Research Paper Education

Kohlberg's Stager of Moral Reasoning in The Context of Intelligence and Socio Economic Status of High School Students

Dr. S.S. Rana | Associate Professor, T.R. College of Education, Sonipat-131001

ABSTRACT

Education is a powerful tool for the cultivation of values among students. At every stage, in any system of education, character development is regarded as one of the important aim of education. There are various psychological approaches to moral development. One of the most important approach is cognitive development approach by Kohlberg (1966), which concentrates largely on individual moral judgement that is the reason behind the judgement they make. This study was to investigate the impact of Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning on intelligence and socio-economic status of high school students. The data of present study was analyzed by 't' test and co-efficient of correlation. It was found that public school students significantly differ in moral reasoning ability than the Govt. school students. Positive relationship between moral reasoning and intelligence was obtained.

KEYWORDS Moral Reasoning, Intelligence, SES

Introduction:
One of the most significant defects of modern education is the absence in it of any clear objective and programmes promoting religious and moral education. Our educational system does not consistently foster an attitude of reverence. The growing indiscipline, the lack of ideas and the weakening of social and moral values in the younger generation have caused grave concern in many countries of the world including India.

Education is a powerful tool for the cultivation of values among students. The goals and aims of education also include development of values among children. Planned and desirable experiences need to be provided to children for making them values oriented citizen. The aim of contemporary education is not only the physical, intellectual, emotional, social, cultural development of individual but also the moral development.

Morality signifies a code of ethical principles which are essential for leading a noble life. Moral virtues like honesty, truthfulness, loyalty, co-operation, fellow feeling, justice promote the social efficiency of individual. Herbert rightly remarks "Education is the development of good moral character". Education is the only means to develop moral sense and train children for moral behavior and moral activities.

Development of Moral Reasoning:
Children are not miniature adults. They think differently, they see the world differently and they live by different model and values than adults do. There are ages at which children simply do not have the maturity to learn certain concepts. Affective teaching strategies must taken into account students ages and stages of development. There are three major psychological approaches to moral development:

1. The Psychoanalytical approach
2. The Learning theory approach
3. Cognitive development approach

Present study was concerned with cognitive development approach. Jean Piaget made the first effort to define stages of amoral reasoning in children through actual interviews and through observations of children. Piaget defined the pre-moral, the conventional and the autonomous levels as follows:

1. Pre moral stage
2. Heteronymous stage
3. Autonomous stage

The work of Kohlberg:
Besides Piaget's work, Kohlberg's contributed in this field i.e. psychology of moral development. Like Piaget, he too concentrated largely on individuals moral judgement i.e. the reasoning behind the judgements they make. Kohlberg (1966) too adopted a cognitive theory of moral development and sets out to show that principles of moral judgement gradually develop as children grow older, but this developments is highly dependent on environmental and social conditions. Kohlberg's scheme of moral development takes the form of 6 main stages, each of which reveals a different kind of motivation for acting morally or for forming moral judgements.

A stage of moral judement is reflected in the overall pattern of an individual's responses to moral dilemmas. Neither researchers nor teacher can determine a person's stage of moral thinking on the basis of answers to a single dilemma. Kohlberg did not studied children game playing, like Piaget, but rather probed for their responses to a series of structured situations or moral dilemmas on the basis of answers he received from various dilemmas. Kohlberg proposed that people pass through a series of six stages of moral judgement or reasoning. He grouped these 6 stages into 3 levels:

1. Punishment & obedience orientation
2. Instrumental Relativist Orientation
3. "Good Boy – Nice Girl" Orientation
4. "Law and Order" Orientation
5. Social Contract Orientation
6. Universal Ethical Principle Orientation

Objectives:
1. To study the percentage of students at the different stages of Kohlberg's moral reasoning.
2. To study the differences in moral reasoning of Public and Government high school students.
3. To investigate into the differences in moral reasoning scores of high school students at different levels of intelligence.
4. To investigate into the differences in moral reasoning scores of high school students at different levels of socio-economic status (SES).
5. To find out relationship between moral reasoning scores and SES.
6. To find out relationship between moral reasoning scores and SES.
7. To study the relationship of moral reasoning scores on intelligence and SES.

Hypotheses:
1. Public school students score significantly higher in moral reasoning ability than the Government school students.
2. The students who score high on intelligence show greater maturity in their moral reasoning than who score low on intelligence.
3. The students who score high on SES, show greater maturity in their moral reasoning than who score low on SES.
4. There is positive relationship between moral reasoning and intelligence.
5. There is positive relationship between moral reasoning and SES.

Tools and Sources:
1. Culture fair test of intelligence (Scale 3 form A)
2. Socio-economic status scale questionnaire by Kapoor and Kocher
3. Moral dilemmas were prepared for obtaining scores on moral reasoning

Sample:
Sample of 50 students belonging to different schools of Rohtak city was taken. Students both from public and Government school were selected

Statistical Analysis and Interpretation:
The data of present study was analysed by 't' test and coefficient of correlation (Product-Moment Correlation). In this regard, means and S.D.'s in various combinations were calculated. The results are presented as follows:

1. Significant differences in moral reasoning scores of high school students:
Table No. 1
Overall means, S.D.'s and t values of High School Students N = 50

	Mean	S.D.	t	P
Public schools	45.7	3.24	2.11	.05
Government schools	43.2	4.98		

The result of t test as shows in Table No. 1, reveals that the t ratio was 2.1, d.f. 48, which is found to be significant at .05 level. This shows that public school and Government schools students differs significantly in their moral reasoning score.

2. Significances of differences in Moral Reasoning scores of various groups
Table No. 2.1
Mean, S.D.'s and t values of Moral Reasoning Scores of high and low I.Q. scorers school students.

	Mean	S.D.	t	P
High I.Q. Scorers	45.5	3.28	1..95	.10
Low I.Q. Scorers	43.3	5.01		

The result of t test as shows as Table No. 2.1, reveals that the t ratio is found 1.95, d.f. 48 which is found to be significant at .10 level. It means that students who are high on I.Q. are also high on moral reasoning.

2.2 SES and Moral Reasoning Scores:
Means, S.D.'s and 't' values of moral reasoning scores of high and low SES students.

	Mean	S.D.	t	P
High SES	45.84	3.96	1.87	.05
Low SES	43.48	4.96		

The result of 't' test as shows in Table No. 2.2 the t ratio comes out to be 1.87, d.f. (48) which is found to be significant at .05 level.

3. Significance of differences in I.Q.'s scores of public and Government School Students
3.1 I.Q. Score and School Students
Table No. 3.1.1
Means, S.D.'s and 't' values of I.Q.'s scorers of public & Govt. School students.

	Mean	S.D.	t	P
Public schools	109.72	10.67	10.2	.001
Government schools	80.12	10.53		

As it is clear from table 3.1.1, that t ratio is 10.2 (d.f. 48), which is found to be significant at .001). It means in public schools usually the students of high IQ level admits. The parents of such children are very much concern about their children future.

3.1.2 SES Score and School Students
Table 3.1.2
Means, S.D.'s t values of SES scorers of public and Government School Students

	Mean	S.D.	t	P
Public schools	64.24	6.10	2.60	.02
Government schools	55.68	15.32		

The result of t test as show in Table No. 3.1.2, d.f. = 48 t -2.60 which is found to be significant at .02 levels. It means that, in public school students of higher or middle strata of society get admitted. Whereas in Govt. School students of low strata of society comes.

Table No. 4 Coefficient of correlation of moral reasoning score with various criterias Correlation among

	r	P
Reasoning Score & I.Q.	0.51	.01
Reasoning Score and SES	0.47	.01

4.1 Moral Reasoning and I.Q.:
The result show that coefficient of correlation for Reasoning score and intelligence was found to be 0.51 d.f. 48 which was statistically significant, which means that jntelligence and moral reasoning are positively correlated.

4.2 Reasoning Score and SES
The result of coefficient of correlation for moral reasoning and SES was 0.47 df 48 which was found to be significant at 0.01 level which means that there is positive relationship between SES and reasoning scores.

Table No. 5 Percentage of student at different stages of Kohlberg's Moral Reasoning

Stage	Percentage Public	Government
I	0	0
I	0	0
III	20	56
IV	80	44
V	0	0
VI	0	0

As it is clear from table No. 5, that majority of public school students falls in IVth stage while Government schools students falls in stage III. According to Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning, the children who falls in stage IVth, shows respect for authority and maintain the social order for own sake. While student belongs to Stage III, behave in such manner which

pleases or helps other and is approved of by them. Although both stage III and IVth are of conventional level, yet schools students have great interaction with their parents. Parents tells them advance what will be practical consequences of doing any action. So they behave in such manner which is within the context of society's norms. They do not behave in selfish manner. Laws are followed without question and breaking the law can never be justified.

Findings:

1. Public school students significantly differ in moral reasoning ability than the Government school students.
2. There is a significant difference in moral reasoning of students who score high on intelligence than those who score low on intelligence.
3. The students who score high on SES show marked difference in their moral reasoning than those who score low on SES.
4. There is a positive relationship between moral reasoning and intelligence.
5. There is a positive relationship between moral reasoning and SES.

REFERENCES

• Alston, W.P. (1971) Comments on Kohlberg's from is to ought In Mischel, T. (ed) Cognitive Development and Epistemology, New York Academic, 269-284. | • Balhatchet, R.P. (1980) Survey of Moral Values, Interim Report on Progress of Moral Education Project, Singapore Ministry of Education. | • Berry, J.W., Dases, P.R. (1974) Culture and Cognition: Readings in Cross Cultural Psychology, London, Methuen. | • Kohlberg, L (1966) Stage and Sequence: The cognitive development approach to socialization in Goslin, D.A. (ed) Handbook of Socialisation. Theory and Research, Chicago, Rand McNally, 347-480. | • Kohlberg, L. (1958) The Development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years ten to sixteen, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago. | • Kohlberg, L. (1971a) From is to Ought: How to commit naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development, in Mischel, T. (ed) Cognitive Development and Epistemology, New York, Academic, 151-235. | • Piaget, J. (1932) The Moral Judgement of the Child, New York, The Free Press. | • Simpson, E.L. (1974) Moral Development Research: A Case of Scientific Cultural Bias Human Development 17 2 81-106 | • Slavin E. Rober (1986) Educational Psychology: Theory into Practice, Prentice-Hall, Englewood cliffs, New Jersey. | • Thomas, E., Ang, K.H. (1985 a) Value Preferences of Junior College Adolescents in Singapore, Research Report University of London Institute of Education/Institute of Education, Singapore. | • Truiel, E. (1975) The Development of Social Concepts: Mores Customs and Conventions in De Palma D., Foley, J., (eds) Moral Development: Current Theory and Research. Hillsdale, J.J., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. |