CHAPTER - II

THEORETICAL VIEWPOINTS

Piaget's theory of moral judgement and its development forms the conceptual framework of the present study. The nature of moral judgement is discerned in terms of its chronological and developmental sequence in the perspective of Piaget's viewpoints. However, before this an attempt has been made to place the concept of moral judgement within a more comprehensive and broader conceptual structure of moral development. Subsequently, the theoretical viewpoints of moral judgement and its development has been visualized as related to environmental factors, more specifically to home and school environment.

The evidence (Brown, 1967; Issac, 1966; Price, 1967) supplied by contemporary research into children's morality makes it clear that one can speak confidently of moral development. In normal social relationships one comes to expect different kinds of moral conducts from infants as distinct from adolescents and respondents behaviour towards both is modified accordingly. It is true, that different research projects have
produced varying conclusions, yet in the main they all agree on the essential that children develop morally just as they develop intellectually, socially and physically thereby, urging the understanding of the fundamental postulates of human growth and development (Kay, 1968).

There are at least four different ways to view the process of development namely, (a) things grow either qualitatively or quantitatively; (b) they fall into two groups those which develop by a slow uniform transition from lower to higher levels and those which grow by passing through critical points, each of which marks the end of one stage and the beginning of another; (c) development may either follow a predetermined course or appear to be haphazard; and (d) some growth appears to be almost entirely the result of genetic heritage, while in other aspects environment plays the major role as agent of this development.

In certain respects, the moral development of children proceeds quantitatively. The attitude of responsibility, altruism, independence and rationality, for example, emerge in childhood and slowly mature. The different stages of morality may not only be clearly defined and easily recognized, but also are located in a fixed sequence.

A young child is clearly controlled by authoritarian considerations, while an adolescent is capable of applying
personal moral principles. These two moralities are not only clearly distinct but can be located one at beginning and the other at the end of a process of moral maturation.

There is interplay between the quantitative and qualitative elements which makes it difficult to analyse a person's moral development with complete certainty. However, in general, one may trace moral growth through a series of sequential and qualitatively different stages and also along a line of growth marked by quantitatively increasing stability and complexity.

It is difficult to say whether moral development is a result of nurture or nature. Such a multitude of immeasurable variables is subsumed in its concept and they interact in such intricate ways that it is difficult to determine the exact relative influence of each. However, moral development at any time is an integration based upon biological factors on the one hand and certain conditionings stimulated by the environment, on the other.

"Morals are simply the conduct of patterns which man in association with other men over centuries have found most productive of the human happiness and welfare." (Brubacher, 1962). Although the inculcation of moral values begins with infancy, the preconditions of morality such as identity, self-acceptance, identification, fully formed conscience, success and
achievement, must be established before moral growth is possible. A sense of identity is necessary before an individual can become autonomous. Self-acceptance enables him to make valid moral judgements. Identification facilitates those paradigmatic experiences without which a child has little to guide his early conduct. A mature and formed conscience provides the inward validation of such judgements. Success and achievement cause all the elements to cohere which are then confirmed by the attendant positive reinforcement (Kay, 1968).

Educators are increasingly accepting the view that a pattern of development can be discerned in every area of a child's personality (Gesell, 1956; Buber, 1958; Hemming, 1960). This is not quite simple as one would expect. Inspite of its sequential order moral conduct is extremely complex and often very difficult to analyse with complete certainty.

Macaulay and Watkins (1925-26) reported that there was a general pattern in moral development in their study on school children of every age group, whereas Hartshorne and May (1928-30) were convinced that it was not so. Thus, the two earliest works present two apparently incompatible and diagrametically opposed conclusions. The subsequent criticism of the Hartshorne and May conclusions suggest that moral behaviour is not as specific as they suggest. Yet, this does not mean that a scheme as simple and unspecific as Macaulay and Watkins proposed has to be accepted. The truth seems to be somewhere between the two extreme views.
Piaget's work (1932) marks a further stage in the emergence of some scheme of moral development. In the early stages of moral development, Piaget found that children regarded rules to be not only obligatory but also inviolable. At this point the coercive rules, it seemed, reflect parental authority. These rules, like parents, had to be obeyed without question. Later, as a result of social interaction and co-operation it is seen that rules are not absolute, but are relative to society. Piaget then, passed on to the nature of children's moral judgement. He found a growing pattern of operational thinking in children's moral judgement, and psychologically speaking, this described the process in children of passing from pre-moral to genuine moral judgement. In the growth one must expect to find the internalizing of rules and admission of reversibility in their application. This in fact, is what his research indicates. Piaget (1932) concluded his research findings by reporting that a developmental pattern can be traced when the child moves from one stage to another, and when he moves from morality of constraint towards morality of cooperation.

While the balance was thus, tipped slightly in favour of a developmental pattern, Piaget (1932) added his conclusion of tracing out a clear developmental pattern in his study and brought the scale down heavily on this side. His conclusions were criticized heavily by Issacs (1934) who rejected Piaget's developmental stages; and Lerner (1937) was
convinced that Piaget had been far too superficial in his view of morality as adult constraint. Mac Rae (1954-) too, was a critic of Piaget. For Mac Rae the stages of development were an illusory corollary of methodology. However, one can find support for the Piagetian position in the work of Brennan (1965). He sustained the view that one may clearly discern four stages in the growth of moral judgement. Goldman (1964) too, had supported Piaget in an oblique way. His work has been the most comprehensive confirmation of the Piagetian scheme. But despite the criticism, Piaget's view that one can trace a scheme of moral development seems to be assured by at least two considerations. Firstly, Piaget's subsequent work in other fields has confirmed this general development view. Secondly, many later studies of moral development have each presented a similar development scheme.

Havighurst and Taba (1949) suggested that a development pattern could be discerned. This is based on the fact that different personality types emerge in the maturational process and these types display common patterns of moral behaviour. The work of Gesell (1946-56) revealed a vague generalized Piagetian type scheme of moral judgement. McKnight (1950) showed clearly that different moral controls coincide with different stages of mental and physical development. Finally, Peck and Havighurst (1960) made it perfectly clear that their motivational theory of morality lends support to the general
Piagetian view. Behind moral behaviour, consistent though it may appear to be, lies a pattern of sequential development which preserves continuity of conduct as a child grows up, wherein a clear scheme of moral development can be traced. This scheme is apparent as children grow from childhood to adolescence. There are clearly defined stages in this process. Specific kinds of control are indigenous to each stage. And these controls can be interpreted in terms of moral judgement, social relations, personality structure or moral sanctions.

Moral development has various elements, but no one element exists independently of others. Firstly, there is the simple view that moral development passes through different stages and the behaviour characteristic of each stage can be clearly described. Secondly, this development can be understood in terms of the different sanctions which govern moral behaviour. This is rather more complicated and involves one in a study of the varying motives underlying behaviour at different stages of development. Third viable alternative is the study of moral judgement. This is not so much concerned with behaviour and its motivation as with the developing maturity of moral judgement. Obviously, actual behaviour and the motives behind it are important too, but the emphasis here is on the intellectual element involved in judgements made concerning moral problems. Finally, moral development can be viewed in terms of insights provided by psychology. Here the actual
personality of the individual is linked with his behaviour and his stage of psycho-social development.

The elements of moral development can thus, be teased out into the following four categories:

1. Simple stages of development
2. Moral sanctions
3. Moral judgement
4. Psycho-social development.

The present study, is basically concerned with the development of moral judgement.

Moral Judgement and Its Development:

Moral Judgement is presumably cognitive in form, that is, it is an aspect of intellectual activity. The study of moral judgement inevitably leads one to consider the relatively clear and comprehensible activity of human thought. It looks as if one is entering the ordered area of logical thinking (Kay, 1968).

But it is not to be expected that human motives are amenable to logical analysis. It is accepted without question that ordinary people everyday of their lives, are prompted to act morally. At the same time without feeling it incumbent upon them either to explain the reason for their behaviour or
to supply a logical explanation of their conduct, they say, 'I just felt that I had to do it'; and the normal person accepts this without question since it echoes his own moral experience (Kay, 1968).

But this does not apply to moral judgement. Here the individual is primarily involved in cognitive activity. He is applying his mind to a moral problem. Just as he would solve a logical problem and reach a decision by purely intellectual means, so he applies the same mental process to a moral problem and reaches a decision by almost exactly the same process.

This, however, is not so simple. There is firstly, the problem of human experience. Moral judgements are rarely made without emotional involvement of some kind. They extend beyond the realm of detached and objective logical considerations and become inextricably linked with human feelings. The moral judgement is usually accompanied by 'adjectives' describing human behaviour, as "I just felt that I had to do something". The expressions "felt" and 'had to do' both show clearly that discussion has left impersonal and uninvolved logical considerations behind. There is secondly, the semantic problem of deciding precisely what one is talking about when discussing moral judgement. Is there a specific and identifiable aspect of human ability which can be termed as 'moral judgement'; or should one speak of moral judgement that is, about separate
and identifiable critical judgements which are all related to a moral topic (Kay, 1968). It was while discussing the characteristic of the growth of moral judgement that Johnson referred to this second problem. "Whether there is a thing as moral judgement as such," he writes, "or whether moral judgements merely consist of a number of specific areas of response that are essentially unrelated to one another," seems an even more basic question that has not yet been answered satisfactorily (Johnson, 1962).

Although these questions remain unanswered, it is still possible to discuss the development of moral judgement, if the researcher has a definite framework.

Jean Piaget's investigation on this subject in 1932 may be cited as of great importance in this direction. Arising mainly from the general theory of child's conception of the world (1928) his objective was to study the mental process and thought structure underlying judgements concerning a variety of problematical situations.

Nearly every developmental psychologist would now agree with Piaget's general proposition that the basis of a child's moral judgement changes as he grows up. He starts with rigid rules and regulations i.e. morality of constraint, in which moral judgements are based on outside criterion and passes on to morality of co-operation where the previous rigid rules are
now flexible and are interpreted according to social considerations.

Piaget postulated that development of an individual's morality, intelligence and personality are affected by four factors, each necessary but not sufficient for development. These four factors are organic maturation or biological growth and development; experience - a child's contact with object, action and causality; socialization - transactions the sending and receiving of messages between child and his social world; and equilibrium - a dynamic self-regulating conditions between child and environment (Piaget and Inhelder, 1969).

Piaget constructed a model consisting of the four stages of development through which an individual might progress. Further, he established characteristics and age ranges for each stage. Regarding the use of stage in his model, Piaget wrote that "a typology of stages permit us to construct simplified models of reality and thus provides the study of the latter with irreplaceable dissecting instruments" (Piaget, 1950).

In reinforcing the value to stage - age usage, Rest (1974) has written that "stages are constructs defined by the psychologists to represent pattern in people's thinking. The degree to which these patterns are discernable, recurrent and prevalent, the constructs are useful".
The following outlines Piaget's four stages with approximate age ranges and characteristics:

I. Sensorimotor stage (Age Range-Birth to approximately 2+ years). There is total egocentrism at first, which gradually lessens but remains dominant throughout. The child operates as though he is the whole world and causes all events.

II. Preoperational stage (Age Range-Approximately 3 years to 7 years). The actions are internalized, and, therefore, represented, but the thought is not liberated from perceptions. The child in this stage makes decisions, based on perceptual clues when confronted with a conflict between cognition and perception. His ability to take social participation is limited.

III. Concrete operational stage (Age Range-Approximately 7 years to 11 years). The child is no longer perception bound, he can make cognitive, logical decisions rather than perceptual decisions. He is no longer dominated by egocentrism and can see the view of others and co-operate in a reciprocal manner. Here appears the desire for mutual understanding. Children of this stage do not yet know the rules in detail and different children within the same group give contradictory accounts.

IV. Formal operational stage (Age Range begins about 12 years and may be well developed by 16 years). This is the
final stage of adult thought or moral development. Now he can deal with ideas. Issues and principles become important and can see things as they "ought" to be rather than what "is". These children have thoroughly mastered their code and even take pleasure in juridical discussions, whether of principle or merely of procedure, which may at times arise out of the points in dispute.

Piaget also describes three kinds of rules: the motor rule relatively independent of any social contact, the coercive rule, due to unilateral respect and; the rational rule, due to mutual respect. The first rule corresponds to the egocentric stage; the child seeking merely to satisfy his motor interests. He defined these rules in a game of marbles. He says that consciousness of rules are conditioned by the child's moral life as a whole, even if he has never seen marbles before; his life is already permeated with rules and regulations due to the environment. The second rule sets in from the moment the child, either through imitation or as the result of verbal exchange, begins to play in conformity with certain rules received from outside. It is not until about the age of six or seven that this attitude appears clearly and explicitly. Piaget characterizes the rational rule as 'autonomy follows heteronomy'. The rule of a game appears to the child no longer as an external law, sacred in so far as it had been laid down by adults, but as the outcome of a free decision.
and worthy of respect in the measure that it has enlisted mutual consent (Piaget, 1932).

Piaget (1932) further in his investigation, presented children with hypothetical situations in the form of stories and attempted to examine the criteria upon which the child made moral realism. Piaget examines (i) the objective responsibility incorporating clumsiness, stealing and lying (ii) co-operation and the development of the idea of justice includes experiment and discussion concerning the problem of punishment, collective and communicable responsibility (iii) the two moralities of the child and types of social relations.

In summary, Piaget viewed moral judgement development as a process involving the development of cognitive processes in conjunction with experience of role taking in the peer group and society allowing the movement from moral realism to autonomy.

Another closely linked theory, namely developmental theory, based on Piaget's theory of moral judgement is that of Lawrence Kohlberg (1958). Kohlberg, like Piaget developed sequence stages for cognitive development and consequently for moral development. Both theories assume equilibrium occurring through the interaction of the individual and the environment.

For more than sixteen years, Kohlberg has studied the development of moral judgement and character. These studies have led to the definition of moral stages derived from
responses to hypothetical dilemmas, deliberately philosophical and some medieval works of casuistry.

Kohlberg's model consists of three levels of moral reasoning with each level consisting of two stages; thus a six stage hierarchical construct.

At the lowest stage of model, the individual exhibits a punishment-obedience orientation where goodness and badness are motivated by avoidance of punishment rather than consideration of higher values or the human consequences of an act. At the highest stage of model, rightness is determined by the individual on universal principles of justice, reciprocity and equality of human rights. Empirically, Kohlberg defined moral stages as an individual response to a set of moral dilemmas.

I. Preconventional Level: At this level the child is responsive to cultural rules and labels in terms of either the physical or hedonistic consequences of action. The level is divided into two stages: Stage 1 the punishment and obedience orientation, where the physical consequences of actions determines its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or values of these consequences; stage 2 the instrumental relativist orientation, where right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfied one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others, human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place and reciprocity is
a matter of 'you scratch my back and I will scratch yours' not of loyalty, gratitude and justice.

II. **Conventional Level**: At this level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it and of actively maintaining it. It also has two stages, Stage 3 the interpersonal concordance or 'good boy' — 'nice girl' orientation, characterized by good behaviour which pleases or helps others and is approved by them; stage 4 the law and order orientation, where the orientation is toward authority, fixed rules and maintenance of social order. Right behaviour consists of doing one's duty.

III. **Post Conventional Level**: At this level there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles. This level again has two stages. Stage 5 the social legalistic orientation, generally with utilitarian overtones; stage 6 the universal ethical principle orientation, where right is defined by decisions of conscience according to ethical principles ...

Central to Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development is that movement, from preconventional to conventional to post conventional or principle levels of moral judgement, must involve a 'reorganization' of the concept of justice within the moral agent or the individual. Kohlberg argues that what logic is to the cognitive domain, justice is to moral domain. He says, 'justice, the primary regard for the value and equality of all human beings and for reciprocity in human relations, is a basic and universal standard' (Kohlberg, 1972).

Kohlberg's cognitive developmental theory can be summarized as claiming that (a) moral judgement is a role taking process which (b) has a new logical structure at each stage (c) this structure is best formulated as a justice structure which (d) is progressively more comprehensive, differentiated and equilibrated than the prior structure.

Both Piaget and Kohlberg have stressed the cognitive structure in the moral development and the way in which moral judgement influences action, characterizable in a cognitive structure. They also emphasised that cognitive development is a necessary but not sufficient condition for moral judgement.
The conception of moral development within the cognitive developmental framework implies that the basic development of moral judgement involves transformations of cognitive structures. This development is sequential, universal and approximately related to chronological age. The development of basic cognitive structure is the result of interaction between structures of environment and structure of the organism. Environmental factors speed up, slow down or stop the development of cognitive structure. However, they do not change the sequence of development nor can they create structures.

The stages of moral development can be looked at as structured wholes and are qualitatively different, that is, each stage is characterized by a unique mode of thought. This is so because cognitive structure for each stage evolve as a result of reorganization of the existing stage and of new experiences. The stages are invariant and hierarchical in integration, that is, one has to go through the lower stages in order to reach higher stages.

The direction of the development of moral judgement within the cognitive structure is toward greater equilibrium in the organism—environment interaction, which implies a greater balance or reciprocity between the action of the organism on the perceived object and of the perceived object on the organism.
It can be said that development of moral judgement is fundamentally the restructuring of modes of role taking. All the processes involved in cognition of the physical world and stimulating developmental changes in this cognition are also basic to social development. This is why, social cognition involves role taking, that is, the awareness that the other is in some way like the self and that the other is responsible to the self. As the direction of cognitive development is toward reciprocity, the direction of social development will be toward a reciprocity between the action of self toward others and of others toward self. Moral stages thus represent successive forms of role taking. Both, Piaget and Kohlberg, the chief exponents of moral judgement, view moral stages as structured wholes within the cognitive framework forming a universal sequence in the direction of increasing maturity. They consider that opportunities for participation and role taking in all basic groups, to which the child belongs, are important for moral judgement.

Determinants of Development of Moral Judgement:

What are the factors contributing to the individual differences in the moral judgement development? Does a child of a given age shows up poorly in morality because he is
deficient in those biological factors which supply the potential base for moral judgement development, or because the conditioning and learning which his environment afforded were faulty? This raises the age old controversy of nature and nurture, and it raises it in a most complex field of behaviour.

If one was starting out at the present stage of knowledge, to discover the percentage contribution of nature and nurture in accounting for individual differences in moral judgement development, he would be doomed to failure. Such a multitude of unmeasurable variables is subsumed under each of these concepts, and they interact in such intricate ways, that the crucial experiment to determine the exact relative influence of each is at present out of question.

However, data are available to indicate that at least intelligence, age or level of maturation, sex and certain emotional factors affecting moral judgement may be inherited, yet the children do not inherit their morality. They may inherit capacities for responding to stimuli and for profiting by experience; probably they inherit or biologically develop certain glandular and volitional strengths and weaknesses, but they acquire their judgement of morality, by responding in certain ways in the situation which the environment affords. It is the environment and the forces acting in the environment which finally shape and give the child his code of conduct and develops his power of moral judgement.
Support for the belief that environment is an influence on the moral judgement is seen in the writing of several leading theorists as also in the empirical evidence, submitted by research workers in this field, albeit very scarce and limited. Piaget (1950) wrote that "the degree and variance of experience directly influence the process of equilibrium, a critical factor in cognitive development and consequently in moral judgement too. Mature or higher structure of moral judgement involve integration and reintegration with how an individual views himself, his environment, and the choice of action available to him. Thus, it is more likely that a child will progress to higher stages of development in an environment rich in experience." Turiel (1969) offered that "a complex heterogeneous environment that present a variety of contradiction is more likely to facilitate the equilibrium process in moral development, than a more homogeneous environment". According to Bloom (1963) "...we regard the environment as providing a network of forces and factors which surround, engulf and play on the individual". Kohlberg (1969) said that "the moral judgement of the child takes place when there is social interaction, that is, the child's interaction with the environment is important for the development of moral judgement to take place".

The environmental factors which relate themselves to the moral development of a child are legion. Indeed, it would
be difficult to name a factor in the environment calling forth a psychological reaction which might not have some relation to moral development. But since the formative years of the child are spent at home and later at school it would be more appropriate to study their influence on the moral development of the child. Hence, the influence of home and educational environment on the moral judgement of the child forms an integral part of the present study (Details of the research studies are given in Chapter III).

Moral Judgement Development and Home Environment:

The home is the most important part of child's "social network" (Jersild, 1975). This is because the members of the family constitute the child's first environment and are the most significant people during the early formative years. In the early years the sharing occurs almost exclusively with the members of the family. The home is the basic unit of growth and experience, fulfilment or failure (Hurlock, 1968). From contacts with family members children lay the foundation for attitude towards people, things and life in general. The home is intermediate between the individual and wider society. It thus opens new avenues of research.

A study of home life can enable to achieve a functioning philosophy of personal and family living. The kind of home a person comes from has a powerful influence on his moral conduct.
The home largely determines his personality and influences his ethical code. Home is then, one of the most important environmental factor influencing moral development." It is the family which is the essential agency for the development of morality among children, and introduces him to the culture in which he is to grow and live (Frank, 1948). As Groves (1940) also says that home itself enmeshed in a cultural milieu is the most powerful transmitter of the culture of the group. It complements such institutions as government, education and religion, but it begins its work long before the child is conscious of these other institutions. Parental percepts and example get in their conditioning long before conscious teaching of other institutions of society can reach the child, and they are continually reinforced as long as he is under home influence.

Broken homes due to death of a parent or divorce between parents is one of the factors which influences the moral judgement of the child. A comparison of the children from such homes with those from normal homes proved that inferior development in several aspects of moral judgement could be attributed directly to broken homes (Wallenstein, 1937). Lack of normal home life and parental identification prevents children in developing their morality in a proper way (Stern, 1949).

Rejection and warmth on the part of the parents strongly affects the moral judgement. If one or both parents strongly reject a child, he may resort to truancy, lying and stealing.
The association between high levels of morality and warm, rewarding nurturant parent-child relationship is consistent with the fact that morality is, at least in part, a consequent of identification (Symonds, 1949). Strong emphasis on filial piety in the Chinese culture does not seem to interfere with the development of mature and critical judgements in Chinese children in situations involving moral dilemmas. Instead it appears that close and affectionate ties with patriarchal management in the home help in the development of moral maturity among children (Liu, 1950). Inadequate affection in the home and diffidence of parents concerning the social and moral development of their children are the conditions most likely to lead to delinquency. If the child is not developed morally in a proper way the chances of his becoming a delinquent are more; and this is all because of lack of warmth and affection on the part of the parents (Cooper, 1950). It is the presence of parental warmth and love that the child manifests internal reaction to transgressions and adopt moral standards which he feels responsible for maintaining (Allinsmith, 1960; Aronfreed, 1961; Unger, 1962; Hoffman, 1963).

It has been suggested (Havighurst, 1952) that consistence of disciplinary technique is positively related to the development of moral competence. Becker (1964) also said that love oriented techniques of discipline may facilitate
the development of moral judgement by providing the child with a better learning situation for the development of moral standards. Consistent and democratic kind of discipline is necessary for the child to conform to social standards and this can only be taught at home, with the contacts with other family members.

The moral attitude of parents is another home factor, which influences the moral attitude of the children. Within the home there is a closer relationship between the children and parents, and the parental ideas of right and wrong strongly affect the idea of right and wrong of their children and thus develop the moral judgement accordingly (Hartshome, May, Shuttleworth, 1930). There is a strong relationship between the values of the children and those of their parents and their effect on the moral judgement of the child (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1953).

Another home factor which has been found to bear some relation with the development of morality is the size of the family. The influence of the size of the family on moral behaviour of children has received some attention from experimentors but no general conclusions can be drawn. If a child gets the impression that he is not wanted by the parents he has greater difficulties in making satisfactory personal adjustments whether the adjustments finally made, however, will lead to stronger or weaker moral judgement remains an open
question. Probably it will depend both on the individual child and the degree to which he feels that he is rejected.

The economic situation of the home is an important factor in the moral judgement of children when all other variables correlated with it are considered. It has been reported that children from poorer homes are likely to be less developed, both in the moral sense and moral behaviour (Harrower, 1959; Hartshorne & May, 1930).

Education of the parents, positively influences the quality of the moral judgement of the child. If the parents are educated and have a refined moral orientation, it will help them in harnessing the potential of moral judgement of their children adequately.

Various home factors show that a child's tendency to feel guilty about "doing something wrong" and developing a strong moral judgement is related to a number of parental practices; such as frequent use of praise, expression of affection, infrequent use of punishment, not rejecting the child, maintaining close affectionate time with the children and using disciplinary techniques that are capable of arousing unpleasant feelings in the child about his misbehaviour, independently of "external threat". All these promote the development of a high level of moral judgement and internalized reaction to transgressions.
It, therefore, appears clear that the nature of parents-child relationships, disciplinary techniques, size of the family, broken homes, education of the parents, socio-economic standards of the family and other parental practices prevalent in the family play a crucial role in developing the level of moral judgement of the child.

**Development of Moral Judgement and Educational Environment:**

Educational environment is a part of the total environment in which the child as a living organism is continuously affecting and in turn is affected by the various forces impinging upon him.

The school constitutes an environment with which students interact for considerable periods of time. With regard to the educational influence on moral judgement, Kohlberg (1967) has suggested that "...the school is the most important environment of the child outside the home. While Hartshorne and May findings did not show that specific religion or moral education classes had a strong effect on moral conduct, they did demonstrate that the total school or classroom atmosphere had an extremely important influence on such conduct...." In support of this position, Purple and Ryan (1976) wrote that education is not value free in terms of schools' influence on developing moral judgement.
While speaking of the educational system, one cannot just talk about 'schools' or 'the school' as each school has its own distinct component parts. A simple contrast makes this clear. By reference to the school, does one mean a top preparatory school or a primary school? Yet, despite the inherent uniqueness of each school it is still possible to classify them. They are either primary or secondary, public or state schools. These are then divided into boarding and day schools, which may be co-educational or mixed, with each one varying in size. The curriculum and teaching techniques may differ in each. Finally, the ethos and structure may be considered, some may be authoritarian, others democratic and still others may display a spirit of laissez-faire.

It is clear from this that the relative efficacy of these different systems must be examined in the light of schools as agents of moral education and moral judgement development. This implies that one may study the school in terms of organizational climate, classroom atmosphere, teachers' moral and general attitude, and moral education and their influence on the development of moral judgement.

The classroom atmosphere, in which a child is a member, is certainly one important condition influencing his moral development. Jones (1936) has reported in this
that the classroom atmosphere is the most significant condition in an experimental learning situation, he differentiated the classes which improved most in moral conduct from those which improved least. It is impossible to say how much contribution to good class atmosphere is made by the teacher in his teacher-pupil relations and in his teaching techniques, and how much is made by pupils in their own interrelations. However, if these two are considered together then there are sets of factors in the educational situation which are most clearly related to moral judgement. Classroom atmosphere with its intervening factors of text books, teaching methods, discipline, teacher-pupil relation is related to the advancement in moral development (Blatt, 1969; Hickey, 1972).

Democratic organisational climate of the school has characteristics which appear to be most effective in terms of moral judgement. Democracy lays emphasis on shared power and authority and decision making is also a shared affair. This helps to build up a conducive environment for the development of higher forms of moral judgement. A more open democratic environment allows for greater student involvement and also allows him greater opportunities in making moral decisions and judgement; while the authoritarian or closed type of organizational climate, not only prevents moral development,
but also induces moral immaturity (Illich, 1971). Democratic environmental school facilitates the establishment of precondition of morality, they also provide opportunity for autonomy and responsibility to flourish.

Children's behaviour in school tend to vary with different teachers. The personality and character of teacher are important in affecting the child's moral judgement. The evidence showed that in classes or schools where the teacher is ineffective and his moral judgement is not properly oriented, the attitude and moral conduct of the students deteriorate (Anderson et al., 1946). Castle (1958) supports the role of teachers as moral instructors. His work stressed that in the school situation the teacher is the most powerful determinant, and the influence of teachers' moral attitude on the moral conduct of the students cannot be ignored.

Instruction in moral education should form an integral part of the curriculum. Many researchers have found moral education to positively affect the moral development of the child. The question arises as to how best a school imparts moral education to children under its care. The methods are two fold — indirect and direct.

Indirectly, the school atmosphere, the personality and behaviour of the teachers, and the co-curricular activities
provided in the school play a vital role in the moral judgement development. Example is better than precept. The ethical values that the school wants the pupils to imbibe must be first cultivated and practiced by the teachers. School influences the moral judgement if the required moral tone permeates the whole school atmosphere. The school assembly, celebration of festivals of all religions, work experience, games and sports, social service programmes develop the moral values of comradeship, mutual regard, honesty, integrity, discipline and responsibility. Developing knowledge of these traits affect the moral judgement of the child indirectly.

In addition to the indirect approach for inculcating moral and spiritual values, schools directly influences the moral judgement by having provision for direct moral instruction in the school programmes. Biographies of saints, religious leaders and their teaching is included in the curriculum. Teachers are required to hold discussions with their pupils on certain values and lay stress on values to be imbibed (Education Commission Report, 1964-65).

These two methods should then go side by side to make its influence on the moral judgement of the child a strong one.
Thus, the factors of classroom atmosphere, democratic organizational climate, personality and moral attitude of the teachers and moral education in educational environment are important in child's moral judgement and its development.

Development of moral judgement among children is then a joint responsibility of home and school. In both these environmental forces right emotion, good moral, physical and mental habits should be inculcated. Explicit in the cognitive developmental theory of moral judgement is the environmental force, being the major factor in the individual's moral judgement. In view of this, the present study, was undertaken.