), crimes involving Counterfeiting increased by 14.4\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.6), cases of Cheating increased by 98.41\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.7), crimes involving Grievous Hurt increased by 27.11\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.8) and reports of dowry deaths increased by 32.61\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.9).

Similar analysis of the data of reports of incidents between 1988 and 2012, i.e. in 25 years; it was seen that crimes involving Murder has increased by 19.68\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.2), crimes involving Attempt to Murder increased by 69.83\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.3), incidents of Rape increased by 173.9\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.4), crimes involving Kidnapping and Abduction increased by 201.76\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.5), crimes involving Counterfeiting increased by 52.96\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.6) and cases of Cheating increased by 314.89\% (See Appendix D: Fig 1.7).

\(^1\) Since this study was initiated in the year 2012, the data pertaining to the crime rates only till then is included in the text tables and figures. The data analysis of the crime rates were originally presented in the International Science Congress [Dec 2013, Coimbatore] and published in January 2014 [Varghese & Raj 2014a].
Total crimes in the country punishable under the Indian Penal Code (IPC) showed an alarming rate of 39.1% of increase in 10 years and 66.73% in 25 years (See Appendix D: Fig 1.1). In conclusion, a total of 20391021 crimes were reported in the country between 2003 and 2012 and a total of 45587831 crimes were reported in 25 years, between 1988 and 2012. The data reveals that the total crimes in India over a period of 10 years i.e., between 2003 to 2012 increased by 39.10% against the 11.55% of increase of population. From 1988 to 2012, the crime rates in India increase by 65.73% against the population growth of 52.80%. It is evident from the figures that, there is a considerable increase in the number of people involving in crimes and antisocial behaviour (Varghese & Raj 2014a).

In addition to crime; the decline of moral values and Moral Competence is also a contributor to juvenile delinquency, marital dissatisfaction and violence, suicides and a large number of unlisted social and moral evils. Though crime is not the subject matter of this study; the concern arisen from the observation of the facts created interest in the investigator to explore further into the factors of morality and Moral Competence in the global context. This study focuses on exploring the nature of Moral Competence and its factors in the global context which can add further clarity into the understanding of morality; and in later stage attempt into the development of focussed psychological modules of moral competency enhancement.

1.2. Morality and Moral Competence: Meaning and Definition

The Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD, 1998) Panel on Moral Education defines a moral person as “one who respects human dignity, cares about the welfare of others, integrates individual interests and social responsibilities, demonstrates integrity, reflects on moral choices and seeks peaceful resolution of conflict”.
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Morality in general sense is understood as a set of values relating to right conduct, against which behaviour is judged to be acceptable or unacceptable. Morality originated from the Latin word ‘moralitas’ refers to "manner, character, proper behaviour" etc., which differentiates intentions, decisions, and actions between those that are "good" (or right) and those that are "bad" (or wrong). Individuals across the cultures are found to follow a set of written or unwritten moral codes that to a greater extend guides moral behaviour. A moral code is a system of morality existing in a particular philosophy, religion, culture, etc. and morals are practices or teachings within that moral code. Morality may also be specifically synonymous with "goodness" or "rightness." Immorality is the active opposition to morality (i.e. opposition to that which is good or right), while amorality is variously defined as an unawareness of, indifference toward, or disbelief in any set of moral standards or principles.

Morality can be either descriptive or normative. Descriptive morality is identified with the codes of conduct formulated by a society, culture, religion, community etc., and refers only to what is considered right or wrong according to the referred worldview of the defining agency. Descriptive morality is the foundation of descriptive Ethics. On the other hand, Normative morality refers to the codes of conduct that is defined as right or wrong irrespective of the observer or any agency. Normative morality is rational in origin and identifies itself with the universal moral principles. In a specific sense Normative morality attempts to be absolute in its definition and it is the foundation of the Normative ethics.

Competence refers to the ‘capability’, ‘capacity’, ‘efficiency’, ‘proficiency’, ‘skill’ etc. with which an action is performed and it is the specialized system of abilities, proficiencies, or skills that are necessary to reach a specific task or goal (Weinert, 2001). Moral Competence is the ability to apply moral principles and
make moral decisions and judgments based on it, and act in accordance with it (Kohlberg, 1964). In other words, Moral Competence is the competence with which a moral action is performed and is the active application of moral intelligence. It is an outgrowth of ‘living in alignment’ with the basic moral principles, values and beliefs (Lennick and Kiel, 2005; Veach & Asce, 2006). Moral Competence is the affective orientation to perform altruistic behaviours towards others and the ability to judge moral issues logically, consistently, and at an advanced level of development (Ma, 2012).

The Oxford dictionary (2015), defines morality as “principles concerning the distinction between ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ or ‘good’ and ‘bad’ behaviour; a particular system of values and principles of conduct, the extent to which an action is right or wrong” etc. The Merriam Webster dictionary (2015), explains morality as “a moral discourse, statement, or lesson; a literary or other imaginative work teaching a moral lesson; a doctrine or system of moral conduct; particular moral principles or rules of conduct; conformity to ideals of right human conduct” etc.

According to the Dictionary of Psychology (Asch, 2008), “morality is a system of beliefs and a set of values relating to right conduct against which behaviour is judged to be acceptable or unacceptable.” American Heritage Dictionary of English Language (2011), defines morality as “the quality of being in accord with standards of right or good conducts; a system of ideas of right and wrong conduct; virtuous conduct; a rule or lesson in moral conduct” etc. Dictionary.com (2015), defines morality as “conformity to the rules of right conduct, moral or virtuous conduct; moral quality or character; virtue in sexual matters, chastity; doctrine or system of morals; moral instruction, a moral lesson, perpect, discourse, or utterance” etc.
1.3. Theories Perspectives and Approaches to Morality and Moral Competence

Development of morality or acquisition of Moral Competence is a major psychological process in the life span and social development of an individual. It is through moral development that an individual becomes capable of moral judgement and it is as a result of moral development that a child or individual becomes capable of differentiating between right and wrong. As with other components of development, morality is shaped by multiple factors. For example, during a child’s development, his/her experiences with family, peers, and other adults influences his/her moral development substantially. In addition, their physical, cognitive, emotional and social skills that mature with time work together and influences moral development.

The faculty of human morality has always fascinated philosophers, social scientists and psychologists across the globe and several thinkers and scientists have immensely pondered on understanding the nature of morality and moral behaviour, across the timelines in the history of social thought and the study of human behaviour.

1.3.1 Major Philosophical Approaches to Morality

Philosophers from the time known have made sincere attempts to contemplate on the nature of Human morality. Among them, the major philosophical approaches are Moral Subjectivism which says that right and wrong is determined by what each individual just happens to think or feel as right or wrong. Morality as per Cultural Relativism is determined by the particular set of principles or rules each culture derives and holds at a time [Mahavira, 599–527 BC; Protagoras, 481–420 BC; Herodotus, 484–420 BC (as cited in Varghese & Raj 2014b)]. Ethical Egoism holds the view that right and wrong is determined by what is in the self-interest of the actor [Yang Zhu, 4th century B.C.; Broad, 1950 (as cited in Varghese & Raj 2014b)]. As per the
Naturalistic view of morality, the universe is governed by rational principles and the humans have reason within them to understand, distinguish, interpret and obey the law. Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43 BC) argues that right reason is always in agreement with the nature, unchanging, everlasting and universally applicable. According to the Divine Command Theory, there is no morality without a divine moral law giver and as per the theory; an action is ‘right’ or obligatory, if God command to do it and ‘wrong’ if God commands to refrain from doing it. An action according to the divine command theory is morally permissible if God does not command that it not be done [Thomas Aquinas, 1225-1274 (as cited in Varghese & Raj 2014b)]. Virtue Ethics holds the position that right and wrong are characterized in terms of acting in accordance with the traditional virtues that makes a person good [Aristotle, 384–322 BC (as cited in Varghese & Raj 2014b)]. Utilitarianism argues that an action can be called morally right or wrong only with reference to the overall goodness that results as the consequence of the action [Jeremy Bentham, 1748-1832; John Stuart Mill, 1806-1873 (as cited in Varghese & Raj 2014b)]. According to Deontology, in order for an action to be morally good, it is not enough that it conform to the moral law, but it must also be done for the sake of the law [Immanuel Kant, 1724-1804 (as cited in Varghese & Raj 2014b)]. According to Contractarianism, principles of right and wrong are a social contract that everyone in the society agrees upon to follow [Thomas Hobbes, 1588-1679; John Bordley Rawls, 1921-2002 (as cited in Varghese & Raj 2014b)]. The philosophical approaches to the understanding of morality have considerably laid the foundations of the modern moral thought and understanding of morality (Varghese & Raj 2014a; 2014b).
1.3.2. Morality and Law

All the existed and existent legal and penal systems in different parts of the world have been founded on the moral laws of that particular society or state. As is known, Morality represents a set of ideas, precepts, and rules about good and evil, right and wrong, just and unjust whereas Law is a system of rules of conduct, developed or recognized by the state power, that guides human behaviour in accordance with the prevailing moral values of that society, thus establishing legal rights and obligations of which mandatory abidance is provided, when needed by the coercive force of public power. Human beings are conceived as homo justiate (moral beings) and Law being as old as the Society plays an important role in regulating the social relations by means of ensuring and maintaining social order and preservation of moral values of that society or state. Laws and penal codes of any society can be identified as a measure of effort of that system, to ensure virtue and uphold moral values. To any society, Morality and Law are inseparable elements, where the former plays the causal role, while Law and penal system together play the implementation role ensuring justice for all (Varghese & Raj, 2015).

1.3.3. Perspectives in Social Sciences

Several Social scientists and thinkers have long sought to understand the nature of human moral systems and attempts are seen to have made to understand the nature of morality in the economic, anthropological, sociological, political and theological perspectives. According to Adam Smith (1845) all the economic transactions in the society are resultant of the moral sentiments. The moral values play a very important role in the marketplace in the day to day economic transactions (Granovetter & Swedberg 1992; Guillén et al. 2002; Smelser & Swedberg 1994; Zelizer 1979/1994). According to Durkheim (1973) morality bounds the society
together and it is a reflection of the organization of the society. As per Weber (1949) the moral world is based on value-rationality and the competing claims of historical ideas. Marx (1844) holds the position that morality is a historically contingent social system tied up within class domination. The study of morality had been of much interest to the social sciences studying its relation and influence on various aspects of the society. To underline a few studies of interest; the studies like ‘moral order of a suburb’ (Baumgartner, 1988), the ‘provincial morality of slum neighbourhoods’ (Suttles, 1968), the ‘moral life of the inner city’ (Anderson 1999), studies in the sociology of crime and deviance like, ‘moral panics’, ‘moral crusades’, and ‘moral entrepreneurs’ (Becker, 1963; Cohen, 2002; Erikson, 1966; Goode & Ben-Yehuda, 1994; Gusfield, 1963; Thompson, 1998) etc., have attained notable attention in the domain of study of morality.

1.3.4. Research Trend in Neurobiology and Interdisciplinary Sciences

Interests in the field of biology and neuroscience in the past few years concentrated on seeking whether a ‘moral organ’ exists in the brain and the understanding of the biological basis of morality, has changed dramatically in the past few years with the use of fMRI techniques along with other psycho-physiological measurements (Greene et al., 2001; Hauser, 2006). While some of the neurological studies focused on identifying parts of the brain that light up while confronting conventional moral dilemmas (Greene et al., 2008). On the other hand few other neurological studies explored the conflicting hot and cold brain systems (Metcalfe & Mischel, 1999) and their varying influences on human moral functioning (Haidt et al., 1993). Another notable movement in the neuro-biological studies of morality is the research on the influence of Oxytoxin on morality (Kosfeld et al., 2005; Zak et al., 2007; Zak, 2011; Conlisk, 2011). Oxytoxin which is pseudo named as’
moral molecule’ was also found to influence empathy, trust, generosity, social attachments and affiliations, including parental care, bonding between pairs, social memory etc. (Kosfeld et al., 2005; Baumgartner et al., 2008; Zak et al. 2007; Carter, 1998/2003; Ferguson et al., 2002; Insel & Young, 2001; Lim & Young, 2006; Young & Wang, 2004). The science of morality has flourished, in interdisciplinary studies in the past two decades, narrowing its scope into the questions of brain functioning (Haidt, 2008; Sinnott-Armstrong, 2008; Turiel, 2002; Appiah, 2008).

1.3.5. Major Theories of Moral Development in Psychology and Behavioural Sciences

Moral Development resulting in the acquirement of Moral Competence is largely a psychological process and various psychologists have contemplated deeper into the different aspects of morality. There have been multifarious approaches to the study of moral development by psychologists belonging to different schools of thought. Some of the most prominent perspectives and approaches are discussed below.

1.3.5.1. Psychoanalytic Approach

Psychoanalytic theory stands as the forerunner of all the theories of moral and emotional development. According to the psychoanalytic theory of Freud (1905), the adult personality and behaviour is determined by the first five years of the childhood. The child adopts the moral values of their society through identification with the same sex parent, during the phallic stage which is the third of five stages of psycho-sexual development. This stage approximately falls between 3-6 years of age. As per the theory a child sees the same sex parent as a competitor in getting the opposite sex parents attention and affection. The conflict is resolved when the child identifies him/herself with the same sex parent and ‘becoming like’ him/her. According to the
psychoanalytic school, the mental architecture consists of the ‘id’ which is hedonistic, ‘Ego’ which is realistic and the ‘Super Ego’ which is idealistic. The ‘Super Ego’ controls the moral events by suppressing the ‘id’ impulses. The morality is rooted in the avoidance of guilt and shame which are products of the super-ego.

**1.3.5.2. Social Learning Perspective**

A child learns moral values by imitating the behavioural samples who meets the moral standards of the society. Bandura (1977) holds that the acquisition of moral behaviour occurs through learning by imitation. The behavioural samples may be parents, teachers, peers, role models and the authority figures. The child grabs moral values and moral standards which regulates and control their moral behaviour. According to the social learning theory the child acquires moral values either through direct tuition or observational learning. Direct tuition is self indulged learning which teaches the child through personal experiences based on the reinforcement involving reward or punishment for their behaviour; whereas in observational learning the child learns by observing the experiences of others and by imitating the behaviour which were noticed to be rewarding to others, and avoiding those behaviour for which others were found to be punished.

**1.3.5.3. Behaviouristic Perspective**

According to the behavioural perspective the moral values are essentially synonymous with cultural mores and the results of conditioning. Morality according to Skinner (1971) is those set of responses that the society rewards. The mind of a new born is a *tabula rasa* close to a blank slate which is devoid of any inherent moral emotions or inclinations. Skinner defined socialization as the primary agent of moral development, in the course of life span development. The direct experiences and the
consequences a child encounter are the sole sources of moral learning. According to the behaviouristic school, children acquire moral values through the rewards and punishments for the acts they perform. The positively reinforced behaviour is learned and violation of social norms gets associated with the fear of punishment and pain, in the child. Accordingly, as per behaviouristic approach, morality has neither any biological or evolutionary basis nor it is motivated by emotions, conscience, or judgment. Moral behaviour is simply those behaviours reinforced as good with positive reinforcement and or bad with negative reinforcement.

1.3.5.4. Piaget’s Theory of Moral Development

Children feel sympathy when they see others suffering and accordingly the child gradually comes to understand and respect rules that help them get along, share, and thereby reduce suffering (Piaget, 1965). All morality, according to Piaget “consists in a system of rules, and the essence of all morality is to be sought for in that respect which the individual acquires for these rules” (Piaget, 1932/1965). According to Piaget, cognitive development is closely linked to moral development and he was particularly interested in the way children's thoughts about morality changed over time. According to Piaget, children between the ages of 5 and 10 years see the world through the lens of a ‘Heteronomous’ which is an other-directed morality. Accordingly, moral understanding is developed in them by rules handed down by parents, teachers, government leaders and other authority figures. These rules are seen by them as absolute and unbreakable. Towards the end of middle childhood, a child develops the ability to view situations from other's point of view. As a result, their appreciation of morality changes by then. As children develop the ability to put themselves into other persons shoes; their appreciation of morality becomes more ‘Autonomous’ ie., self-directed morality. Piaget called this expanded appreciation a "morality of cooperation".
At around an age of 10 continuing through adolescence, children start seeing moral rules as socially approved guidelines designed to benefit them and the group. They see rules as, complex and somewhat negotiable guidelines that benefit everyone and at this stage following the rules are perceived to be something more than mere avoidance of negative personal consequences or desire for individual gain. Accordingly, a child learns that Decisions affect everyone; and can benefit and/or hurt everyone. Piaget divided moral development in a child into three stages:

Stage 1: Premoral Judgement (Birth to 5 years): At this stage the child does not have any idea about the internal or external morality and they do not understand the concept of rules. During this stage, children have poor conception of the consciousness of others and as they are incapable of carrying out complex mental operations and they lack pure sense of morality. This stage roughly coincides with the sensor motor and pre-operational stages of Piaget’s cognitive theory.

Stage 2: Moral realism (5 to 9 years): At this stage children learn and understand the concept of rules but they view it as external and immutable. Rules are obeyed largely because they are there children evaluate wrongdoings with reference to its consequences, and not the intentions of the person behind doing it. This stage corresponds to the pre-operational and concrete operational stages of Piaget’s cognitive theory.

Stage 3: Moral relativity (5 to 7 years): This stage overlaps at first with the stage of moral realism. At this stage children start developing their own sense of internal morality different from the external rules and they learn that rules can be changed with mutual consent. A major development at this stage is that actions are now evaluated more in terms of their intentions, which most
people would see as a more sophisticated view of morality. This stage corresponds to the concrete and formal operational stages in Piaget's cognitive theory.

1.3.5.5. Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development

Kohlberg’s (1969/1971) theory of moral development is rooted on Piaget’s theory and according to him, young children are egocentric and concrete; and they determine right and wrong with reference to reward and punishment. Moral development is directly linked to the cognitive development and by age 6-8 the child becomes capable of looking at situations through the eyes of others and they learn to appreciate the value of rules and laws. The abstract reasoning ability of children matures over puberty and they become able to appreciate rules and laws. Individuals make progress by mastering the stages of development, one at a time and a person could not skip stages. Kohlberg based his theory upon research and interviews with groups of young children after presenting series of moral dilemmas (Kohlberg, 1969/1971).

According to Kohlberg’s theory, the moral development occurs in six successive stages briefly divided in three levels. Level 1 is the ‘Pre-conventional Morality’ with stages 1 and 2; Level 2 is ‘Conventional Morality’ with stages 3 and 4; and Level 3 is ‘Post Conventional’ Morality with stages 5 and 6.

Stage 1 is characterised by ‘Obedience and Punishment’ and in this stage, children see rules as immutable, and for them following rules is a means of avoiding punishment. Stage 2, is characterised by ‘Individualism and Exchange’ and at this stage, children learn to assess actions with reference to how they serve individual needs. Children at this stage engage in reciprocal interactions only to serve their own
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self interests. Stage 3 is identified by ‘Interpersonal Relationships’ and at this stage children learn how their personal choices affect relationships. Individuals at this stage identify themselves with the society and focuses on living up to social expectations and roles. The basic orientation of Stage 4 is ‘Maintaining Social Order’ and individuals at this stage consider society as a whole while making judgements. Individuals at this stage give emphasis to following rules, maintaining social order etc. At Stage 5, people are oriented towards ‘Social Contract and Individual Rights’. At this stage they respect the values, beliefs and opinions of others and consider rules as important factors for maintaining social order. The Stage 5 is characterised by ‘Universal Principles’ orientation and individuals at this stage, perform moral reasoning based on abstract reasoning and the universal ethical principles. They also follow internalised principles of justice even when it contradicts the rules and laws.

1.3.5.6. Social Domain Theory

The Social Domain theory was inspired by the theory of moral development proposed by Kohlberg. Elliot Turiel (1983) further worked on the Kohlberg’s moral development model and modified to show that children distinguishes different kinds of rules and practices and treat them with different statuses. According to the theory, children sorts rules thrown to them by adults, into different domains of social knowledge or ‘cognitive bins’ and figure out how and when to use or to reject the different rules. The model includes three domains viz, Moral domain, Socio-Conventional domain and Personal domain. Moral domain regulates behaviour based on principles of fairness and care. The leading norms of moral domain includes fairness in interactions including preservation of equality and rights of others, refraining from causing emotional distress and violation of norms of pro-social behaviour, safety etc. The Social-conventional domain represents the rules that children think are mandatory and
regulates the social behaviour of the individual. The Personal or Psychological domain includes processes guiding towards understanding and discovering the self. Moral rules, which are about harm, rights, and justice, are founded on the Moral domain and are less revisable than social-conventional rules and personal rules.

1.3.5.7. Gilligan’s Approach to Moral Development

Disagreed with the Kohlberg’s theory of Moral Development and rejecting it as male-centric, Carol Gilligan (1977) proposed a new theory that maintained that women approach moral issues with a different perspective to that of men and they sensitively view others feelings and show care and concern for others. Gilligan criticized Kohlberg that he obtained all his findings from men and generalized it to both genders. Gilligan held the position that; the experiences of men and women largely differ, and hence she discarded the universal nature of Kohlberg’s theory (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1987; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Austrian, 2008; Gilligan, 2003). According to her, women emphasize care of others than adherence to abstract principles and set rules. In conclusion to a series of studies conducted by Gilligan, it was summarized that Women rely on interpersonal network of care orientation and men rely more heavily on justice orientation.

1.3.5.8. Pro-social Reasoning Theory

Pro-social reasoning theory proposed by Eisenberg (1968), is rooted on the development of altruistic behaviour. According to Eisenberg, there are four cognitive processes that define pro-social behaviour. They are:

1) Perception of other people as "good" ones, and oneself as a "kind" person;

2) Perception of altruistic motives of one’s own behaviour, aimed at benefits of others, realizing a principle of care;
3) Correct Estimation of the pro-social behaviour of helping other in their needs of support, and appraisal of the necessity of imparting help, and

4) the process of Moral Decision-making and extending help.

Accordingly, the pro-social reasoning development involves 5 stages.

Stage 1- Self-centred (0-7 Yrs): During this stage, the main concerns of children are for themselves and their own interests.

Stage 2- Needs-oriented (7-11 Yrs): At this stage children consider helping others, but experience guilt when help is not given. It doesn’t provide any reflexive behaviour or verbal expression of empathy;

Stage 3- Approval-orientation (11-14 Yrs): Children at this stage are most likely to help others if such behaviour is rewarded with praise or approval, following the stereotypes of "good/bad man" and "right/wrong" behaviour etc.;

Stage 4- Empathic (12 Yrs and above): Children develop sympathetic behaviour with regard to the people in need and at this stage they are concerned to do mostly what is right, and feels guilt when help is not given;

Stage 5- Internalized (16 Yrs and above): At this stage, children totally depend on the internalized values, norms etc. and the rights and beliefs of equality among people while appraising social situations.

1.3.5.9. Social Intuitionist Model and the Moral Foundations Theory

According to the Social Intuitionist Model, moral judgments are predominantly intuitive in nature. They are primarily driven by automatic emotional responses without the conscious effort of the individual (Haidt, 2001). Several studies have confirmed the influence of automatic emotional responses on moral judgment
(Wheatley & Haidt, 2006; Valdesolo & DeSteno, 2006; Greene, Sommerville, Nystrom, Darley, & Cohen, 2001; Koenigs et al., 2007; Schnall, Benton & Harvey, 2008). The model proposed that most of the moral decisions that individuals make are intuitive in nature which may result without the necessary involvement of reasoning.

Moral Foundations theory [MFT] proposes that the human mind is organized in advance of experience so that it is prepared to learn values, norms, and behaviours related to a diverse set of recurrent adaptive social problems (Graham, Haidt & Nosek, 2009; Graham et al., 2011). Moral foundations initially arose as a reaction against the developmental rationalist theory of morality associated with Kohlberg and Piaget. MFT emphasised on moral intuitions against reason which is the basis foundation of the other theorists. A major emphasis of MFT has been the finding that liberals, world-wide, rate the individualizing foundations slightly higher than the binding foundations. This is effectively much lower than the conservatives, who rate them all more or less equally (Graham et al., 2011). The moral foundations are the basic intuitions that lead to moral decisions. The five basic foundations or intuitions proposed by the MFT are as follows.

1. Care/Harm: Protecting others from harm, extending care for others etc.
2. Fairness/Cheating (Proportionality): Treating of others in proportion to their actions and extending justice etc.
3. Liberty/Oppression: Making judgments in terms of whether subjects are tyrannized.
4. Loyalty/Betrayal (In-group): Showing loyalty towards one’s own Family, Group, and Nation etc.
5. Authority/Subversion: Respect for tradition and towards legitimate authorities. This dimension plays as foundations of ‘Respect’.


1.3.5.10. Moral Intelligence: Lennik & Kiel

Gardner (1983) proposed the existence of ten types of intelligences viz. linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal, natural, spiritual, and existential. Later he distinguished interpersonal and Intrapersonal intelligence from among others and called it personal intelligence which referred to the capacity to interact effectively with other individuals 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.

The concept of Moral Intelligence was popularized by Lennick & Kiel (2005). They considered moral intelligence as “the mental capacity to determine how universal human principles – like those embodied by the ‘golden rule’ – should be applied to our values, goals and actions” (Lennick & Kiel, 2005). Moral intelligence is another distinct form of intelligence like cognitive intelligence and emotional intelligence. It develops in the early years of life and plays a major role in all aspects of life like ‘day to day interactions’, ‘defining individual goals’, ‘commercial transaction’ etc. (Lennick & Kiel, 2006). Moral Competence is the capacity to act in accordance with moral principles (Kohlberg, 1964; Lennick & Kiel, 2005) and it is the active application of Moral Intelligence. Moral Competence, like a moral compass of value and belief, is considered as the criteria people use to act ethically. It helps individuals to understand the goals that will allow one to be true to the principles; and Moral Competence enables individuals to act in alignment with their values and
beliefs. In other words, Moral Competence helps people to align themselves with the moral compass and to have the awareness of moral rules and regulations that construct right behaviours (Lennick & Kiel, 2005).

The moral principles apply similarly across all boundaries and cultures and people across the globe value moral individuals and leaders (Lennick & Kiel, 2005). The model proposed by Lennick and Kiel identified 10 specific competencies or traits that contribute to moral intelligence or Moral Competence of individuals. The competencies or the traits include 1) acting consistently with principles, values and, beliefs [Integrity] 2) telling the truth [Honesty] 3) standing up for what is right [Moral Courage] 4) keeping promises [Trustworthiness] 5) taking responsibility for personal choices [Responsibility] 6) admitting mistakes and failures [Humility] 7) embracing responsibility for serving others [Altruism] 8) actively caring about others [Compassion] 9) ability to let go of one’s own mistakes [Self-Forgiveness] and 10) the ability to let go of others’ mistakes [Other-Forgiveness].

1.3.6. Other Contemporary Views on the Nature of Morality

Researches in Moral Psychology have increased its momentum in the last two decades integrating multidisciplinary approaches. One of the researches that have recently gained attention is the universal moral grammar theory [UMG] (Mikhael, 2007). This approach seeks to investigate Moral Competence from computational, ontogenetic, behavioural, physiological and phylogenetic perspectives. UMG theory argues that the mind contains complex and domain-specific set of rules, concepts and principles that generates and relates mental representations of various types which enables individuals to determine the deontic status of an infinite variety of acts and omissions. Recent researches in the domain of neurobiological basis of decision making has identified that there exist more than one system or process in the human
brain with which an individual chooses a behaviour. In all processes of learning and behavioural choice two different sets of algorithm were found to function. This was first known through the machine learning literature (Sutton, 1988 and Barto, 1999), providing a valuable description of the two systems of learning and decision making in the human brain (Daw & Doya, 2006; Daw & Shohamy, 2008; Schultz, Dayan & Montague, 1997).

Several contemporary moral psychologists have delved into the nature of decision making and have proposed several modes of dual-system framework of morality (Bartels, 2008; Cushman, Young, & Hauser, 2006; Greene, 2007; Greene, Sommerville, Nystrom, Darley, & Cohen, 2001; Haidt, 2001; Pizarro & Bloom, 2003; Young & Koenigs, 2007). Some of the noted systems are: Automatic Vs Controlled (Schneider & Schiffrin, 1977); Heuristic Vs Systematic (Chaiken, 1980; Chen & Chaiken, 1999); Input modules Vs Higher cognition (Fodor, 1983 & 2001); Heuristic Vs Analytic (Evans, 1989 & 2006); Implicit Vs Explicit (Reber, 1993); Experimental Vs Rational (Epstein, 1994; Epstein & Pacini, 1999; Evans & Over, 1996); Associative Vs Rule Based (Sloman, 1996; Smith & DeCoster, 2000); Intuitive Vs Analytic (Hammond, 1996); System 1 Vs System 2 (Stanovich, 1999 & 2004); Holistic Vs Analytic (Nisbett et al., 2001); Adaptive Unconscious Vs Conscious (Wilson, 2002) Reflexive Vs Reflective (Lieberman, 2003); Impulsive Vs Reflective (Strack & Deustch, 2004); Stimulus Bound Vs Higher Bound (Toates, 2006); [as cited in Evans, 2008] and Cognitive Vs Metacognitive (Varghese & Raj 2014f; Varghese, 2015) etc.

The theories delineated above that Morality and Moral Competence is a highly contemplated aspect of human life and behaviour and all the theories converges to the relevance of moral competence in the individual’s social life.
1.4. Metaphysical Beliefs and Religio-Spiritual Institutional Affiliation: Meaning and Perspectives

The Metaphysical Beliefs and the Religio-spiritual values that people uphold are some of the significant deciding factors of the approach individuals take in various social situations. The belief systems of individual are major regulatory factors of human moral behaviour.

The Metaphysics derived from the Greek words μετά (metá, "beyond", "upon" or "after") and φυσικά (physiká, "physics") deals with the fundamental quest of the human mind concerning the understanding of 'being', 'existence' and 'beyond'. Metaphysics is the science of the 'immaterial' or what is beyond physical reality, and deals mostly with the intangibles. Most of the metaphysical concepts are abstract in nature and the metaphysical beliefs that an individual holds has significant influence on their morality and moral orientation. The religious worldviews hitherto existing are fundamentally the human attempt to understand the 'metaphysical' and to interpret it in human language.

Religio-spiritual institutional affiliation refers to the inclination or affinity of individuals with the various religions and institutions. All religions and spiritualistic traditions across the world are centred on the metaphysical notions of God, soul, eternity, afterlife etc. and the basic differences between the various worldviews are their basic explanations of the fundamental questions relating to the metaphysical notions. All religious traditions sets apart it own ethical code of conduct which play a significant role in the socialization and moral conditioning of the individuals (Varghese & Raj, 2014e). Majority of the world religions have a distinct position on the basic questions regarding the existence or non existence of God or a Higher
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Being, and an Afterlife. Multifarious concepts exist in the worldviews pertaining to Afterlife such as eternity of the soul, reincarnation or rebirth, renewed life in heaven, life in a paradise or new earth etc.

The world religions and the spiritualistic traditions across the world are found to have influenced the moral dimensions of the world societies to a significant extend. According to Blackburn (2001), “for individuals having theistic beliefs, ethics is not only tied up with religion, but is completely settled by it. Such people do not need to think too much about ethics, because there is an authoritative code of instructions, a handbook of how to live.” It is visible that all religious traditions across the world are centred on certain ethical component or modules, inspired by a supernatural guidance or revelation. Most of the religious and spiritualistic traditions are seen to have a Golden Moral Rule as their foci of reference for ideal human life and ethical interactions with others. There is a similar golden rule found in many of the world religions and spiritualistic traditions (Varghese & Raj 2014e). Some of them are as below.

- **Buddhism**: Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful. 
  
  *(Udana-Varga 5:18)*

- **Bahai**: Ascribe not to any soul that which thou wouldst not have ascribed to thee, and say not that which thou doesn’t. *(Bahá'u'lláh)*

- **Christianity**: "Do unto others, what you want others to do for you. *(Matt 7:12)*.

- **Confucianism**: Surely it is the maxim of loving kindness: Do not unto others what you would not have them do to you. *(Analects 15:23)*

- **Hinduism**: This is the sum of duty: Do naught unto others which would cause you pain if done to you. *(Mahabharata 5:1517)*
• **Islam:** No one is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself. (Sunnah)

• **Judaism:** What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow man. That is the entire Law; all the rest is commentary. (Talmud, Shabbat 31a)

• **Jainism:** Just as pain is not agreeable to you, it is so with others. Knowing this principle of equality treat other with respect and compassion. (Suman Suttam, verse 150)

• **Taoism:** Regard your neighbour’s gain as your gain, and your neighbour’s loss as your own loss. (Tai Shang Kan Yin P’ien)

• **Zoroastrianism:** That nature alone is good which refrains from doing unto another whatsoever is not god for itself. (Dadisten-I-dinik, 94, 5)

Most of the religions or the theistic perspectives attempt to define the ultimate meaning of life and reality of life’s existence, with reference to God or a Higher Being or a supernatural force controlling the universe whereas, the non theistic worldviews such as humanism, atheism or agnosticism connects the meaning and existence to the nature and natural phenomena (Kaplan, 1961; Glock & Stark, 1965). Accordingly, if answering the question of ultimate meaning can be considered as a basic need, then spirituality is a universally relevant value (Niebuhr, 1935; King, 1954; Coles, 1990).

Schwartz (1992) identified spirituality as the 11th dimension of values. Finding inner harmony and meaning of life were defined to as the major motivational goal of spirituality value orientation. Though general spiritual values are universal in nature, the specific spiritual values widely varies across the worldviews and the different religious traditions. However, religion and faith in God is found to play a significant role in promoting moral behaviour in the society.
The fear of a Supreme Being and Judgement of actions are found to promote moral behaviour. Unjust acts against the known scriptural codes provoke strong negative emotions in a religious believer (Mikula, Scherer and Athenstaedt 1998), which induce moral evaluation (Greene & Haidt, 2002) of the actions of the self. The actions that induce feelings of disgust are judged to be immoral even when people cannot offer a logical explanation for their judgment (Haidt et al., 1993). Religious believers perceive violations of their religious code to be offensive to God, and actions that cause offense to other people to be severe moral violations than identical actions that do not (Mikula et al., 1998; Knobe, 2003). The understanding that, actions that cause harm to others are more blameworthy than identical actions that cause no harm, enable an individual to be considerate towards others (Knobe, 2003; Cushman et al., 2006). Former studies in the domain of moral psychology indicates that metaphysical beliefs and religio-spiritual institutional affiliation has significant influence on Moral Competence (Varghese and Raj, 2014; Greene & Haidt, 2002; Mikula et al., 1998).

1.5. Psychological Values: Meaning and Definition

Values and value systems are the key elements involved in understanding Human Behaviour. The Psychological Values and the Value priorities of individuals are vital factors in moral decision making and people tend to approach the moral situations and the moral dilemmas they encounter in day to day life, with reference to their value priorities. Values play a very significant role in the stands people take in all social situations.

Interest in the study of human values has ranged from the abstract contemplation of philosophers, theologians, political theorists, anthropologist and sociologists to the empirical scrutiny of the quantitative psychologists and experimental behaviourists.
Connor and Becker (1975), Allport and Vernon (1931), Allport, Vernon and Lindzey (1960), Gordon (1960/1975), England (1969) and Rokeach (1973) have conducted extensive research based on theory that values are major determinants of individual behaviour.

It is the cultural or the social values that forms the basis of an individual’s personal values. Culture refers to the complex of values, ideas, attitudes and symbols created by man to shape human behaviour and both the social and organizational culture are very real parts of individual’s environment. Functionally, a cultural value system is the set of principles direct and regulates the conducts, providing guidelines both for individuals and social groups. Thus, the value system in which a person lives clearly impinges upon his/her daily life.

According to Kluckhohm (1951), values are a conception of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action. As per Gordon (1975) “Values are constructs representing generalised behaviour or states of affairs that are considered by the individual to be important”. England (1975) defined values similar to that of attitudes but more ingrained, permanent and stable in nature. He also suggested that values are more general and less tied to any specific that is in case with attitudes. Accordingly it is closer to an ideology or philosophy than it is to attitude.

A value system according to Rokeach (1973) is and “enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or enstate of existence along the continuum of relative importance.” They are multifaceted standards leading individuals to take particular position on social issues, predispose of favouring one particular political or religious ideology over another, adopt a worldview, guide presentation of self over others, and provide basis upon which one may evaluate or judge. Thus values provide standards that guide human behaviour.
According to dictionary of psychology (Asch, 2008), “Value is a concept accepted in philosophy, ethics, aesthetics and sociology, and characterising the socio-historical significance for society and personalised meaning for individuals of certain realities”. They refer to the moral, social, aesthetic, economic, and religious concepts accepted either explicitly or implicitly by an individual or a particular society. The Macmillan Dictionary (2015), defines Values as “the principles and beliefs that influence the behaviour and way of life of a particular group or community; the degree to which someone or something is important or useful” etc.

According to the Oxford Dictionary (2015), “Values are Principles or standards of behaviour; one’s judgement of what is important in life.”

Dictionary.com (2015) defines values as; “the ideals, customs, institutions, etc., of a society towards which the people of the group have an affective regard; any object or quality desirable as a means or as an end in itself; the relative worth, merit, or importance; the worth of something in terms of the amount of other things for which it can be exchanged or in terms of some medium of exchange” etc.

According to the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2015), Value is “a principle or standard, as of behaviour, that is considered important or desirable; to rate according to relative estimate of worth or desirability; relating to or consisting of principles or standards” etc.

1.6. Major Approaches to the Study of Values

Study of human values has been of major interest to philosophers, social scientists and psychologists for a long time. Values are major determinants of individual behaviour and some of the prominent theories of values are discussed below.
1.6.1. Study of Values: Allport-Vernon-Lindzey

According to Allport and Vernon (1931) an individual’s philosophy is founded upon the values or basic convictions that he holds about the factors that are important in life. Based on Spranger’s (1928) view that understanding the individual’s value philosophy best captures the essence of a person, Allport and Vernon (1931) created the Study of Values to typify the value orientation of people. In the ‘Study of Values’, Allport and Vernon (1931) and Allport, Vernon & Lindzey (1960) categorized values into six major types Viz. ‘Theoretical,’ ‘Economic,’ ‘Aesthetic,’ ‘Social,’ ‘Political’ and ‘Religious’ similar to the personality types conceptualized by Spranger (1928). The Theoretical value emphasised on the individuals interest in the discovery of truth through reasoning and systematic thinking; Economic value on the usefulness and practicality, including the accumulation of wealth; Aesthetic value in beauty, form and artistic harmony; Social values in people and human relationships; Political value in gaining power and influencing other people; and Religious value in the unity and understanding of the cosmos as a whole.

1.6.2. Milton Rokeach’s Approach

According to Rokeach (1973) values serve as standards to guide not only action but also judgment, choice, attitude, evaluation, argument, exhortation, rationalization, and attribution of causality. In his model, Rokeach proposed a cognitive framework that consists of two sets of values containing 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values respectively. Instrumental values are referred to as beliefs or conceptions about desirable modes of behaviour that are instrumental to the attainment of the desirable end points. Instrumental Values refer to preferable modes of behaviour and they are the means of achieving the terminal values. The Instrumental Values are: 1) cheerfulness
2) ambition 3) love 4) cleanliness 5) self-control 6) capability 7) courage 8) politeness
9) honesty 10) imagination 11) independence 12) intellect 13) broad-mindedness
14) logic 15) obedience 16) helpfulness 17) responsibility and 18) forgiveness.

Terminal values are beliefs or conceptions about ultimate goals of existence that are worth surviving for. Terminal Values refer to desirable enstates of existence. These are the goals that a person would like to achieve during their lifetime and these values vary among different groups of people in different cultures. The terminal values in Rokeach Value theory are: 1) true friendship 2) mature love 3) self-respect 4) happiness 5) inner harmony 6) equality 7) freedom 8) pleasure 9) social recognition 10) wisdom 11) salvation 12) family security 13) national security 14) sense of accomplishment 15) a world of beauty 16) a world at peace 17) a comfortable life and 18) an exciting life.

1.6.3. Goals and Modes of Conduct Theory

Based on Rokeach (1973) model, Braithwaite & Law (1985) proposed the goals and modes of conduct approach to measure personal goals. In this model, the Social Goals and Modes of Conduct contained a set of distinct values which individuals prioritize accordingly. The Goal Values in the approach included 1) internal harmony and equality 2) national strength and order 3) traditional religiosity 4) personal growth and inner harmony 5) physical well being 6) secure and satisfying personal relationships 7) social standing and 8) social stimulation; and the Modes of Conduct Values included 1) positive orientation towards others 2) competence and effectiveness 3) propriety in dress and manner 4) religious commitment 5) assertiveness, and 6) getting ahead.
1.6.4. Schwartz Value Types

Schwartz (1992) defined 'Values' as conceptions of the desirable that influence the way people select action and evaluate events. He along with colleagues carried out empirical research investigating the existence of universal values and hypothesised that universal values would relate to three different types of human needs viz. biological needs, social needs and needs related to the welfare and survival of groups. The results from a series of studies that included surveys of more than 25,000 people in 65 countries with a wide range of different cultural types suggested that there are fifty-six specific values which were later refined into 10 universal values viz. Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self Direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity and Security (Schwartz, 1992/2003). Schwartz also tested an eleventh possible universal value, 'Spirituality', or 'the goal of finding meaning in life', but found that it does not seem to be recognised in all cultures. The power value is characterized by the motivational goal of attainment of social status, prestige and desire to have control over others and resources (Korman, 1974; Schutz, 1958; Schwartz, 2003). The motivational goals of Achievement value are attainment of personal success through demonstration of competence valued by the organization or institution to which the individual belongs (Schwartz, 1992/2003). Hedonism value orientation emphasise on pleasure and sensuous gratification of the self (Freud, 1933; Bentham, 1938 & 1948; Morris, 1956; Williams, 1968; Schwartz, 2003). The motivational goals of Stimulation value are novelty, variety, thrill seeking attitude, excitement and challenge in life (Berlyne, 1960; Maddi, 1961; Houston & Mednick, 1963; Schwartz, 2003). Self-Direction value is differentiated by its motivational goal of independent thought and action, need for autonomy, mastery and control (Kluckhohn, 1951; Morris, 1956; Kohn & Schooler, 1983; Schwartz, 2003). The motivational goals
of Universalism value are tolerance, understanding and protection of the welfare of other individuals and the environment (Schwartz, 1992/2003). Benevolence value emphasizes on the preservation and enhancement of welfare of people with whom one is in frequent contact (Kluckhohn, 1951; Williams, 1968; Maslow, 1959; Korman, 1974; Schwartz, 2003). Tradition values concentrates on respect, commitment, group solidarity and preservation of customs, traditions and ideals of one’s culture or religion (Durkheim, 1912/1954; Parsons, 1957; Radcliffe-Brown, 1952; Schwartz, 2003). Conformity value is distinguished by restraint of action, adherence to social expectation and norms etc. (Freud, 1930; Morris, 1956; Parsons, 1957; Kohn & Schooler, 1983; Schwartz, 2003). The Security value orientation focuses on safety, security of self, harmony and the stability of relations etc. (Kluckhohn, 1951; Maslow, 1959; Williams, 1968; Schwartz, 2003).

1.7. Personality: Meaning and Definition

Personality plays a very vital role in determining human behaviour. Personality Traits are significant determinants of the decisions and approach people take in day to day social and moral situations. The personality dispositions of individuals are major contributing factor of Moral Competence.

There exist multifarious approaches to the study of Personality and the most prominent of them in psychological studies are the type approach and the trait approach. Type approach explores the similarities and resemblances between the personalities of the individuals whereas trait approach explores the persisting characteristics of the personality as traits are considered as the enduring features of individual’s behaviour.
The term personality is derived from the Latin word ‘persona’ meaning a ‘mask’. Personality is a patterned body of habits, traits, attitudes and ideas of an individual as these are organized externally into roles and statuses and as they relate internally to motivation, goals and various aspects of selfhood.

Merriam Webster Dictionary (2015), describes Personality as “the quality or state of being a person; The complex of characteristics that distinguishes an Individual or a Nation or Group: the totality of an individual’s behavioural and emotional characteristics; A set of distinctive traits and characteristics” etc.

The Farlex Trivia dictionary (2011), describes Personality as “the totality of qualities and traits, as of character or behaviour that are peculiar to a specific person; the pattern of collective character, behavioural, temperamental, emotional, and mental traits of a person; distinctive qualities of a person, especially those distinguishing personal characteristics that make one socially appealing” etc.

The Macmillan dictionary (2015), defines Personality as “the countable or uncountable part of a person that makes them behave in a particular way in social situations, for example in a friendly or unfriendly way, or in a confident or shy way; the word character when you are talking about whether someone is good or bad, or honest or dishonest” etc.

The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Heritage (2015), defines Personality as “the visible aspect of one's character as it impresses others; the sum total of the physical, mental, emotional, and social characteristics of an individual; the organized pattern of behavioural characteristics of the individual; the quality of being a person; existence as a self-conscious human being, personal identity” etc.
1.8. Major Approaches to the Study of Personality

In course of the life span development of an individual, and the process of socialization, the personality is acquired through different sources. There are various theories of personality development based on different schools of thought. Some of the major classification of theories in personality includes the following:

1.8.1. Classical Theories

The earliest known theory of personality can be dated back to the Greek physician Hippocrates (460-370B.C.), who identified human behaviour with reference to four temperaments that are determined accordingly by the amount of presence of four types of bodily fluids or humor. Hippocrates identified four personality types viz. sanguine/optimistic, phlegmatic/lethargic, melancholic/depressed and choleric/angry each associated with the body fluids blood, phlegm, black bile and yellow bile respectively (as cited in Arikha, 2008). Sheldon (as cited in Phares, 1991 & Sheldon, 1942) classified personality into three categories based on body types: the endomorphs those who are heavy and easy-going; mesomorphs characterised by muscular build-up and aggressiveness and ectomorphs, thin in built with intellectual or artistic abilities.

1.8.2. Psychodynamic Theories

Psychodynamic theories play the foundational role on most of the modern theories in personality. Twentieth century views on personality have been heavily influenced by the psychodynamic approach and the most prominent psychodynamic theories include Sigmund Freud’s psychosexual stage theory and Erik Erikson’s theory of psychosocial development. Freud (1923) proposed a three-part personality structure consisting of the id (concerned with the gratification of basic instincts), the ego (which mediates between the demands of the id and the constraints of society),
and the superego (through which parental and social values are internalized). In contrast to type or trait theories of personality, the dynamic model proposed by Freud involved an ongoing element of conflict, and it was these conflicts that Freud saw as the primary determinant of personality. According to Erikson (1950/1958) the “personality development occurs in a series of stages and each stage is characterized by a set of conflicts.” Success in each stage depends on how well the person overcome and tackles with the conflicts of that stage.

1.8.3. Behavioural Theories

The behaviourist approach explains personality as a pattern of learned behaviours acquired through conditioning shaped by reinforcement in the form of rewards or punishment. Personality, in behaviourist approach is studied in terms of the effect of stimuli on behaviour. The learning-conditioning theories were a radical shift from the widely accepted Freudian philosophy and behaviourism strongly emphasised the role of scientific thinking and experimentation in the study of psychology. The behaviourist school traces its origin in the classical conditioning studies of Pavlov (1902), which demonstrated that learning results out of the Paired-Associate learning continuum. Pavlov’s experiments with dogs displayed a conditioned response of salivation to ringing of bell (conditioned stimulus) in place food (unconditioned stimulus). Skinner (1938) emphasized the role of mutual interaction of the person with the environment, in the development of personality. According to him, children repeat the actions that obtain attention, which acts as a reinforcement in learning of the behaviour. In response to a situation (stimulus) the child cries (response) if crying has led to attention (reinforcement) in the previous similar instance. Accordingly, the reinforcements lead to operant conditioning characterized by learning of the behaviour. Operant conditioning explains the learning of a
behaviour based on a Stimulus-Response-Consequence model. According to Herrnstein (1970), attitudes and traits with genetic/biological property are developed when the response strength i.e. the tendency to respond in the presence of a group of stimuli becomes stable. Bandura (1977) emphasised the role of imitation in learning and according to him, the accumulation of personality characteristics takes place by observation and learning of desirable behaviour from significant others.

1.8.4. Humanistic Theories

Humanistic theories emphasize the importance of free will and individual experience in the development of personality. Prominent humanistic theorists include Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow and the humanistic psychologists were greatly influenced by the existential philosophies of Hussrel, Hiedegger and Kierkegaard. Humanistic theories emphasise the need of Self-actualization, which according to the school of thought is the vital factor that motivates behaviour. Individuals become self-actualizing persons if their basic needs are adequately met (Maslow, 1943). Qualities of a self actualized person includes Awareness (satisfaction and happiness in life), Reality and Problem centeredness (concerned about the problems in the surroundings), Acceptance/Spontaneity (accepting situations that cannot be changed), Democratic and Unhostile sense of humour.

1.8.5. Biological Approach

Biological approach holds that personality is the outcome of genes and other biological factors. According to the theorists, ‘Genes’ provide numerous options for varying cells to be expressed; and the environment determines which of these options to be activated (Gazzaniga & Heatherton, 2006). DNA-Environment interactions are important in the development of personality and changes in DNA in individuals
determines the uniqueness of a person as well as differences between individuals in shape, bodily features, abilities, intellect etc. which ultimately develop a consistent personality (Marcus, 2004). According to Eysenck (1947) introverts have high cortical arousal which leads them to avoid stimulation and extroverts have low cortical arousal which causes them to seek out stimulating experiences.

1.8.6. Type Theories

Personality type refers to the psychological classification of different types of people. The type theories suggested that there are a limited number of "personality types" based on certain psychological features of individuals. Spranger (1928) based his personality theory on value attitudes and he emphasised six fundamental values viz. Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetics, Social, Political and Religious that corresponds to the personality type of individuals. One of the most influential ideas originated in the theoretical work of Jung (1921) (as cited in Daryl, 1987; Jung, 1971). Jung categorized people into primary types of psychological function. Jung proposed the existence of two dichotomous pairs of cognitive functions; Thinking (function of intellectual cognition; the forming of logical conclusions) Vs Feeling (function of subjective estimation); and Sensation (perception by means of the sense organs) Vs Intuition (perceiving in unconscious way or perception of unconscious contents) which are expressed along with the attitudes in an introverted or extraverted form. As per Jung (1971) the human mind is an apparatus capable of adaptation and orientation and performs numerous psychic functions. Thinking and feeling are rational function of mind, while sensation and intuition are non-rational. The personality types in Jung’s model are determined by the combination of functions and attitudes one from each pair of Extraversion (E)/Introversion (I), Intuition (N)/Sensing(S), Thinking (T)/Feeling (F), Judgement (J)/Perception (P), forming 16 personality types.
On the hand, Friedman and Rosenman (1959) classified personality into Type A and Type B behaviour patterns and theorized that individuals with Type A personalities take higher level of stress and they are at higher risk of coronary diseases whereas the type B are less competitive, more relaxed and takes lower amount of risks. Holland (1966/1973) developed the RIASEC vocational model referred to as Holland Codes identifying 6 personality types that leads people to choose career paths.

1.8.7. Trait Theories

According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, APA (1994), personality traits are "enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts." The trait approach is one of the largely studied areas within personality psychology. The trait theorists view personality as the result of internal characteristics of an individual and a trait is basically a relatively stable characteristic that causes an individual to behave in certain ways. Thus the personality is made up of a number of broad traits.

Allport (1937) delineated different kinds of traits or dispositions and extensively investigated the ways in which traits combine to form normal personalities. Allport catalogued over 18,000 separate traits over a period of 30 years and differentiated them into Central Traits (those are basic to the individual’s personality) and Secondary Traits (peripheral traits). There are also Common Traits (that are culture specific) and Cardinal traits (traits by which an individual is uniquely recognized). He proposed that each person has about seven central traits that dominate his/her behaviour.
Cattell (1957) reduced Allport's extensive list to 16 fundamental groups of inter-related characteristics, and Eysenck (1968) claimed that personality could be described based on three fundamental factors: psychoticism (characterised by antisocial traits of cruelty and no adherence to social customs), introversion/extroversion, and emotionality/stability (also called neuroticism). Eysenck also formulated a quadrant based on intersecting emotional-stable and introverted-extroverted axes namely stable extraverts, unstable extraverts, stable introverts and unstable introverts.

Goldberg (1990) proposed a five-dimension personality model, nicknamed the "Big Five" Model. The five traits in the Big Five model include Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to Experience. Extraversion is characterised by affection, sociable and fun-living nature; Agreeableness, by soft-heartedness, helping mentality and trust; Conscientious individuals are well organized, disciplined and careful; Neuroticism is characterised by anxiety, insecurity, and self-pity; and Openness to Experience upholds the qualities of independence, imagination, and interest in variety.

Ashton and Lee (2008) proposed a six-dimensional HEXACO model of personality structure. The HEXACO personality traits are Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraverionsion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O). In the HEXACO model, Honesty-Humility, Emotionality and Agreeableness differ from the Neuroticism and Agreeableness factors of the Big Five Model. The role of Honesty-Humility (H) factor differentiates the HEXACO model from the former personality frameworks and the attributes of Honesty-Humility factor includes sincerity, honesty, loyalty, modesty, fair-mindedness etc.
1.9. Emotional Intelligence: Meaning and Definition

Emotional Intelligence is a major determinant of Moral Competence and it involves the ability to recognize the meaning of emotions and their relationships, and resolve the problems on the basis of them. Emotional intelligence enables individuals to understand and regulate the emotions in self and others, that are the most required qualities for moral thinking and moral decision making.

Emotional Intelligence is “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in self and others” (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2000). Understanding the concept of emotional intelligence requires exploring its two component terms ‘emotion’ and ‘intelligence’. Emotions include moods, evaluations and feeling states that include fatigue and energy whereas Intelligence pertains to abilities such as the ‘power to combine and separate’ concepts to judge and to reason, and to engage in abstract thought. According to Goleman (1995) Emotional Intelligence involves self control, zeal, persistence, and the ability to motivate oneself. According to Mayer and Salovey (1993), Emotional Intelligence is a set of abilities that account for how people’s emotional perception and understanding vary in their accuracy.

Emotional intelligence is the ability to identify, assess, and control the emotions of oneself, of others, and of groups. According to the online dictionary from google.com (2015), Emotional Intelligence is “the capacity to be aware of, control, and express one's emotions, and to handle interpersonal relationships judiciously and empathetically”. Emotional Intelligence is predictive of success at home, at school, at work place etc. and it helps to distinguish genuine and warm people from the obvious. Emotional Intelligence assists people in team work, cooperating with others, work more efficiently and improving interpersonal relationships.
American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2015), defines Emotional Intelligence as “the Intelligence regarding the emotions, especially in the ability to monitor one's own or others' emotions.”

According to the Collins English Dictionary (2015), Emotional Intelligence is “the 'awareness of one's own emotions and moods and those of others, especially in managing people.”

Oxford Learners dictionary (2015), defines Emotional Intelligence as “the ability to understand one’s emotions and those of other people and to behave appropriately in different situations.”

Macmillan Dictionary (2015) defines Emotional Intelligence as the ability to understand own personal feelings and those of other people, and to consider other people’s feelings when making decisions.”

According to Businessdictionary.com (2015), Emotional Intelligence is “the ability to identify, assess and influence one's own feelings and those of others.”

1.10. Major Models of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive, control and evaluate emotions; and from the theoretical perspectives it refers to the interaction of emotion and intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi, 2001). Mayer and Salovey (1997) define Emotional Intelligence as the capacity to reason ‘about emotions’, and ‘of emotions’ to enhance thinking. According to Goleman (1998) Emotional Intelligence is the capacity for organizing one’s own feelings and those of others, for motivating oneself, and for managing emotions well in self and in personal relationships. Some of the prominent models of Emotional Intelligence are discussed below.
1.10.1. Ability Model

Salovey & Mayer (1990) defined Emotional Intelligence as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions”. They proposed a model that identified four different abilities viz. Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions, Understanding Emotions and Managing Emotions. Perceiving emotions is characterized by the ability to detect and decipher emotions in faces, pictures, voices, and cultural artefacts—including the ability to identify one's own emotions. Perceiving emotions represents a basic aspect of emotional intelligence, as it makes all other processing of emotional information possible. Using emotions refers to the ability to harness emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities, such as thinking and problem solving. An emotionally intelligent person can capitalize fully upon his or her changing moods in order to best fit the task at hand. Understanding emotions include the ability to comprehend emotions in language and to appreciate complicated relationships among emotions. Managing emotions refers to the ability to regulate emotions in both self and in others. Therefore, an emotionally intelligent person can harness even negative emotions, and manage them to achieve intended goals (Mayer & Salovey 1997).

1.10.2. Bar-On Model

Bar-On (1997) defined emotional intelligence as the concern with effective understanding of oneself and others, relating well to people, and adapting to and coping with the immediate surroundings to be more successful in dealing with environmental demands. According to Bar-On, the emotional intelligence develops over time and it can be improved through training, programming, and therapy. The model theorized that individuals with higher than average EQs are in general
more successful in meeting environmental demands and pressures and deficiency in EI can mean a lack of success and the existence of emotional problems. Problems in coping with one's environment are thought, by Bar-On, to be especially common among those individuals lacking in the subscales of reality testing, problem solving, stress tolerance, and impulse control. In general, Bar-On considers emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence to contribute equally to a person's general intelligence, which then offers an indication of one's potential to succeed in life.

1.10.3. Mixed Model

The model introduced by Goleman (1995) focused on emotional intelligence as a wide array of competencies and skills that drive leadership performance. Goleman's model outlines five main constructs of Emotional Intelligence. The constructs identified by Goleman are Self Awareness, Self Regulation, Social Skill, Empathy and Motivation Goleman (1995/1998). Self-awareness refers to the ability to know one's emotions, strengths, weaknesses, drives, values, goals etc. and recognize their impact on others while using gut feelings to guide decisions. Self-regulation involves controlling or redirecting one's disruptive emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances. Social skill refers to the ability to manage relationships to move people in the desired direction. Empathy refers to the consideration towards others feelings especially when making decisions and Motivation that refers to the drive to achieve for the sake of achievement. A certain set of emotional competencies is identified with each of the emotional intelligence construct. Goleman posits that individuals are born with a general emotional intelligence that determines their potential for learning emotional competencies which are not innate talents, but rather learned capabilities that must be worked on and can be developed to achieve outstanding performance.
1.10.4. Trait Model

Trait Emotional Intelligence is a constellation of emotional self-perceptions located at the lower levels of personality and it is the individual’s self-perceptions of their emotional abilities. Petrides & Furnham (2001) proposed a conceptual distinction between the ability based model and a trait based model of Emotional Intelligence. This definition encompasses behavioural dispositions and self perceived abilities and is measured by self report, as opposed to the ability based model which refers to actual abilities, which have proven highly resistant to scientific measurement. An alternative label for the same construct is trait emotional self-efficacy. The conceptualization of EI as a personality trait leads to a construct that lies outside the taxonomy of human cognitive ability. The trait model proposed four distinguishing traits of emotional intelligence viz. Well-being, Emotionality, Sociability and Self-control (Petrides & Furnham, 2006). Well-being refers to the extent to which an individual feels happy, fulfilled and positive about past achievements and future expectations. Self-control is the ability of the individuals to have a healthy degree of control over their urges and desires. Emotionality refers to the internal belief of the individuals that they have a wide range of emotion-related skills. Sociability is the ability of the individuals to emphasise and manage social relationships and social influences.

The theories and the perspectives on the nature of moral development and Moral Competence, metaphysical beliefs, values, personality, emotional intelligence etc. discussed above are directly concerned with human behaviour at large. Man, being a social organism has his identity in relation to the society where he dwells. Moral Competence is a vital factor of human interactions in the society, and
based on the theoretical perspectives, this study focuses on exploring the effect of Metaphysical Beliefs, Religio-Spiritual Institutional Affiliation, Values, Personality Traits and Emotional Intelligence on Moral Competence.

1.11. Need for the Study

Any research pertaining to Morality and Moral Competence bears high significance in the contemporary society. The moral orientation of the world societies are changing at a faster pace and the moral values that the world societies upheld are diminishing and gradually losing its meaning (Varghese and Raj, 2014a). There are multifarious theories and views existing on the question of the various aspects of morality. However, very less attempts are found in the literature, studying the concept of Moral Competence in multicultural context or in the universal scenario. In the context of the present day society, understanding the agents behind the individual morality and Moral Competence; and the factors of social morality bears a high significance. Since, Social development is directly dependent on the development of individuals in that society, identification of the key influencing factors of Moral Competence and the type of its relationship with the variables will substantially contribute in working towards invention of competency based psychological training modules for moral education with a socio-centric approach. Deeper researches in this area both from the academic point of view and social point of view would be highly relevant in framing psychological and educational interventions for moral competency enhancement. This study is an attempt to explore the various psycho-social factors that determine the Moral Competence in a universal context and intents to be a fore runner in devising psychological interventions in the area of improving Moral Competence.
1.12. Objectives of the Study

Any psychological research is carried out with definite objectives. The theme focus of this research is the study of Moral Competence in relation to its relationship with Metaphysical Beliefs, Religio-Spiritual Institutional Affiliations, Value Orientation, Personality Traits and Emotional Intelligence in a global sample. The current research is carried out with the following objectives:

- To find whether the levels of Moral Competence differ between genders.

- To find whether the level of Moral Competence varies in individuals with age.

- To find out if there is any difference in the levels of Moral Competence between the Indians and the non-Indians.

- To find out the levels of Moral Competence in the sample of Indian Population and find if Indians from different regions differ on Moral Competence.

- To find if metaphysical beliefs such as Faith in God or a Higher Being, Belief in Afterlife and the Belief in the Influence of Present life on Afterlife influence Moral Competence.

- To find whether the levels of Moral Competence vary according to the Religio-Spiritual Institutional affiliations of the individuals.

- To find if the specific value orientation of individuals have any influence on moral competency and identify the specific influence of the values like Conformity, Tradition, Benevolence, Universalism, Self Direction, Stimulation, Hedonism, Achievement, Power and Security on Moral Competence.
• To find if the personality traits like Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to Experience have any influence on Moral Competence.

• To find if the Moral Competence is influenced by Emotional Intelligence traits such as Well-being, Self-control, Emotionality and Sociability.

1.13. Operational Definitions of the Terms Used in the Study

Moral Competence: Moral Competence is the capacity to act in accordance with moral principles (Kohlberg, 1964; Lennick & Kiel, 2005) and it is the active application of Moral Intelligence. In the context of this study Moral Competence refers to the ability of an individual to perform moral action or it is the measure of the consistency of moral behaviour (Varghese & Raj 2014e). Measure of Moral Competence in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

Integrity: Integrity refers to the extent to which individuals’ acts consistently with their principles, values and beliefs. Integrity is a concept of consistency of actions, values, methods, measures, principles, expectations, and outcomes. Integrity is a personal choice, an uncompromising and predictably consistent commitment to honour moral values and norms. Measure of Integrity in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Acting consistently with principles, values and beliefs’ ie, the Integrity subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

Honesty: Honesty refers to a facet of moral character and indicates positive and virtuous attributes such as truthfulness and straightforwardness, including straightforwardness of conduct, along with the absence of lying, cheating, theft, etc.
Furthermore, honesty means being fair, and sincere. Measure of Honesty in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Telling the truth’ ie, the Honesty subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

**Moral Courage:** Moral Courage in the context of this study is the ability to stand up for what is right and it is the willingness to confront fear, pain, danger, uncertainty, or intimidation. Moral courage is the courage to take action for moral reasons despite the risk of adverse consequences and is the ability to act rightly in the face of popular opposition, shame, scandal, or discouragement. Moral courage therefore involves deliberation or careful thought. In other words it is the righteous sense of universal justice coupled with the courage to act in the situation without regard to self and consequences. Measure of Moral Courage in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Standing up for what is right’ ie, the Moral Courage subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

**Trustworthiness:** Trustworthiness is the trait of deserving trust and confidence. Trustworthiness in the context of this study refers to ability of individuals to keep promises and it is also the measure of dependability and reliability of individuals. Trustworthy individuals are truthful, loyal and worthy of confidence. Measure of Trustworthiness in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Keeping promises’ ie, the Trustworthiness subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

**Responsibility:** Responsibility, in the context of this study refers to the state or fact of being accountable for personal choices. People having sense of responsibility consider themselves accountable for their actions and for the situations around them. Measure of Responsibility in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Taking responsibility for personal choices’ ie, the Responsibility subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).
**Humility:** Humility synonyms in this study with the ability to admit one’s own mistakes and failures. In a broader sense, it refers to the moral quality or condition of being humble; modest opinion or estimate of one's own importance, rank, etc. Humility also involves the act or posture of lowering oneself in relation to others, or conversely, having a clear perspective, and therefore respect, for one's place in context. Measure of Humility in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Admitting mistakes and failures’ ie, the Humility subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

**Altruism:** Altruism refers to selflessness and in the context of this study Altruism is the ability of individuals to embrace responsibility to serve others. Altruistic individuals take steps beyond their ways to help others without selfish motives and spend significant amount of their personal time and resources for the benefit of others. Measure of Altruism in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Embracing responsibility for serving others’ ie, the Altruism subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

**Compassion:** Compassion is a process of connecting by identifying with another person and actively caring about others. This identification with others through compassion can lead to increased motivation to do something in an effort to relieve the suffering of others. In other words Compassion is the moral feeling or the sympathetic pity and concern for the sufferings or misfortunes of others which motivates a desire to help. More involved than simple empathy, compassion commonly gives rise to an active desire to alleviate another's suffering. Measure of Compassion in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Actively caring about others’ ie, the Compassion subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).
**Self-Forgiveness:** Self-Forgiveness in this study refers to the ability to let go of one’s own mistakes. Self-Forgiveness is a trait that supports and enables an individual to learn from past mistakes and failures. It also refers to impartial and unprejudiced judgement of the mistakes committed by self and the failures in the past. Measure of Self-Forgiveness in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Ability to let go of one’s own mistakes’ ie, the Self-Forgiveness subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

**Other-Forgiveness:** Other-Forgiveness in this study identifies with the ability to let go of others mistakes. Forgiveness is the intentional and voluntary process by which a person undergoes a change in feelings and attitude regarding an offense or offender and let go of negative emotions such as vengefulness, with an increased ability to wish the offender well. Measure of Other-Forgiveness in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the ‘Ability to let go of others’ mistakes’ ie, the Other-Forgiveness subscale of the Moral Competency Inventory (Lennik & Keil, 2005).

**Personality Traits:** Personality traits are distinguishing qualities or characteristics of a person. Traits enable an individual to think or act in a similar or consistent fashion in response to a variety of different stimuli or situations. There are five common personality traits and they are extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience and neuroticism

**Extraversion:** Extraversion is marked by pronounced engagement with the external world. Extraverts enjoy interacting with people, and are often perceived as full of energy. They tend to be enthusiastic, action-oriented individuals and they possess high group visibility, like to talk, and assert themselves. Characteristics of extraversion are energy, positive emotions, assertiveness, sociability and the tendency
to seek stimulation in the company of others and talkativeness. Measure of Extraversion in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Extraversion subscale of the Big Five Inventory-10 (Rammstedt & John, 2007).

**Agreeableness:** Agreeableness is a measure of one's trusting and helpful nature, and whether a person is generally well tempered or not. The agreeableness trait reflects individual differences in general concern for social harmony. Agreeable individuals’ value relations and easily get along with others. They are generally considerate, kind, generous, trusting and trustworthy, helpful, and willing to compromise their interests with others. Agreeable people also have an optimistic view of human nature and are compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. Measure of Agreeableness in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Agreeableness subscale of the Big Five Inventory-10 (Rammstedt & John, 2007).

**Conscientiousness:** Conscientiousness is characterised with the tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement against measures or outside expectations. It is related to the way in which people control, regulate and direct their impulses. High scores on conscientiousness indicate a preference for planned rather than spontaneous behaviour. Measure of Conscientiousness in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Conscientiousness subscale of the Big Five Inventory-10 (Rammstedt & John, 2007).

**Neuroticism:** Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability or is reversed and referred to as emotional stability. Neuroticism is interlinked with low tolerance for stress or aversive stimuli. Those who score high in neuroticism are emotionally reactive and vulnerable to stress (Damodaran, Varghese & Paul, 2015). Neurotic individuals are likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening and
minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. Their negative emotional reactions tend to persist for unusually long periods of time, which means they are often in a bad mood. Measure of Neuroticism in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Neuroticism subscale of the Big Five Inventory-10 (Rammstedt & John, 2007).

Openness to Experience: Openness is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity, and variety of experience. People who are open to experience are intellectually curious, open to emotion, sensitive to beauty and willing to try new things. They tend to be more creative and more aware of their feelings and they are also more likely to hold unconventional beliefs. Measure of Openness to Experience in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Openness to Experience subscale of the Big Five Inventory-10 (Rammstedt & John, 2007).

Emotional Intelligence: Emotional intelligence (EI) refers to the ability to perceive, control and evaluate emotions. It is either the subset of social intelligence, that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions. Measure of Emotional Intelligence in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Petrides & Furnham, 2006).

Well-being: Well-being refers to the extent to which an individual feels happy and fulfilled and positive about past achievements and future expectations. Individuals who score high in Well-being tend to have high self-regard and possess the ability to tackle disappointments in life. Measure of Well-being in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Well-being subscale of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Petrides & Furnham, 2006).
Self-control: Self-control is the ability of the individuals to have a healthy degree of control over their urges and desires. In addition to fending off impulses, people having good Self-control are good at regulating external pressures and stress. They are neither repressed nor overly expressive. In contrast, low scorers are prone to impulsive behaviour and seem to be incapable of managing stress. Low self-control is associated with inflexibility. Measure of Self-control in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Self-control subscale of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Petrides & Furnham, 2006).

Emotionality: Emotionality refers to the internal belief of the individuals’ regarding the wide range of emotion-related skills they possess. Individuals high in emotionality perceive and express emotions and use these abilities to develop and sustain close relationships with others. Individuals with low scores on this factor find it difficult to recognize their internal emotional states and to express their feelings to others, which often lead to less rewarding personal relationships. Measure of Emotionality in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Emotionality subscale of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Petrides & Furnham, 2006).

Sociability: Sociability refers to the ability of the individuals to emphasise and manage social relationships and social influences. Individuals with high scores on the sociability factor are better at social interaction. They believe that they have good listening skills and can communicate clearly and confidently with people from very diverse backgrounds. Those with low scores believe they are unable to affect others’ emotions and are less likely to be good negotiators or networkers. They are unsure what to do or say in social situations and, as a result, they often appear shy and reserved. Measure of Sociability in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Sociability subscale of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Petrides & Furnham, 2006).
Conformity: Conformity is the value orientation with emphasis on control of action, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms (Schwartz, 1992). Conformity values are mentioned in virtually all value analyses (Freud, 1930; Morris, 1956; Parsons, 1957; Kohn & Schooler, 1983) and it is derived from the requirement that individuals inhibit inclinations that might be socially disruptive in order for personal interaction and group functioning to run smoothly. Conformity values emphasize self-restraint in everyday interaction, usually with close others. Conformity value promotes obedience, self-discipline, politeness, honour etc. Measure of Conformity value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Conformity subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

Tradition: The motivational goal of tradition values is respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that one's culture or religion imposes on the individuals (Schwartz, 1992). A traditional mode of behaviour becomes a symbol of the group's solidarity and an expression of its unique worth and, hopefully, its survival (Sumner, 1906). Traditional modes of behaviour become symbols of the group’s solidarity, expressions of its unique worth, and presumed guarantors of its survival (Durkheim, 1912/1954; Parsons, 1957). Traditions most often take the form of religious rites, beliefs, and norms of behaviour (Radcliffe-Brown, 1952). Measure of Tradition value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Tradition subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

Benevolence: The motivational goal of benevolent values is to preserve and enhance the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact (Schwartz, 1992). Benevolence value focuses on the concern for the welfare of others in everyday interactions, to promote the flourishing of the groups (Kluckhohn, 1951; Williams, 1968)
and need for affiliation (Maslow, 1959; Korman, 1974). Measure of Benevolence value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Benevolence subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

**Universalism:** The motivational goal of universalism is the understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection of the welfare for all people and for nature (Schwartz, 1992). Universalism values are derived from those survival needs of groups and individuals that become apparent when people come into contact with those outside the extended primary group and become aware of the scarcity of natural resources (Schwartz, 1992). Measure of Universalism value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Universalism subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

**Self Direction:** The motivational goal of this value type is independent thought and action like choosing, creating, exploring etc. (Schwartz, 1992). Self-Direction comes from the need for control and mastery (White, 1959; Bandura, 1977; Deci, 1975) along with the need for autonomy and independence (Kluckhohn, 1951; Morris, 1956; Kohn & Schooler, 1983). Measure of Self Direction value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Self-Direction subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

**Stimulation:** The motivational goal of stimulation values is excitement, novelty, and challenge in life (Schwartz, 1992). This value type is derived from the need for variety and stimulation in order to maintain an optimal level of activation (Berlyne, 1960; Maddi, 1961; Houston & Mednick, 1963). Thrill seeking can be the result of strong stimulation needs. Measure of Stimulation value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Stimulation subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).
Hedonism: The motivational goal of this type of value is pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself (Schwartz, 1992). This value type is derived from physical needs and the pleasure associated with satisfying them (Freud, 1933; Bentham, 1938/1948; Morris, 1956; Williams, 1968). Measure of Hedonism value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Hedonism subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

Achievement: The primary goal of achievement value is personal success through demonstrated competence. Achievement values emphasize demonstrating competence in terms of prevailing cultural standards, thereby obtaining social approval (Schwartz, 1992). Measure of Achievement value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Achievement subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

Power: The motivational goal of power values is the attainment of social status and prestige, and the control or dominance over people and resources (Schwartz, 1992). Power values may also be transformations of the individual needs for dominance and control identified by analysts of social motives (Korman, 1974; Schutz, 1958). Measure of Power value orientation in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Power subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).

Security: The motivational goal of security value orientation is safety, harmony, and stability of society or relationships, and of self (Schwartz, 1992). It derives from basic individual and group requirements (Kluckhohn, 1951; Maslow, 1959; Williams, 1968). Measure of Security value in this study is the effective score of the subjects in the Security subscale of the Portrait Value Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2003).
**Metaphysical Beliefs:** Metaphysics deals with the fundamental quest of the human mind concerning the understanding of ‘being’, ‘existence’ and ‘beyond’ and the Metaphysical beliefs are the specific beliefs of individuals pertaining to that. The specific metaphysical beliefs taken for this study are ‘Faith in God’, Belief in Afterlife, and the ‘Belief in the Influence of the Present Life on Afterlife’ (Varghese & Raj, 2014e).

**Afterlife:** Afterlife is the concept of life after death which is prevalent in majority of the worldviews, religions and cultural traditions. Though the nature of beliefs differs among the worldviews, most of them are centred on the concepts of eternity of the soul, reincarnation or rebirth, renewed life in heaven, life in a paradise or new earth etc. or a continued existence in some conscious form (Varghese & Raj 2014e).

**Religio-Spiritual Institutional Affiliation:** Religio-Spiritual Institutional affiliation refers to the specific religious beliefs and affiliation of individuals to a specific system or worldview pertaining to a higher being, beyond self. Though there and many things in common, the world religions basically differ on their concepts of God, Afterlife, judgement, salvation, moral and spiritual obligations, etc. (Varghese & Raj 2014e).