CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION
1.1 MORALITY:

Morality is the supreme essence of civilized society which distinguishes men from animals. The entire super structure of our society and of the state is built on it. Any social organization devoid of morals is bound to totter down in no time. No civilization can survive for long which is not based on the eternal principles of morality. Therefore, it is the crying need of the hour to infuse into the hearts of men from the childhood the highest moral principles which have stirred up men at all times to a life of selfless service to humanity and to act according to which man can only be happy when he lives for the whole humanity. Morality, in this way, is conformity to the moral code of the social group.

The term or the word moral comes from the Latin word "i*iOS" which means custom, practice, a way of accomplishing things. Moral concepts are the rules to which the members of the given culture have become accustomed over a period of time. They determine the expected behaviour pattern of all members of that culture. To act in a moral way thus means to act in conformity to group standards or conduct. Moral is (1) a term used to delimit those characters, traits,
intentions, judgements or acts which can appropriately be 
designated as right, wrong, good, bad; in this meaning, 
moral is opposed to amoral; (2) a term also used to designate 
the right or good over against the wrong or bad, in relation 
to some criterion of obligation; in this meaning, moral is an 
antonym of immoral. The concept of morality, according to 
Wilson (1967b), is broken down into six component parts each 
named from classical Greek words:

(a) PHIL defines the degree of ability to identify with 
others, to accept them, that is, as equals.

(b) EMP describes insight into the feelings of oneself, 
or self awareness termed AUTOEM: and awareness of the 
feelings of others, termed ALLEMP. There is a psychological 
link between these two first components.

(c) GIG refers to necessary knowledge, above all, for 
example, of the likely consequences of actions.

(d) DIK defines the moral rules or principles, formulated 
rationally by the individual through the first three 
components, to which he commits himself. They define 
for him what is good and right in his relations with 
others.

(e) PHRON describes the same process of formulating moral 
rules or principles relating to self and self-interests.
KRAT describes the ability to put accepted moral principles into action.

"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).

Morality is the conduct of man towards man in various situations in which they come together (Sri Parkasha Committee on Moral Education, 1960). According to Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms (1942), "moral, ethical, virtuous, righteous, noble" are synonyms only when they mean confirming to a standard of what is right and good. Moral and ethical also come into comparison as meaning relating to the science and theory of right conduct... in all its pertinent senses it (moral) implies a relationship to character or conduct viewed as good or bad, right or wrong". Chamber's Dictionary (1970) described morality as "that an action which renders it right or wrong". According to Good's Dictionary of Education (1897), "Morale is a term which indicates courage, faith and personal integration maintained in face of adversity and group solidarity maintained in the face of threatening forces."

Morality is the law of humanity in terms of behaviour and the conduct of universal law of harmony. It is the internalization of a set of virtues, ideas and values sanctioned
from society. Hurlock (1968) says, "Morality is conformity to the moral codes of the social group." Piaget (1932) says, "All morality consists in a system of rules, and the essence of morality is to be sought for in the respect of which the individual acquires for these rules." Acquisition of morality as commonly conceived by the psychologists is the internalization of a set of virtues, ideals and values, sanctioned by society which becomes an integral part of the individual self through the process of development. To Freud (1933), it is the installation of an agency, the super-ego within the personality. Morality may also be described as a system of personality traits which are in harmony with the inner nature of an individual and which are in accordance with the values approved by the society. Morality, in fact, is a mixture which cannot be exercised in a vacuum. It requires a social medium. Morality is a comprehensive term which includes in its fold, the intellectual, social and aesthetic aspects of life and moral values refer to the conduct of man towards man in the home, in social and economic fields and in the life of the outside world generally. Kailen (1933) says in the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, "Until rather recent times morals were not distinguished from manners. Together with the ceremonials they were techniques of behaviour believed to be efficacious in securing good and averting evils.... they were called not morals but morality and were ascribed to universal
principles of right conduct endemic to mankind. The pluralisation of morality into morals follows upon the recognition that morality also consists of manifold changeful techniques of conduct. Morality thus consists of universal principles of conduct which teach the distinction between good and evil, between proper and improper actions and is a doctrine of right and wrong.

Westermark (1912) explained the nature of moral values in terms of pleasant and unpleasant emotions. According to Earnest Hemingway (1955) the test lies in the effect of an action on one's feelings. He lays down that "what is moral is what you feel good after and what is immoral is what you feel bad after. The only true morality is autonomy, self rule, the action of an individual guided by internal controls. Its essential characteristics is free choice; imposed morality can never be genuine morality. Moral concepts and rules are closely related to the structure of society, and morality is therefore relative in the sense that, as the ends of each society vary, so do the standards of right and wrong. Although all human societies have some standards of right and wrong and are sensitive to judgements in such terms, but behind the variations is some real measure of uniformity."

Stephen defines morality as "a function of the social forces". The individual becomes moralized as a result of
group pressure continually exerted upon him from his earlier childhood, modifying his "instincts". The morality of the group changes constantly with the conditions of its social development, so that at any stated time group morality can only be defined as "a statement of the conditions of social welfare, the sum of the preservative instincts of society". Thus, morality has been defined as a set of cultural rules of social action internalised by the individual. Internalization means the pressure to behave in terms of social or cultural rules from within and not from outside. This means that the control by others is replaced by self-control. Internalization of moral action can be studied in three ways:

(a) observation of behaviour
(b) emotions, and
(c) judgement.

The internalization of rules through behaviour is measured by intrinsically motivated conformity and resistance to temptation. The emotional internalization is revealed by feelings of guilt after transgression of cultural standards. The judgemental aspect of morality is the ability to make judgement of right and wrong and to justify the standards maintained by oneself and others.

In the study of morality, corresponding to these above three approaches to morality, there are three directions in
theory and research. These are (i) learning theory, which emphasizes the behavioural aspect; (ii) psycho-analytic theory which emphasizes the emotional aspect and (iii) cognitive theory which emphasizes the judgemental aspect.

Learning theories, as reflected for instance in the work of Sears (1957), Bandura (1962), Eysenck (1960) assume that moral behaviour is the result of reinforcement, rewards or punishments, and that much moral conduct is a result of child's modelling himself on an admired adult. Individual differences in moral behaviour are explained in terms of differences in conditionability (Eysenck, 1964). Strawson (1959) is mainly concerned with the idea that moral judgements can be known to be true by a direct intuition. The approach would be to observe and to analyse the behaviour of children in concrete and normal - if fabricated - moral situations. A massive piece of such empirical research has been made (Hartshorne & May, 1928-30), but it has small value today. As with the psychoanalytical approach, morality or moral conduct is seen as conformity to some sort of cultural or social norm. Edward Westermark (1906) drew certain conclusions about the meaning and truth of moral judgements from these anthropological and sociological studies, which he set forth in two large volumes titled "The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas". Westermark's thesis is that moral judgements are statements about the tendency of an object to arouse in us certain emotions,
which he calls "moral emotions". Cognitive theorists, on the other hand (Piaget, 1932; Kohlberg, 1964), view moral judgement as an active, dynamic and constructive process leading to a state where the individual is able to act according to moral principles which he either accepts because he understands them and agrees with them or which he has worked out for himself. It is the cognitive theory - which emphasizes the judgemental aspect and as moral judgement tends to be universal and can be tested objectively, therefore, judgemental side of the morality has been preferred in the present study for the study of morality among students. Further out of the many aspects of morality, i.e. moral knowledge, concept, judgement and behaviour, moral judgement seems much important as it is a process of defining a happening, incidence and performance in terms of moral justifiability.

1.2 MORAL JUDGEMENT:

In logic and psychology, judgement is an act of thought by which something is evaluated or interpreted, in terms of an idea or concept derived from past experiences. The process of thinking, therefore, consists of units of judgements linked by rational ties. Kovesi (1967) says, "by moral judgements I mean judgements like: 'lying is wrong', 'promises ought to be kept' and also judgements like 'it is you who should stay with your mother and your brother should join the resistance
movement'. While moral notions play a role in the first two judgements, the third does not incorporate a moral notion.

First two examples were examples of moral principles and only the third is an example of a moral judgement. The third example is a particular moral judgement applying general moral principles to a particular situation, or, as someone with an existentialist persuasion might say, it is a moral judgement simply.

Moral judgement includes the concept of morality as visualized by the individual and appraisal of the consequences of the act - a purely cognitive deliberation. Ordinarily, no body goes through a lengthy process of deliberation of a moral act. But there are cases where deliberation is necessary. Some of the situations are given below:

1) Conflict of values, e.g. 'Having executed a bond for three years should I remain or resign?'

2) Hierarchy of values, e.g., 'Should I spend this money on a religious act like pilgrimage or on my daughter's marriage?'.

3) Interference by social approval, e.g., 'As a widow, should I remarry?'.

4) Conflict between duty and sentiment, e.g. 'As a police inspector, should I handcuff my own brother?'
Moral judgements are capable of truth or falsity and that such truth or falsity can be determined by a cognitive or rational process. We cannot construct a valid moral code, or determine the basis of moral obligation, or discover the "first principles" of morality, unless we have analysed the meaning of moral judgements and have investigated the appropriateness or inappropriateness of applying the words "true" and "false" to them.

Naturalism and non-naturalism hold that a moral judgement is an assertion which is either true or false, but naturalism claims that such assertions are empirically verifiable, while non-naturalism denies this.

According to subjectivists, truth or falsity of a moral judgement depends upon some fact or facts about people's feelings and attitudes.

The objectivists maintain that the truth or falsity of a moral judgement depends on whether the property of goodness or rightness is objectively present in the thing which is being judged, regardless of how people feel about it.

To some philosophers the most striking fact about moral judgements is the intimate connection that such judgements have with people's feelings, attitudes and interests. When we say that something is good or right, a positive emotion of liking or approval seems to be expressed, just as a negative
emotion of dislike or disapproval seems to be expressed in the moral judgement that something is bad or wrong.

McDougall (1960) holds moral judgements to be rooted in the emotions, rather than in reason; and of nothing is more true than of conscience. They are built up, of course, from natural sympathy by the processes of suggestion and, above all, of identification. But they can, and often do, conflict with the individual's concrete, personal and more rational judgements. Judgement, therefore, depends on motives, relationships, circumstances, obligations. While lying is wrong, it is permissible under certain clearly defined conditions - that no one else is hurt, that the trouble must not be serious, nor deserving of severe punishment; that there is a real personal relationship of loyalty, friendship or love.

Though all moral judgements are ultimately based on emotions, the influence that intellectual factors exercise on such judgements is very great indeed. Emotions are determined by cognitions and differ in nature or strength according as the cognitions differ. This has been a very important cause of the variations of moral judgements.

Morality is neither a matter of following absolute rules of conduct regardless of their consequences, nor it is a matter of bringing about some fixed amount or condition of "happiness" as a final end of human existence. Life is an ongoing activity, and moral judgements are formed when
practical problems confront us and demand resolution by us. Moral judgements are justified in terms of their success in helping us to overcome difficulties, conflicts and frustrations in practical life.

Most philosophers agree upon the characteristics that make a judgement a genuine moral judgement (Hare, 1963; Frankena, 1962). Moral judgements are judgements about the good and right of action. Not all judgements of good or right are moral judgements, however; many are judgements of aesthetic, prudential or technological goodness or rightness. Moral judgements tend to be universal, inclusive and consistent and have objective, impersonal or ideal bases. The genuinely moral judgement of the high-stage subject is a judgement of principle, and to become morally adult is to learn to make decisions of principle; it is to learn to use "ought" sentences verified by reference to a standard or set of principles which one has accepted by his own decision (Hare, 1952).

Moral philosophers have often remarked that moral judgements are about ends, not means. It is indeed true, as Aristotle implied (Nichomachean Ethics, in 109a 15-16) that within any morality which distinguishes end and means, ends are more important. Moral Reformers and other people of unusual opinion often hold a moral judgement knowing the majority of people to hold the contrary; therefore when they say a course of action is right or wrong, they cannot mean the
action is approved or disapproved by the majority of men. Such individual judgements simply express the feelings of the person judging and have no denotative reference to the feelings of most people.

Therefore, moral judgement is the cognitive capacity to define situations in terms of rights and duties and the insight to see the relationship between an abstract principle and concrete cases. By the general experience it enables the child to evaluate worthiness or unworthiness of an action as good or bad (Piaget, 1932). It is the evaluation of actions, motives and character of people (Colengalo, 1977) and it is the perception of what one should do in situations involving moral dilemmas (Liebert, 1973). In other words, moral judgement is accomplished through cognitive structuring and restructuring of the perceived social environment. According to Jean Piaget's Theory (1932), which is the most important work in the field of moral judgement; as a child matures his moral judgement changes. In his words, child bearing with morality of constraint others that judgements are based on external authority i.e. where most judgements are based on outside criterion and as he grows his judgement passes to the morality of cooperation where the previous rigid rules are made flexible and are interpreted according to social consideration (Piaget, 1932).
1.3 EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT:

Watts and Barnett (1973) inspite of giving the customary definition of 'environment' which refers to socio-economic status, culture, family structure or life style, have defined environment somewhat unconventionally as "a set of human and non-human elements in the external world that are directly and observably connected the child's experience and that may affect his development of competence either through participating in a developmentally pertinent experience or by making such an experience more or less likely to occur or more or less pleasurable for the child. The total environment which surrounds an individual may be defined as being composed of a complex network of forces and factors which surround, engulf and play on the individual (Bloom, 1964).

Educational environment according to Dave (1963) relates to "the conditions, processes and psychological stimuli of the total environment, which affect child's cognitive ability". Thus from above, we can say that 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 question of the effect of educational environment on the individual in the field of education has been the subject of much discussion and investigation for many years. At the psychological level, the concern has been to understand
why certain instructional materials are more effective with some type of pupils than with others. According to Michael, Barbara, Fresko (1978), on the sociological plan, researchers have been interested in the effect which differential types of schools have on the achievement, aspirations, creativity, motivation and moral judgement of students possessing differing initial ability and deriving from various home background. Samuel, Soto and Parks (1976); Hilderbrand and Patricia (1978) found that variables of environment have a considerable effect on the I.Q. of the children. Vernon (1979) concluded that both genes and environment have very substantial effects on the measured intelligence of children. Dave (1965) and Wolf (1964) found that the measure of environment accounted for approximately 50 per cent of the variance in global intelligence test scores. Marjoribanks (1972) found that 52 per cent of the variance in a global intelligence test scores could be attributed to the measured environmental forces. Reddy (1973) in his study observed that home environment appeared to be more prominent as potential predictor of academic achievement after intelligence. Thus each child lives in a unique educational environment and resulting into differential ability in moral judgement.

1.4 FACTORS AFFECTING MORAL JUDGEMENT

What are the factors contributing to the individual differences in the moral judgement of the child? 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 of the child, 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, he would be doomed to failure.

Although, 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 develop his power of moral judgement.

Support for the belief that environment has an influence on the moral judgement is seen in the writings of several leading theorists as also in the empirical evidence, submitted by research workers in this field although these are 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. Turiet (1969) offered that "a complex heterogeneous environment that present a variety of contradiction is more likely to facilitate the equilibrium process in moral judgement than a more homogeneous environment." 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 moral judgement to take place."

The environmental factors which relate themselves to the moral judgement of a child are many. 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 judgement. But since the formative years of the students are spent at home and later at school and college it would be more appropriate to study their influence on the moral judgement of the students. Hence, the influence of his personal factors (e.g., intelligence, age, sex etc.) and educational environmental factors (e.g., home, school, college) on the moral judgement of the student forms an integral part of the present study.
Theoretical viewpoints about predictors under consideration are presented here briefly so as to get the conceptual understanding of these variables as also to understand the rationale of relationship of these variables with moral judgement of the students.

1.5 THEORETICAL VIEWPOINTS ABOUT PREDICTORS

1.5.1 PERSONAL FACTORS AND MORAL JUDGEMENT:

Intelligence and Moral Judgement:

In Halsey and Friedman's (1979) view, three concepts occur most often in conceptualizing intelligence: (a) the ability to deal with abstract symbols, concepts and relationships, (b) the ability to profit from experience, and (c) the ability to adapt to new situations or problem solving in the broadest sense. However, the available research work indicates that intelligence is not a unitary capacity and that the generality of the function cannot be overlooked. The same individual may, for example, deal effectively with verbal concepts and be deficient in handling quantitative aspects and vice versa.

According to Terman (1921), the developer of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, intelligence is the ability to carry on abstract thinking. As a result, there are a number of items on his test directly measuring the capacity to think abstractly. Research on the relationship between learning and intelligence shows little relationship between simple learning and IQ, but when the material to be learned is
complex or abstract, high IQ subjects perform better than low IQ subjects.

Intelligence, as the ability to learn and profit from past experiences also involves the limitation of perceiving it as a unitary phenomenon. There are many different kinds of learning, and individuals who do well on some kinds of learning do not necessarily do well on others. Numerous studies report a high relationship between school grades (presumably a measure of learning) and intelligence test performance (e.g., Bond, 1940).

Intelligence is what has been learnt (Wesman, 1968). Intelligence is a summation of learning experiences. It implies that intelligence tests do not measure an ability or potential as much as they do measure achievement. In a sense, these tests measure our knowledge and judgement. One difficulty with such an approach is that it does not fit in with popular notions of what intelligence is.

In Stern's (1914) words, "Intelligence is the general adaptability to the new problems and conditions of life." But this definition does not answer what is meant by "adapt". There are some people whom it is generally agreed are not very intelligent and who do not do very well on intelligence tests, yet they adapt very well to their environment. Other people, who score very well on intelligence tests and are generally agreed to be quite gifted, make a very poor adjustment to their
environment. Certainly what is a successful adjustment for one individual would be a poor adjustment for someone else, since people from different cultures have different goals, talents and aspirations.

Many researchers prefer to define intelligence in very global terms rather than in terms of a specific ability. For example, according to Wechsler (1944), "Intelligence is the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal effectively with his environment" and "intelligence is the ability to undertake activities that are characterized by - (i) difficulty, (ii) complexity, (iii) abstraction, (iv) economy, (v) adaptiveness to a goal, (vi) social values, (vii) the emergence of originals, and to maintain such activities under conditions that demand a concentration of energy and a resistance to emotional forces." (Stoddard, 1943).

With regard to the theoretical viewpoints of intelligence, Spearman (1927) concluded that one fundamental general factor underlies all manifestations of intelligence. He called this factor 'g'. According to Spearman, the 'g' factor is involved to some extent in all behaviour of the individual, and some behaviour is heavily dependent on this factor. Some types of activity depend on specific abilities called 'S'. Individual differences in intelligence are due primarily to individual differences in 'g'. According to this theory the mentally retarded child is deficient in the amount of 'g' he possesses.
Intelligence, to Thorndike (1962), is nothing more than a convenient name for an almost infinite number of actual or potential specific connections between the stimuli and responses. Differences of intelligence among people are due to the number of connections in the neurological system.

According to Group Factor Structure of intelligence, intelligence neither consists two factors as proposed by Spearman nor multifactors as developed by Thorndike. It consists of six primary factors which are: (i) Number Factor (N) - which is the ability to do numerical calculations rapidly and accurately (ii) Verbal Factor (V) - which is found in test involving verbal comprehension. (iii) Space relations (S) - which is involved in any task in which the subject manipulates an object imaginary in space. (iv) Memory (M) - which involves the ability to memorize quickly (v) Reasoning (R) - which is found in tasks that require the subject to discover a rule or principle. (vi) Word fluency (W) - which is involved whenever the subject is asked to think of isolated words at a rapid rate.

Structure of intellect (SOI) was developed by Guilford (1957). The model is a three way classification of intellectual abilities namely - operations, contents and products. The kind of classification on the basis of operations gives five major groups of intellectual abilities: (1) cognition (2) memory (3) divergent thinking (4) convergent thinking and (5) evaluation. A second way of classifying the intellectual factor is according
to the kind of material or content involved. The content may
be (1) figural (2) symbolic (3) semantic (4) behavioural. When
a certain operation is applied to certain kind of content, as
many as six general kinds of products may be involved. The six
types of products are: (1) units (2) classes (3) relations
(4) systems (5) transformations and (6) implication, on the
basis of the factor analysis. The three kinds of classifications
of the factors can be represented by means of a single solid
model which is called the structure of intellect.

In addition to these, different models of structure
of abilities based upon factor analysis have been suggested by
different researchers. In Gustafsson's (1984) view, one line
of demarcation goes between models which postulates a general
factor of intelligence - (e.g. Spearman 1927, Vernon 1950) and
models which do not allow a general intelligence factor (e.g.
Thurstone, 1938, Cattell, 1971); and another line of demarcation
goes between hierarchical models which treat all the dimensions
as being of equal generality (e.g. Guilford 1967). Jensen (1969)
has distinguished level I intelligence (simple associative
learning) from level II intelligence (conceptual ability). Level
I is best measured by memory span and rote learning, whereas
level II involves cognitive transformation and is close to IQ.

If we may now seek a broad definition of moral judgement,
we can say at once that it is by no means unitary. Clearly, it
has a number of constituent parts. Native intelligence has a key place, not only in making a moral analysis of the concrete situation, but also in bringing to bear upon it. Moral judgement is not merely the simple application of moral knowledge to the situation. The individual by no means always act upon what he knows to be right. Morality involves not simply having effective motives to activate conduct. It also involves knowing what those motives are. It means intelligence plays a vital part in the process of moral judgement. On the other hand, we find evidence in all areas that higher moral judgements are associated with higher intelligence. In other words morality must be reasoned if it is to be anything more than the heteronomous obedience of the slave, or the social conformity dependent upon social praise and blame - both external to the self. It must, therefore, have a solid cognitive nucleus.

The cognitive element in moral judgement as intelligence is a key variable. But it does not of itself promote higher levels of conduct. It is generally found, moreover, as one of a group of factors in the higher-status home that tend to give its children moral advantages not generally enjoyed by those of lesser ability. According to Bull (1969), statistical analysis certainly showed intelligence to be the most noteworthy of the factors in its positive association with moral judgements. There is generally a low positive correlation between knowledge
and intelligence on one hand and moral conduct on the other—probably because knowledge and intelligence make it easier to foresee the full consequences of actions and to take the long view which shows that on the whole, morality is justified by its results. Thus, moral judgement is presumably cognitive in form, that is, it is an aspect of intellectual activity. 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.

From above discussion, as the conclusive evidence in favour of any particular models is difficult, therefore, debate as to what intelligence is continue. However, for the purpose of present study, intelligence has been operationally defined as "the ability to deal with numbers, analogies, opposites and synonyms, to make categories, to draw inferences." Its measurement (verbal) is the total score on Tandon's Group Test of General Mental Ability.

Diet and Moral Judgement:

Kalia (1983) favours the yogic diet. For the proper development of personality, Sattvik food is essential because yoga philosophy accepts the middle way. It is based on the principle of "sound mind in a sound body".
Bhagwan Sri Krishanachander composed a beneficial supernatural Granth Ratna like 'Sri Mad Bhagwad Gita' even by eating butter, milk, cheese, etc. He ate and loved Sattvik food and has shown to the world that Sattvik food is best for the development of personality, a strong asset to moral living and is immense helpful in the establishment and understanding of moral principles (Shastri, 1983). Here diet means vegetarian and non-vegetarian diet. Vegetarian diet includes all types of vegetables, milk, cheese, butter and curd etc., whereas non-vegetarian diet consists of mutton, chicken, fish etc.

**Sex differences and Moral Judgement:**

Differences are found in men and women. Women are more delicate while men are sturdy. Although, in many areas hardly any differences are found in their abilities. Studies of moral judgement have not revealed any clear cut distinction between the sexes. By testing an equal number of boys and girls at every age, it was observed by Bull (1973) that girls were found to be in advance of boys in their moral judgements in every area examined. Girls have the innate advantages, revealed in various moral situations, of greater initial sympathy, of stronger feeling for others, and therefore, more profound sensitivity to personal relationships and social attitudes.

**Age and Moral Judgement:**

As regards to the age, Piaget constructed a model consisting of the four stages of development of moral judgement through
which an individual might progress while establishing the characteristics and age ranges for each stage e.g. in the first stage (age, birth to approximate 3 years) there is total egocentrism which gradually lessens but remains dominant throughout. In the second stage (age from 3 years to 7 years approximately), the child makes decisions based on perceptual clues when confronted with a conflict between cognition and perception. In the third stage (age from 7 to 11 years approximately), the child can make logical decisions rather than perceptual decisions while in the fourth stage (age from 12 to 16 years approximately), child can see things as they "ought" to be rather only what 'is'. Thus Piaget (1932) viewed ability of moral judgement as a process involving the development of cognitive process in conjunction with experience of role taking in the peer group and the society allowing the moment from moral realisms to autonomy as the child grows. Kohlberg (1958) like Piaget also visualized stages for cognitive development and consequently for moral judgement in relation with the age of the child. In the present study, students of two age groups i.e. less than 16 years and more than 16 years will be taken into consideration.

**TV Viewing and Moral Judgement:**

Television with its combined appeal to eye and ear is a growing giant in the field of mass communication. Many school/college students spend nearly as much time watching television
as they spend in the school. It is important, therefore, to inquire what the total effect of television is on the developing minds of young students, and especially upon their scale of moral and spiritual values. Undoubtedly, the content of some programmes e.g. the excessive commercial emphasis, the dramatization of crimes which leaves little to the imagination, the tawdry dramas which depict the most sordid aspects of behaviour is detrimental to the moral and spiritual values (Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of school Administrators, 1951). In the present study, two groups of students i.e. T.V. viewing and non-viewing have been taken to study their effect on the moral judgement of the students.

1.5.2 EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND MORAL JUDGEMENT

Every individual bears an imprint of the environment in which he is brought up. The family which constitute earliest environment for every individual is one of the most important force in developing the ability of moral judgement of the students (Shamusdin, 1976). Home is the foundation of the child's virtues such as sympathy, affection, generosity, justice, truth (Goode, 1963; Morton, 1957). The emphasis on the great power is attributed to the fact that home is first and the only social contact the child has in early years which
are critical in the development of values and ideals (Mavis, Hintherington and Parke, 1975; Piaget-Kohlberg, 1977). In addition, the beliefs, values and ideals are filtered through the parents and are presented to the child in a highly personalized and selective fashion (Dammerson, 1955; Hemming, 1957 and Morris, 1958). It is the home in which the child not only lives and grows but forms patterns of life (Irwin, 1958 and Krane, 1955). He learns which ways of behaving bring approval and this good or bad behaviour become standard of conduct for him. These views are endorsed by Roe (1951), Jenson and Kirchner (1955), Bordin (1943), Super (1953), Grigg (1959), Hachman (1960), Moser (1952) and Gibson (1968).

Home is, then, one of the most important environmental factor influencing moral judgement. 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).

**Education of the Parents and Moral Judgement:**

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. There is no denying the fact that economic factor is important in determining the social status of the family, but what is the contribution of this factor when, education of the parents is taken as an independent
variable? This is a pertinent question. Precisely for this the present investigation proposed to treat education of the parents as an independent variable in itself.

**Parental Warmth, Affection and Moral Judgement:**

Parental warmth and affection strongly influences the moral judgement of their children. If one or both parents strongly reject a child, he may resort to truancy, lying and stealing. It appears that close and affectionate ties with good management in the home help in the development of moral judgement among children (Liu, 1950). 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 affection that the child manifests internal reaction to transgressions and adopt moral standards (Allinsmith, 1960; Aronfreed, 1961; Unger, 1962; Hoffman, 1963). Piaget recognises, too, that an affectionate mutual relationship between parent and child tends to develop a higher morality of generosity and altruism.

**Death or Divorce of Parents and Moral Judgement:**

Neumeyer (1960) argues "a family broken by death, divorce, desertion and separation of the parent is handicapped in the discharge of duties towards children". "This kind
of family is expected to have an adverse effect on the child's development because of lack of proper role models, failure to control the child and insufficient paternal or maternal love" (Giallombardo, 1976). Referring to the absence of one parent, Sheldon and Glueck (1963) state: "...it is likely to deal the greatest blow to a child's conception of the solidarity and reliability of the parental team and to disrupt the general sense of security as well as family liability." According to G.A.P. Committee (1977) "single parents almost by definition are less able to share the burden-some task of the child rearing and housekeeping with some body else in the way, that is open to two parent families. The burden of this task can lead to the feelings of helplessness and distress. The sheer practical difficulty of coping with the child single-handed, coupled with the possibility of persistent and unresolved feelings about the absence of father or mother lies at the root of social isolation and loneliness. As comparison of the children from broken homes due to death of parents or divorce between parents 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).

**Socio-Economic Status and Moral Judgement:**

The moral judgement of the child is powerfully influenced
by its socio-economic background. Each social grouping has its own moral ethos, its own values, its own code. Higher status carries with it, not only its own pattern of behaviour, but a complex of advantages not enjoyed by children of low status. It decides, too, the moral values of the group, since values of one social class vary from those of another. 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). They showed poverty, population density, family size, poor health and inadequate general knowledge to be the aspects of low social class, which appeared to prevent children from taking full advantage of educational opportunities and hence promote backwardness.

Moral Attitude of Parents and Moral Judgement:

There is a strong relationship between the moral attitude of parents and its effects on the moral judgement of their children (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1950). Within the home there is a closer relationship between the children and parents, and the parental ideas of right and wrong strongly affect the ideas of right and wrong of their children and thus develop the ability of moral judgement accordingly (Hartshorne, May, Shuttleworth, 1930).

Disciplinary Techniques and Moral Judgement:

Given the key role of motivation in all genuine moral
judgement action, a disciplinary approach from the psychoanalytic viewpoint could make its own contribution. Bronfenbrenner (1962) observed that parental practices: such as frequent use of praise, expression of affection, infrequent use of punishment, not rejecting the child and using disciplinary techniques that are capable of arousing unpleasant feelings in the child about his misbehaviour, independently of "external threat" and developing the ability of moral judgement are related with each other.

From the preceding paragraphs, it appears that factors like parents' education, parental warmth and affection, death or divorce of parents, socio-economic status of parents, moral attitude of parents and love oriented techniques of discipline play very important role in developing the ability of moral judgement of the children. Hence the relevance of examining the relationship between the above factors i.e. parents' education, parental warmth and affection, death or divorce of parents, socio-economic status of parents, moral attitude of parents and love oriented techniques of discipline and moral judgement of the students in the present study.

School also 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." Therefore, the relative efficacy of different variables of school such as moral attitude of teacher, school characteristics index, school/college organizational climate, school/college differences, private/government institutions, moral education in school/college, urban/rural differences of the school/college must be examined.

**Moral Attitude of Teacher And Moral Judgement:**

The individual teacher must have immense moral influence on the students. Like the parent, he cannot help but serve as a model and example. As the Newsom Report commended, "Teachers can only escape from their influence over the moral and spiritual development of their pupils by closing their schools" (Half Our Future, 53). 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) also supported the role of teachers as moral instructors.

**School/College Characteristics and Moral Judgement:**

The characteristics of each school and college too can exert strong moral influence on the students. Each school has its own characteristics. It is formed by relationships within the school community, the headmaster playing an inevitably leading part. Relationships among the staff,
between staff and pupils and among pupils themselves, the school assembly, text-books and evaluation, teaching methods, school rules, co-curricular activities, school traditions, celebration of festivals of all religions, work experience, games and sports, social service programmes play a great role in shaping the ability of moral judgement of the students and develop the moral values of comradeship, mutual regard, honesty, integrity, discipline, responsibility and cooperation among the students.

**Organizational Climate and Moral Judgement:**

By organizational climate, we mean a combination of all relevant factors which influence and determine the general atmosphere of a school. Consequently, organisational climate would include the personality of the head of the institution and other teachers, their academic qualifications, the extent of student participation in classroom practices and school activities, arrangement for games and sports, school tone and performance.

Organisational climate can be defined in simple words as the interaction which takes place between the teachers, as a group and the principal as the group leader and among the teachers themselves. Sharma and Buch (1968) define climate as a set of organizational properties which may influence the behaviour of individuals in organization.

Democratic organisational climate of the school has characteristics which appear to be the most effective in terms of
moral judgement. Democracy helps to build up a conducive environment for the moral judgement of the child. 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 judgement level of the students but also induces moral immaturity (Illich, 1971).

Operationally defined it is the sum of scores or items reflecting the perception of students about eight school dimensions viz: Disengagement, Hindrance, Organisation, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production, Thrust, Consideration.

Institutional Differences and Moral Judgement:

It is supposed that schools play a positive role for the formation of moral judgement among students. The previous institutions where students studied have a significant role to play in the cultivation of moral judgement. According to Krishnaraj and Balasubramaniam (1985), the students who had their schooling at private institutions have more positive attitude towards moral judgement than students of Government institutions. This is perhaps due to the constitutional restriction against providing moral and religious education in any state, school or college.

Moral Education and Moral Judgement:

Joshi (1982) defines moral education as cultivation
of critical insight into human relations and values in terms of psychological, social, ecological and spiritual dimensions and suggest a scheme for pilot programme for moral education. The moral instructors (parents, teachers etc.) themselves have to be moral before they teach morality. An immoral father cannot teach his child to be moral. Of course, imposing morality through anger and punishment would force the child to obey the commands, but it would not inculcate in his mind an attitude of critical insight into the moral values. The same is true of the school environment and the society at large. One cannot hope to develop the students as the moral agents in an environment in which immorality prevails.

Schools and colleges directly influence 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 discussion with their pupils on certain values and lay stress on values to be imbibed (Education Commission Report, 1964-66).

The specific objectives of the moral education programme at senior secondary level are to promote in children some basic and fundamental qualities as moral judgement, truthfulness, love, honesty, peace, equality, non-violence, co-operation, justice etc. Education should provide situations in which the
child has to make judgements regarding the moral values; then only the child can be helped in developing a high level of moral judgement.

1.6 URBAN/RURAL ENVIRONMENT AND MORAL JUDGEMENT:

The main distinction between rural and urban setting may be that in rural setting we get primary products e.g. sugarcane, wheat etc., whereas in urban setting we get secondary products i.e. sugar, oil, etc. In other words urban denotes a distinct quality of human community, a special mode of existence or way of life which is characteristic of the city. Thus, the students who study in urban schools and colleges are considered to be urban students, whereas a society or community may be classified as rural which has less population, less social differentiation, slower rates of social change, agriculture as a major occupation. The students who are studying in rural schools and colleges are considered to be belonging to rural group.

The role of urban and rural environment in accelerating the process of moral judgement is of paramount importance. Good environment accelerates activities and leads to better outcome and also potentials of students find full play. What has generally been found is that rural children, rural parents and rural communities have low level of educational aspirations and expectations. Rural children have been shown to be more shy, anxious and introvert in personality than their urban counterparts.
1.7 EMERGENCE OF THE PROBLEM:

There are several different processes which effect the complex phenomenon of the students and educational environment is the most important force in affecting moral judgement.

Positive and significant correlation between the environmental factors and moral judgement of the students at various stages were found by Brown, Morrison and Couch (1947); Gough, Horris and Marvin (1950); Langdon and Stout (1952); Hallowitz and Stulberg (1952); Stevens (1955); Allinsmith (1960); Levine (1961); Grinder (1962); Becker (1964); Hoffman (1963); Sollenberger (1968); Kohlberg (1969); Wood (1972); Wallston (1973); Staugh (1974); Jones (1975); Verma (1976); Stark (1981); Marvin (1981); Hurley (1982); Edwards (1985) and Bhargava (1986). The results of above studies suggested that conducive environment at home, the interactions between parents and children, parental attitude, disciplinary techniques, parental warmth and affection, size of the family, broken homes, religious influences at home, sex, socio-economic status and education of the parents influence the moral judgement of the students. Similarly, the school environment is one with which children interact for considerable periods of time (Arnstonine, 1971). Likewise, the climate of the school has been characterized as "constellation" of interactions, customs and perceptions. Ryans (1963), Croft (1962), Bennett, (1963), Blatt (1969), Keasey (1977) Hickey (1972), Boyd (1973)
McCann and Bell (1975), Stewart (1976), Verma (1976), Plimption (1979), Hurley (1982) and Bhargava (1986) have observed that school factors are positively correlated with moral judgement of the students. Above studies suggested that important variables that contribute to moral judgement of the students are: the school climate, school characteristics, type of schools/colleges, the moral attitude of teachers and moral education in schools and colleges.

Both personal and educational environmental factors are, therefore, potent forces in moulding the child's ability of moral judgement. It is reasonable to assume that when these two forces augment each other, their influence could be irresistible.

But not too much research work has been done in the field of moral judgement and reasons for the lack of research into moral judgement are not hard to find. The very nature of the study has its own inherent data that is objective rather than evaluative. The area full of problems, and is unproductive of concrete results. Another serious difficulty is that of securing evidence of moral judgement. There are two broad approaches that might be used, the theoretical and the practical. The more theoretical approach seeks the child’s judgements upon hypothetical moral situations. It is open to the obvious criticism that a child's cognitive judgements
upon theoretical situations may bear little or no relation to his actual conduct. The more practical approach observes the child's actual behaviour in concrete moral situations. It is also open to the obvious criticism that the child cannot but be aware of what is happening, and that therefore, his conduct may not be genuine. Yet another difficulty is that of having a yardstick by which to assess moral judgement. The paucity of research in this field is due to lack of norms; and of course, it does little to fill the gap.

Moreover, there is inconsistency in the relationship between intelligence, sex, age, SES, parent acceptance or rejection, parents' moral attitude, teachers' moral attitude, school climate, school characteristics, types of schools/colleges, moral education given in schools and colleges on the one hand and moral judgement of the students on the other hand. Also, while conducting research in these aspects, the researchers have not paid due attention to the rural and the urban differences especially at the age level from 16 to 18 years when the students are passing from adolescent age. But as in these days the students of rural areas are in a state of profound unrest, frustration, fear, tension and disturbances, so that present investigation was aimed at throwing some light on the comparative study of the impact of personal and educational environmental factors on the moral judgement of the urban and rural senior secondary students.
1.3 **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:**

In view of the above rationale and arguments the present study entitled, "PERSONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AS CORRELATES OF MORAL JUDGEMENT AMONG URBAN AND RURAL SENIOR SECONDARY STUDENTS" was undertaken.

1.9 **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:**

The study was conducted with the following objectives:

1.(a) To see the relationship of students' personal variables such as intelligence, diet, sex, age, impact of TV with moral judgement among urban and rural senior secondary students.

(b) To compare the degree of relationship of students' personal variables and their moral judgement of urban and rural senior secondary students.

2.(a) To see the relationship of home variables such as death or divorce of parents, moral attitude of parents, socio-economic status, love-oriented techniques of discipline, parental warmth and affection, parents' education with moral judgement among urban and rural senior secondary students.

(b) To compare the degree of relationship of home variables and moral judgement of urban and rural senior secondary students.
3. (a) To see the relationship of teacher variable such as moral attitude of the teacher with moral judgement among urban and rural senior secondary students.

(b) To compare the degree of relationship of teacher variable and moral judgement of urban and rural senior secondary students.

4. (a) To see the relationship of structural and process variables of school such as school/college differences, private/government institutions, school characteristics index, school climate and moral education in institutions with moral judgement among urban and rural senior secondary students.

(b) To compare the degree of relationship of structural and process variables of school and moral judgement of urban and rural senior secondary students.

5. To examine and compare factorial structure underlying personal variables of students, home variables, teacher variable and variables related to school (structure and process variables) and moral judgement among urban and rural senior secondary students.

6. (a) To examine the conjoint effect of significant personal, home, teacher and school variables on moral judgement among urban and rural senior secondary students.
(b) To compare the predictive efficiency of personal, home, teacher and school variables towards moral judgement among urban and rural senior secondary students.

7. To study the urban-rural differences as regards to the ability of moral judgement of the senior secondary students.

1.10 NEED OF THE STUDY:

The study will provide a standardized tool to measure the ability of the moral judgement of the urban and rural students for the age group from 15 to 18 years.

Today the whole world is suffering from the lethal disease of moral anaemia. Most of the people adopt illegal and immoral means to grind their own axe. Today a man sacrifices everything and joins the mad rat race of materialism. The fact that crisis of values as seen among school and college students as also among teachers and parents and as in other walks of life is highly dangerous development. Therefore, the need of the hour is to re-orient the process of education by including moral education in the curriculum so that young people should be made to realise that exploitation, insecurity and violence are not the solution of every problem and an organised society cannot be sustained without adhering to and enforcing some norms of social and moral behaviour. According to Secondary Education Commission (1952-53),
"whole purpose of education is not fulfilled unless certain definite moral principles are inculcated in the minds of the youth of the country". In the words of Kothari Education Commission (1964-66), "in the life of the majority of Indians, morality is the great motivating force for the formation of character and inculcation of ethical values. Ability of moral judgement among students have a significance in Indian society today, when young students are passing through a crisis of character." Various commissions seem to assume that schools and colleges develop moral values among students. Accepting their views to give moral education in schools, it will be worthwhile to study the ability of moral judgement of the students.

An important aim of our education is the formation of character. The feeling of equality, welfare, love for humanity, good manners, honesty, truthfulness, co-operation and tolerance must be inculcated among students. If the students at the senior secondary stage have the ability of moral judgement, it will help a lot in reducing the problem of indiscipline among them and especially at the university stage when they go for higher education. In this way, it becomes the responsibility of home
and school to prepare morally mature students so that tomorrow they can become responsible citizens of India. Therefore, in the process of inculcating moral values among students, home and school should act as moral agents. In order that youth can become morally mature, there is a need to identify those personal and educational environmental factors which lead to maximum moral judgement of the students. For studying the total effect of personal and educational environmental variables as related to the moral judgement of the students, multivariate approach will give the true picture regarding the inter-play of various forces responsible for the moral judgement of the students.

National system of Education envisages a common educational structure. The 10+2+3 structure has now been accepted in all parts of the country. This will cut across subject areas and will be designed to promote values such as India's common cultural heritage, egalitarianism, democracy and secularism, morality, equality of sexes, protection of environment, removal of social barriers, observance of small family norm, inculcation of scientific temper, understanding of diverse cultural and social systems of the people living in different parts of the country. Therefore, when all the subjects up to senior secondary stage directly or indirectly give emphasis to morality, then to evaluate the ability of the moral judgement of the students at senior secondary stage
will throw some light regarding the usefulness of this system in the inculcation of moral values among students.

India's political and social life is passing through a phase which poses the danger of erosion to long-accepted values. The goals of secularism, democracy and professional ethics are coming under increasing strain. Life in the coming decades is likely to bring new tensions together with unprecedented opportunities. The coming generation should have the ability to internalise new ideas constantly and creatively. They have to be imbued with a strong commitment to humane values, morality, social justice and ability of moral judgement specially when they are adolescent and studying at senior secondary stage. Also diversity existing within our contemporary society places the child in the position of dealing with increasingly complex moral issues and situations. All this implies a need of conducting a study to explore the factors which go with the moral judgement of the students.

As to develop a more mature and integrated moral judgement amongst children, personal variables of the children such as sex, intelligence, age, diet, viewing of T.V. etc. and variables related to home largely determines their personality and have influences on their ethical codes. Therefore, it was felt to study the influence of students' personal factors and educational environmental factors on the moral judgement of the children.
There are rural urban disparities in our country. The rural areas, with poor infrastructure and social services do not get the benefit of trained and educated youth, good educational and home environment. The present study will be helpful in examining the urban-rural differences in the moral judgement among senior secondary students.

Another reason for conducting the present study is that not much work of this nature has been done in India. There is paucity of literature in this field and specially the senior secondary stage has been ignored. The studies are few and scattered and even in those studies which have been conducted so far, wide range of variations in the value of 'r' between the various factors and moral judgement of the students have been reported.

Lastly, findings of the present study are expected to be useful for the teachers, students, educators, planners, curriculum designers, counsellors and parents and for the moral health of the nation. They will also be benefitted because then they will be able to bring desirable changes in the home and school/college environment and will minimize or eliminate those educational environmental factors in the home and school which hinder the ability of moral judgement of the students. In other words, the results of this study will tell which factors related to students and educational
environment are more favourable for the moral judgement among senior secondary students.

1.11 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

(1) As it is apparent from the title, the research project was confined to the senior secondary students. The present study confined itself to the sample of 375 students of Senior Secondary Stage.

(2) It was assumed that personal and educational environmental factors influence the moral judgement of the students, so both the factors were taken in this study.

(3) The study was limited to the sample drawn from both urban and rural population.

(4) Senior secondary students were taken from both the schools as well as from colleges.

1.12 ORGANISATION OF THE RESEARCH REPORT:

After having presented the need, emergence for the present study and theoretical viewpoints regarding the moral judgement and its relationship with the personal and educational environmental variables along with introductory remarks in chapter one, the second chapter has been devoted for the review of related literature. In the third chapter, methodology
and procedure along with detailed account of the research tools used in the present study has been given while the fourth chapter has been devoted for developing Moral Judgement Test (MJT) and Students' Information Proforma. Fifth chapter studies the nature of score distributions. Sixth chapter deals with the analysis of data and discussion of results. Summary and conclusions form the content of the seventh chapter.

Bibliography and appendices have been given at the end of the research report as usual. Analysis of data was done by using the HCL Work Horse II Computer.