

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORAL JUDGMENT IN FILIPINO URBAN CHILDREN

MA. CARMEN JIMENEZ
Department of Psychology
University of the Philippines

Three aspects of Piaget's theory on moral development (intentionality, punishment and responsibility for a culpable act) and their applicability to urban Filipino children were studied. Specifically, the present study investigated whether the Ss would choose consequences or motives as their basis for moral judgment (intentionality), whether they would choose punishment and if so, what kind under three situations presented – breakage purely accidental, due to carelessness and intentional (punishment)–and whether they would decide on collective or individual responsibility and hence punishment in two situations – the one at fault does not wish to tell and the group willingly shields him and only the offender knows he did wrong and keeps quiet.

Seven stories generally patterned after those used by Piaget and Johnson were presented to 216 schoolchildren from the Greater Manila Area who were evenly divided as to age (3 levels – 6-7, 9-10 and 12-13), sex (male and female) and socio-economic status (3 levels – high, middle and low).

Data indicated that children across the variables of age, sex and SES chose to base their moral judgments on motives rather than consequences; that there is a progressive decrease in retributive forms (physical) with age and rise in socio-economic status; that females proposed more reciprocal forms as well as a greater number of punishments; that collective responsibility was favored by children in all three variables for both situations, with children in the youngest group and the lowest socio-economic level being the most punitive.

Any attempt to define morality necessarily encounters difficulties. It is a concept everyone presumes to know until asked. Then everyone discovers an inability to conceptualize it. It is a subject to be lived rather than consciously defined.

Definitely, morality plays a very important role in society, pervading every aspect of life in politics, economics, religion and education, to mention a few. Indeed, one may even question whether there can be a society without morality. Or even if there can be a morality

apart from society.

Socially, morality may be defined as a phenomenon, a framework of rules and ideas, conformity to which is enforced by the weight of social pressure. In this definition are two ideas – the idea of sanction so that individuals are penalized for breaking a rule by their neighbors and the idea of general rules of standard patterns of conduct which are taught and systematically enforced. Wherever men gather in meaningful interaction, a morality is evolved to order and regulate these interactions.

A body of value judgments is generally agreed upon, labelling those aspects of interaction as good or bad, right or wrong, adequate or inadequate and enforcing conformity by means of a system of reward and punishment.

Psychologically, morality may be defined from the aspect of the agent himself. Morality is the content of conscience. My morality is not what other people insist I should do but what I insist I should do. Moral sanctions may come from the individual. He may have learned to dislike himself for acting in certain ways by being made to feel disliked by others for acting in certain ways. In this way, conscience becomes the representative of society inside the individual's mind. It is society with its rules and regulations internalized.

A psychologist closely associated with the study of morality is Jean Piaget. Using stories which systematically varied the magnitude of the crime and the motives for the act, he found two major stages in the formation of moral judgment:

1. the morality of constraint lasting until about seven or eight years and soon followed by
2. the morality of cooperation until the child is about nine or ten.

The Morality of Constraint

The morality of constraint occurs as a result of the egocentric child's view of adults as dominant and omnipotent. All rules are believed to come from them. All rules therefore have to be obeyed automatically and without question. They are held to be absolute, sacred and immutable. Morality during this period is said to exist solely in relation to rules and the moral life of the child may be characterized by an almost total submission to authority. Obedience is exacted by the adult's reply, "Because I say so," and no questions asked.

The child's judgments are therefore characterized by moral realism which is "the tendency

which the child has to regard duty and the value attaching to it as self-subsistent and independent of the mind, as imposing itself regardless of the circumstances in which the individual may find himself" (Piaget, 1948, p. 106). He is concerned with adult demands as expressed in rules and so he focuses his attention on the visible results of an action. He is unconcerned with intentions or motives. On the cognitive level, this is the period of pre-operational intelligence with its perceptual emphasis. The child is capable of comprehending only the observable. Consequences are perceptible; intentions are not.

At this stage, justice is thought to be immanent, automatically emanating from the object in the situation. A belief in immanent justice is the belief in the automatic connection between a wrongdoing and the physical event following the incident which serves as punishment for the wrongdoing. According to Piaget, belief in immanent justice decreases with increase in chronological age.

Any punishment administered during this period is regarded as an act of expiation. The wrongdoer must be made to realize the seriousness of his misdeed. The more severe the punishment is, therefore, the better or fairer it is. Punishment is arbitrary since there need be no relation between the misdeed and the nature of the punishment.

The Morality of Cooperation

Piaget calls the more mature kind of morality the morality of cooperation. During this period, moral judgment becomes autonomous and is regulated by values originating within the child. The previous unilateral relationship with adults gives way to new relationships with a peer society wherein conduct is regulated by rules based upon mutual respect and cooperation. He comes to realize that rules are no longer unchangeable absolutes but that they can be altered and must be subordinated to human needs. There is a new emphasis on human

relationships which produces a sense of group solidarity. Rules are now to be obeyed, not because adults say they must be, but because rules are representative of the social will whose function is to safeguard society. From experience, he learns that misdeeds are not always punished and that adult justice is far from flawless. On the cognitive level, the child has passed from pre-operational to operational thinking. He can now utilize operations which are internalized mental activities capable of reversibility. He becomes capable of internalizing rules and reversing their application, and begins to take other viewpoints into consideration. Experience, combined with his intellectual development, results in a decrease in belief in immanent justice.

Instead of advocating retributive justice, he believes that punishment should follow the principle of reciprocity. It should put things right, restore the status quo ante. He sees that inflicting pain in retribution is not always necessary. It is enough that the offender realizes that he has broken trust and isolated himself from the group.

Now he comes to evaluate behavior, not in terms of its objective consequences, but in terms of the intentions and motives of the actor. This is the development of the concept of subjective responsibility.

The last stage involves the emergence of equity. The law is not seen to be the same for all men. The personal circumstances of each one are carefully considered so that punishment is administered on a case-to-case basis. This is the development of "equalitarianism in the direction of relativity."

According to Piaget, progression from the morality of constraint to the morality of cooperation is not dependent upon direct adult tuition. Nor can it be explained simply as a result of mere physical or intellectual growth. It is rather a result of social processes, of the child's experiences and interactions with others in his environment. More specifically, it is a result of the child's attempts to abstract some

sense and meaning from these experiences and interactions, to reconcile conflicts and inconsistencies between adult preaching and his own experiences and observations.

Implications

The tremendous implications that such a theory of development raises regarding the proper emphasis and manner of upbringing for children is especially relevant today in view of the importance given to proper education, not only in the schools but also within the family. It has repeatedly been stressed that a nation's strength is reflective of the strength of character of the people. Therefore, a study of morality may yield better understanding of it and enable us to develop better individuals and citizens.

A sense of morality is basic to every man. Therefore a study of morality is a study of man in his development. A study of morality is also a study of a culture since morality changes and in turn is changed by society and its culture.

The foreign literature abounds with studies done in moral development while there is a paucity of Philippine material regarding this area of development. These studies have merely revealed the host of variables affecting moral development, uncovering its rich complexity.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Among the many variables found to affect moral development are:

1. the presence of appropriate social models
2. socio-economic status which affects parental attitudes regarding discipline
3. intelligence
4. religious instruction
5. age
6. sex
7. cultural and educational goals
8. training

Presence of appropriate social models

Bandura and MacDonald (1963) tested the relative efficacy of social reinforcement and modeling procedure in modifying the moral judgmental responses which Piaget considered age-specific.

One hundred sixty-five children described their reactions to a wide variety of social situations and were then divided into three groups. One group observed adult models who expressed moral judgments contrary to the children's orientations. These children were then reinforced with approval for adopting the models' responses. A second group observed the models but were not reinforced for adopting their behavior. A third group was not exposed to the models but was reinforced for moral judgments contrary to their previously expressed beliefs. After the treatments, the children were tested for generalization effects. It was found that the treatments produced substantial changes in the children's moral judgment responses. Conditions utilizing modeling cues proved more effective than operant conditioning techniques. Children's judgmental responses are readily modifiable and may even be reversed by the provision of appropriate social models.

Socio-economic status which affects parental attitudes regarding discipline

Working-class parents are more likely to respond in terms of the immediate consequences of the child's actions and to emphasize surface appearances. Middle-class parents are more likely to respond in terms of their interpretation of the child's intent in his actions. These reflect differences in parental values. Working-class parents value qualities that assure respectability. Desirable behavior consists essentially of adhering to norms. Middle-class parents are more secure regarding their social status and could therefore go beyond appearances. They value the child's development of internalized standards of conduct, stressing self-control; desirable behavior consists essentially of acting according to one's principles. The first

focuses on the act itself, the second on the intent (Kohn, 1959a; Kohn, 1959b; Kohn, 1963; Boehm and Nass, 1962).

Differences in parental disciplinary techniques also contribute to class differences in moral judgment.

Middle-class and working-class parents do not discipline their children in the same manner. The middle-class parent is more likely to be moderate if not lenient. He will overlook some offenses which his working-class counterpart will typically punish. If he does exert discipline, he is more inclined to reason out with the child or even make him feel guilty for his misdeed. He is also more apt to use withdrawal of love as a method of discipline. His emphasis is on the early assumption of responsibility by the child.

Probably reflecting their parents' child-rearing differences, more children from the middle-class look beyond the misdeed. Instead of prescribing punishment, the middle-class child is prone to suggest that the environment be changed. He realizes that environmental features may have produced the immoral deed. If the middle-class child does advocate some form of punishment, he is less likely to call for personal punishment of the naughty child. Children from the lower socio-economic level tend to hold the individual child responsible for any violation of the rules of conduct and thought in terms of punishment for the offending child (Dolger and Ginandes, 1946; Davis and Havighurst, 1946; Hoffman, 1960; Hoffman, 1963a; Hoffman, 1963b; Hoffman and Salzstein, 1967).

Intelligence

There is a lack of unanimity as to whether intelligence affects moral judgment. Durkin (1959) finds little relation between intelligence and the justice concept. Johnson (1962) finds some evidence favoring intelligence as do Whitehead and Kosier (1964). Boehm (1962a) reports that maturity of judgment occurs earlier among academically gifted children of the upper-middle class than among children in the other classes in her sample.

Religious Instruction

Boehm (1962b) tested for influences that religious training might have on conscience development. She found that Catholic parochial school children, regardless of social class or intelligence level, scored higher at an earlier age than public school children, at least in recognizing the distinction between motivation and the results of an action. This, she explained, was because of the emphasis by Catholic schools on the distinction between accident, misdeed, and sin.

To investigate further whether children of other religious schools also learn to distinguish right from wrong at an earlier age because of daily emphasis on ethical principles, Boehm (1963a) elaborated on her previous study.

She studied academically gifted upper-middle class children from a Jewish parochial school. This study showed that these Jewish children showed stronger empathy with an injured peer and more independence from adult authority. So Jewish children did not feel overly concerned with misdeeds, focusing instead on making up with the injured peer. This was contrasted with the attitude of Catholic children who were more concerned with sin and guilt, so that they could only think in terms of expiation, to the exclusion of the injured person.

However, Armsby (1971) found no difference between Catholic and parochial educated children when the distinction between purposiveness and accident was made clear enough. He opined that the more authoritarian approach and emphasis on obedience of Catholic schools only sensitized the children to make their judgments in terms of whether they were obeying their mothers or not.

Age

Piaget (1948) has proposed that a child's understanding of what is just changes with increasing chronological age. For the younger child, justice is to be found in the authority

figure; for the older child, it is to be found in reciprocity.

Durkin (1959a; 1959b) studied children's concepts of justice as compared with Piagetian data. She found that Piaget's contention of a relationship existing between chronological age and justice concept is substantiated. However, data did not support his more specific proposal that acceptance of reciprocity as a justice principle increases with age. Between grades 2 and 5, there is evidence of such a trend, although eight graders, like second graders, tended to seek justice in authority figures.

Ilan and Tan (1969) studied Piaget's proposed two stages of morality with a group of third and sixth graders from a Diliman and a Maquiling school. They found that children, regardless of age, seemed to consider intentions more than the consequences in the attribution of punishment and that females, as well as younger children from Diliman, were more punitive.

Armsby (1971) found that an age progression existed in the internalization of intentionality although there is no clear age level which indicates when the morality of constraint ceases to operate and the child moves into the more mature stage of the morality of cooperation.

Chandler, Greenspan and Barenboim (1973) found that the actual onset of intentional judgments was considerably earlier than previously assumed and that previous results indicating that young children were unresponsive to the issue of intentionality were methodological artifacts of the verbal assessment procedures employed. These assessment strategies inadvertently highlighted the perceptual saliency of the consequences and diluted the significance of the intentions which prompted them. The verbally presented materials employed by previous studies represented a medium in which consequences were made relatively more explicit than intentions while the experimenters felt that the medium they used (videotape) balanced the relative saliency of intentions and

consequences so that children were able to display competence in dealing with matters of intentionality.

Sex

Durkin (1960) investigated sex differences in children's concepts of justice. She found that there was no significant sex difference with regard to moral judgment. Two of the five stories described behaviors commonly regarded as masculine (physical aggression) while another depicted a feminine behavior (verbal aggression). Yet even in these stories, no significant sex differences in responses were found. It was therefore hypothesized that boy-girl responses were similar because the kind of moral training given to children was not affected by the sex of the child. It was further hypothesized that previous studies describing differences in the actual behaviors of boys and girls noted the end result, not of the differences in their training, but rather of important differences in the pressure exerted on boys and girls by parents, teachers and peers to adhere to various precepts and values defined in the training process.

Porteus and Johnson (1965) tested 235 ninth graders using an effective cognitive measures of moral judgment. They found that girls showed greater moral maturity than did boys on both the cognitive and affective measures.

Cultural and educational goals

Boehm (1957) reports a difference in culture and educational goals affecting the development of moral judgment, at least insofar as American children are concerned. According to her, American children appear to be independent of their elders at an earlier age than their European counterparts in thought and action. Not only do they depend less on adult guidance and judgment but their consciences seem to mature earlier. This she attributes to a difference in educational goals.

Inner-directed societies, as are common in Europe, inculcate, through education, the internalization of their goals and values in their children. The child grows up to believe in and respect the authority of his elders and superiors. In other-directed societies, as in America, parents have abandoned all responsibility for directing the child and have abrogated this right to their children's peers. The child is encouraged to use critical thinking in the hope that his reasoning will become "interiorized" or "autonomous". Seemingly, an inner-directed child must be older than the other-directed child before he bases his moral judgments, not only on the effects of the deed but also on the feelings of the victim and on the offender's intentions. It is also possible that an inner-directed child's conscience remains egocentric longer than the other-directed child's conscience. A culture which values cooperation more than dependence upon adults stresses skills necessary for group life, hence, the earlier maturity of social consciences.

Training

Grinder (1964) investigated the relation between behavioral and cognitive dimensions of conscience development. He found that children's compliance with social standards in the face of temptation probably occurred more as a function of social learning experiences than as a result of changes in the cognitive structure. Maturation of the "conceptual schemata necessary for mature moral judgment," although dependent upon interaction with the social environment, does not guarantee significant alteration of habits previously established by reinforcement contingencies.

Crowley (1968) believed that objectivity in moral judgment was the result of egocentrism (inability to assume the other's viewpoint), syncretism (reacting to the whole rather than analyzing the elements), and centration (focusing on some striking but superficial aspect of a phenomenon). Therefore, if one were to present a child with a task which required him to assume the role of the other, look at

his motives and to decenter from the striking but superficial aspects as well as to analyze a story more closely, objectivity would decrease. Accordingly, children were trained to focus on intent and encouraged to verbalize the principle while being reinforced with tokens.

It was found that training was effective since it dealt with a relatively specific response. Any change resulting from training could then be interpreted as a change in an isolated social response rather than in a mental structure or stage. However, verbalization of the principle was not found to be effective since meaningful verbalization by the subject depends on variables such as age and level of conceptual difficulty. The subjects' excellent performance on the training task indicates that objectivity does not mean inability to grasp intention but rather failure to focus on intention when a competing cue is introduced. Centration does appear to be a major factor in objective moral judgment.

King (1971) suggests that children's ability to recognize intention be treated as a conceptual skill distinct from other factors associated with their moral and social judgments. He finds that the ability to distinguish intent from accident initially begins at the age of 4-5 and becomes well developed by the age of 9 while the ability to distinguish unconscious intention in others' behavior begins at 8-9. He further suggests that it is possible to induce more mature moral judgments in young children by training them to discriminate between intention and accident.

Tayag (1964) studied Filipino children's moral judgments regarding two of Piaget's concepts - punishments and responsibility - taking age, sex, and level of parental education as her independent variables. She found that sex and age were significantly related to children's moral judgments. With regard to punishment, she found that girls favored retributive types while boys favored reciprocal types of punishment; that the older age group favored reciprocal types; and that at all age levels, the most common form of punishment advocated

was punishment by reciprocity while significantly more children in the youngest group favored retribution. In general, there was an increase in the number of children who favored reciprocal forms of punishment with an increase in age.

From a review of the literature on the variables affecting moral development, the information relevant to the present study are:

1. Socio-economic status affects moral development insofar as it shapes the values of parents and identifies the cues they respond to in their interactions with their children.

2. Findings are ambiguous as to whether there are sex differences in moral development although there is evidence that girls are more punitive (more inclined towards retributive forms of punishment) than boys.

3. Age is found to be significantly related to moral development with younger children emphasizing objectivity and older children emphasizing subjectivity. Younger children also tend towards retributive forms of punishment. However, more recent studies have found that intentionality occurs much earlier than previously thought and that children may be trained to make more mature moral judgments even at an early age.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present study was designed to investigate three aspects of Piaget's theory of moral development in a Philippine setting - intentionality, punishment and responsibility for a culpable act.

Specifically, the study tries to answer the following questions:

1. Is age a significant factor in the moral judgment of Filipino children? What are the differences, if any, in the moral judgments of Filipino children of different ages?

2. Is sex a significant factor in the moral judgment of Filipino children? What are the differences, if any, in the moral judgments of Filipino males and females?

3. Is socio-economic status a significant factor in the moral judgment of Filipino children? What are the differences, if any, in the moral judgments of Filipino children in the various socio-economic levels?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. **MORAL JUDGMENT** — is not concerned with whether the child's behavior is moral or not but in how he judges or thinks about moral matters such as breaking rules or committing misdeeds. Moral judgments refer to the way in which the child decides such issues.

2. **INTENTIONALITY** — an aspect of moral development wherein immaturity is determined by the child's emphasis on the objective consequences of an act as the basis for judgment, while maturity is indicated by a consideration of such intangibles as motives and intentions.

3. **PUNISHMENT** — On the basis of his empirical data, Piaget classified punishment into two types — retributive and reciprocal.

The word "retributive" implies reprisal or retaliation. This type of punishment is most prevalent among younger children. Responses are classified as retributive when:

a) the punishment is inflicted mainly in order to cause suffering and pain,

b) punishment is given in a vindictive or spiteful manner,

c) punishment is not necessarily related to the offense in content and nature.

Reciprocal forms of punishment are intended to set things right and are most prevalent among older children. Responses are classified as reciprocal when:

a) the misdeed and the punishment are related in content and nature,

b) they are aimed at making the child realize how he has broken the bond of mutual trust and cooperation

More specifically, they involve

a) expulsion from the social group,

b) punishments that appeal only to the immediate and material consequences of the act,

c) deprivation of the thing misused;

d) simple-reciprocity or reciprocity proper — doing to the child exactly what he has done himself and no more (concept of an-eye-for-an-eye),

e) purely restitutive punishments or putting right the material damage,

f) censure, only, without punishment.

4. **RESPONSIBILITY FOR A CULPABLE ACT** — as aspect of moral judgment wherein the child decides who should be punished for a culpable act committed while in the presence of a group — should only the offender (individual responsibility) or should the whole group be held responsible (collective responsibility) — in two types of situation: the group willingly shields the offender and the group is ignorant of the offender's identity.

HYPOTHESES

The following are hypothesized:

1. There will be significant differences among the children in the three age levels with regard to

A. Intentionality

Younger children will emphasize objective consequences while older children will emphasize the actor's intentions;

B. Punishment

Younger children will favor expiatory types of punishment while older children will favor

reciprocal types of punishment.

C. Responsibility for a culpable act

Younger children will favor individual responsibility for Broken Window B and Party Story while older children will favor collective responsibility for Broken Window B and individual responsibility for Party Story.

2. Since the literature is ambiguous with respect to sex differences, the tentative hypothesis that there will be no sex differences with regard to

A. Intentionality

B. Punishment

C. Responsibility for a culpable act

is advanced.

3. There will be significant differences among children in the various socio-economic levels with regard to

A. Intentionality

Children in the lower socio-economic level will emphasize objective consequences while children from the higher socio-economic level will emphasize subjective responsibility.

B. Punishment

Children from the lower socio-economic level will favor expiatory types of punishment while children from the higher socio-economic levels will favor reciprocal types of punishment.

C. Responsibility for a culpable act

Children in the lower socio-economic level will favor individual responsibility while children in the higher socio-economic levels will favor collective responsibility for a culpable act.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

216 schoolchildren from the Greater Manila area served as Ss for this study. They were evenly divided as to age (3 levels - 6-7, 9-10, 12-13), sex (males and females), and socio-economic level (3 levels - high, middle, and low). The distribution of Ss according to these three variables are as follows:

Age	Sex	SES
6- 7 - 72	Males - 108	High - 72
9-10 - 72	Females - 108	Middle- 72
12-13 - 72		Low - 72

Materials

Seven stories were presented to the children (See Appendix). They were short, simple and generally patterned after the stories of Piaget (1948) and Johnson (1963) with some modifications. They were pretested for translation equivalence and comprehensibility and were in two versions (English and Filipino). The stories presented to male subjects had male characters while those presented to female subjects had female characters in order to facilitate identification. Otherwise, the stories were similar in every respect.

Piaget's operational measure of intentionality utilized a pair of stories with an objective alternative (a child's accidental action causes considerable damage) and a subjective alternative (a child's intentionally malicious act is accompanied by minor damage). These stories are complex since two dimensions are combined - intentionality or lack of it - and two types of consequences - large and small. Instead, stories were constructed for this study wherein consequences were equated so that the only important difference was the contrast between an intentional and an accidental act.

Equivalence of the two versions was determined by presenting them to 20 bilingual college students. They were asked to rate the degree to which the two versions were similar on a scale with values ranging from 1 to 5 with 1 being totally similar and 5 being totally dissimilar. They were also asked to indicate which translated portions were doubtful. It was explained that similarity in content and thought was desired rather than complete fidelity to sentence structure.

An example of these stories would be Lost Stories A & B (Intentionality, English version, male).

1. Lost Story A

Mario and his family had just transferred to Quezon City so that he didn't know his neighborhood very well. One day, a man stopped to ask him where Mayon St. was. Mario did not know where Mayon St. was but he wanted to help the man. So he pointed just anywhere and said "There." The man kept walking and walking until he got lost.

2. Lost Story B

Once there was a boy named Freddie. He was a smart boy and knew his neighborhood very well. One day, a man stopped to ask him where Mahinhin St. was. Freddie knew where Mahinhin St. was but he wanted to play a joke on the man. So he pointed to some other place and said, "There." The man kept walking and walking until he got lost.

1. What happened in the stories?
2. Were the two boys naughty, was only one boy naughty or was no one naughty?
3. Why?

There were two stories for Area I (Intentionality), three stories for Area II (Punishment) and two stories for Area III (Responsibility for a culpable act).

The questions for Area I were constructed to see if the child would place more emphasis on the concrete result (Lost Story A) or the actor's intent (Lost Story B).

The questions for Area II were constructed to see if the child would suggest punishment and if so, what kind of punishment in the following circumstances:

1. breakage purely accidental (Broken Window A)
2. breakage due to carelessness (Waterglass Story)
3. breakage intentional (Toys Story)

The questions for Area III were to see if the child would suggest group punishment or indi-

vidual culpability in the following circumstances:

1. the one at fault does not want to tell and the group wishes to shield him (Broken Window B)
2. only the offender knows he did wrong and keeps quiet (Party Story)

Procedure.

Eight college students were asked to classify 23 schools according to the socio-economic status usually associated with their students. Those schools which were unanimously agreed upon as belonging to a particular category were then used as sample areas. This was done in the absence of an SES indicator and in order to control for religious instruction. These schools were Ateneo, Assumption Convent, Malate Catholic School, and Ermita Catholic School.

The children in the age levels used were usually in Grade I (ages 6-7), Grades 3-4 (9-10) and Grades 5-6 (12-13). They were chosen at random from lists of students enrolled in a grade. The Ss were tested individually in a vacant room, asked some questions about themselves and their father's occupation as an index of SES. Each S was also asked if he/she preferred the session conducted in English or Filipino. Once a choice was made, the session was begun, the instructions read out and questions regarding these instructions, if any, were answered. The stories were then read out loud, slowly and clearly, one at a time, to the subject and his answers to the questions at the end of each story written down verbatim. The same order of stories was followed all throughout for all the Ss. If the experimenter felt that the subject did not answer the question satisfactorily, or if verbalization was difficult for him/her, probing was done. Sometimes, more than one answer was given. This was especially true for Area II (Punishment) when the Ss were asked to prescribe punishments. In such cases, the Ss were asked which punishment they considered the more important or the likelier. All the interviews were done by the experimenter in order to control for experimenter effect. The subject's reasons for their answers were al-

ways asked for clarification and/or elaboration.

The length of each session varied, depending upon the age level of the subject. Older Ss usually requested for repetitions of the stories and gave short, direct answers. Thus, the sessions were relatively brief and easy to record. Younger Ss had shorter attention spans, required several repetitions, took their time in answering and often meandered in their replies. These sessions, although highly fascinating and revealing of child logic and full of interesting information, were long and exhausting.

The responses were then categorized by the experimenter and a graduate psychology student who was relatively well-versed with Piaget's theory. They scored the protocols separately at first, after which the two judges came together to compare their ratings and to discuss those they disagreed upon. At all times, agreement was aspired for.

Scoring Method

In Area I, responses were categorized according to whether the child emphasized the objective consequences of the act or the actor's intent. He was presented two stories which were similar in every respect except in terms of the actor's motives. He had to compare the intentions of the principal characters and decide who had committed the more serious misdeed and why. Only one score was recorded – whether the subject chose consequences or motives as his basis for judgment.

There were three stories in Area II (Punishment), each involving breakage under conditions of varying degrees of magnitude – accidentally, carelessly, intentionally. Two scores were derived per story. The first score indicated the subject's judgment as to whether the principal character deserved punishment. The second score indicated the type of punishment he prescribed. The frequencies with which the subjects decided that punishment was necessary were taken. In addition, the answers of those subjects who had opted for punishment were taken into consideration. Their answers were categorized

as either retributive or reciprocal and the specific types of punishment within each category were listed and tabulated.

These categories were those made by Piaget and were used mainly as guidelines for the data gathered in this study. The experimenter also wanted to see if any new categories would be suggested by the subjects.

In Area III, (Responsibility for a culpable act), the subject was presented two stories. For each story, he had to decide whether punishment was necessary and if it was, decide who should be punished. Again, the Ss' responses were tabulated into yes/no categories per story. Also considered were the responses of those who had judged that punishment was necessary. Their responses were categorized as favoring either collective or individual punishment in the two situations given.

RESULTS

Intentionality

The questions in Area I were designed to find out if the child would place more emphasis on the objective consequences of an act or on the imperceptible motive for the act.

TABLE 1
Frequencies and Percentages of Ss Choosing
Consequences or Motives According to
Socio-Economic Status

SES	Consequences	Motives
Low	8 (11.11%)	64 (88.89%)
Middle	8 (11.11%)	64 (88.89%)
High	15 (20.83%)	57 (79.17%)

Lost Stories A and B required that the child judge two children who gave a man the wrong street direction. Both actions resulted in the same consequence (the man got lost) although the children differed in their motivations. Table

1 indicates that children consistently chose to place the greater emphasis on motives rather than on consequences. Children from the lower and middle socio-economic levels chose to consider motives by a larger percentage (88.89%) than children from the upper level (79.17%). These results are contrary to Hypothesis 3A which states that children in the lower socio-economic level will emphasize objective consequences while children in the higher socio-economic level will emphasize subjective responsibility. Children across all three levels consistently chose to consider motives over objective consequences as their basis for judgment.

TABLE 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Ss Choosing Consequences or Motives According to Age

Age	Consequences	Motives
6-7	3 (4.17%)	69 (95.83%)
9-10	8 (11.11%)	64 (88.89%)
12-13	20 (27.78%)	52 (72.22%)

Table 2 indicates that children across all three age levels consistently chose to consider motives rather than consequences as their basis for judgment. Children from the youngest age level chose to consider motives to a greater degree than children from the two older levels (6-7 - 95.83% as compared to 9-10 - 88.89% and 12-13 - 72.22%). This is contrary to Hypothesis 1A which states that younger children will emphasize objective consequences while older children will emphasize the actor's intentions.

According to Piaget (1948), moral realism, that is, emphasis on objective consequences, is to be found only among the very young. With increasing maturity, this is gradually replaced by a corresponding increase in emphasis upon motives and intentions. However, Table 2 indicates that there appears to be a trend towards

the reverse, at least insofar as the present sample is concerned. With an increase in age, there appears to be a corresponding increase in emphasis in the consequences of an act so that moral realism would seem to be found, following the trend in Table 2, in early adolescence.

TABLE 3

Frequencies and Percentages of Ss Choosing Consequences or Motives According to Sex

Sex	Consequences	Motives
Male	14 (12.96%)	94 (87.04%)
Female	17 (15.74%)	91 (84.26%)

Table 3 indicates that both males and females chose to consider motives as their basis for judgment. This is in agreement with Hypothesis 2A which states that there are no sex differences with regard to intentionality.

Table 4 indicates that there are no significant differences between any two categories on the socio-economic level regarding the child's emphasis on the basis for his moral judgment. Using the test of significance of the difference between two proportions as a statistical tool, the data indicate that there are no differences among the responses of Ss in the three socio-economic levels. They all chose to consider consequences or motives in almost the same number.

It was also found that there were significant differences in the responses of children across the three age levels. Significantly, less children in the 9-10 year-old level chose to consider motives as compared to 6-7 year-olds ($t=2.5$, $p<.05$) and significantly less 12-13 year-olds chose to consider motives when compared with the 6-7 year olds ($t=3.88$, $p<0.01$) and the 9-10 year-olds ($t=2.53$, $p<.05$).

There were no significant differences between males and females in their choice of basis for judgment.

TABLE 4

Significance of Differences in Frequencies of Intentionality Responses According to AGE, SEX and Socio-Economic Status

SES	Frequencies	t scores
Low & Middle	64 vs. 64	0.00
Low vs. High	64 vs. 57	1.61
Middle vs. High	64 vs. 57	1.61
AGE		
6-7 vs. 9-10	69 vs. 64	2.5*
6-7 vs. 12-13	69 vs. 52	3.88**
9-10 vs. 12-13	64 vs. 52	2.53*
SEX		
Male vs. Female	94 vs. 91	.069

*significant at .05

**significant at .001

In summary, the following results for Area I (Intentionality) were obtained:

1. Children across all three socio-economic levels chose to consider motives rather than consequences as their basis for judgment.

2. Children across all three age levels chose to consider motives rather than consequences as their basis for judgment.

3. There were no sex differences with regard to Intentionality. This supports Hypothesis 2A. Both sexes chose to consider motives rather than consequences as their basis for judgment.

4. There were no significant differences between any two socio-economic levels with regard to the number of choices of consequences or motives.

5. There were significant differences between any two age levels with regard to the choices of consequences vs. motives. Significantly more 6-7 year olds chose motives as opposed to the 9-10 and the 12-13 year old while more 9-10 year-olds chose motives as compared with the 12-13 year olds.

6. There is no significant difference in the proportion of males and females who chose to consider consequences as opposed to motives. This supports Hypothesis 2A.

Punishment

The questions in Area II were designed to see if the child would suggest punishment under the following circumstances:

1. breakage purely accidental (Broken Window A)
2. breakage due to carelessness (Waterglass Story)
3. breakage intentional (Toys Story)

Table 5 indicates that there are significant differences of opinion as to whether punishment is necessary in Broken Window A (accident) between the children in the lower and middle socio-economic levels ($t = 3.59, p < .001$) and between the children in the middle and upper levels ($t = 2.00, p < .05$). However, the difference between the lower and upper levels ($t = 1.62$) was not significant. More children in the lower socio-economic level felt that the principal character should be punished as compared with children in the middle level while more children from the upper level felt that the principal character should be punished as compared with children from the middle socio-economic level. In the Waterglass Story (carelessness), there was a significant difference of opinion only between the lower and middle levels ($t = 3.07, p < .01$). More children from the lower level felt that the principal character should be punished as compared with children from the middle level. Differences between the lower and upper levels and the middle and upper levels were not significant.

TABLE 5

Significance of the Differences Regarding Culpability Between Levels of Socio-Economic Status Across Various Stories

SES	Accident	Carelessness	Intent
L & M (55 vs. 34)	3.59***	(68 vs. 55) 3.07**	(72 vs. 70) 1.30
L & H (55 vs. 46)	1.62	(68 vs. 61) 1.90	(72 vs. 69) 1.71
M & H (34 vs. 46)	2.00*	(55 vs. 61) .914	(70 vs. 69) .96

*significant at .05

**significant at .01

***significant at .001

There were no significant differences in the Toys Story (intentional) regarding the principal character's culpability between any two levels on the socio-economic level. There was unanimity of opinion among the children in all three levels regarding the necessity of punishing the principal character.

A chi-square test was done in order to see if there were significant differences of opinion as to the culpability of the principal characters in each story. Children in the lower ($X^2 = 5.56$, $p < .01$) and the upper ($X^2 = 5.56$, $p < .05$) levels were quite definitely in favor of punishment while children in the middle level were almost evenly split as to whether punishment was necessary in the Broken Window A Story (accident). Children in all three levels agreed quite definitely that punishment was necessary in the Waterglass Story (carelessness) (Low: $X^2 = 72.00$, $p < .001$; Middle: $X^2 = 64.22$, $p < .001$ and High: $X^2 = 60.50$, $p < .001$) with more children in the lower level favoring punishment. The degree of agreement regarding the culpabi-

TABLE 6

Differences Within Each Socio-Economic Level Regarding Punishment Across Various Culpability Levels, Expressed as X^2 Values

SES	Accident	Carelessness	Intent
Low	10.03**	56.89***	72.00***
Middle	.22	20.06***	64.22***
High	5.56*	34.72***	60.50***

*significant at .05

**significant at .01

***significant at .001

lity of the principal character in the Toys Story (intentional) was almost unanimous for the children in all three socio-economic levels.

TABLE 7

Significance of the Difference Regarding Culpability Between Age Levels Across Stories

AGE	Accident	Carelessness	Intent
6-7 vs. 9-10 (61 vs. 41)	3.66**	(67 vs. 57) 2.5*	(72 vs. 71) 1.25
6-7 vs. 12-13 (61 vs. 33)	4.53**	(67 vs. 60) 1.85	(72 vs. 68) 2.00*
9-10 vs. 12-13 (41 vs. 33)	1.34	(57 vs. 60) .65	(71 vs. 68)

*significant at .05

**significant at .001

Table 7 indicates that there are significant differences in opinion regarding the culpability of the principal character in Broken Window A (accident) between the 6-7 and the 9-10 year-olds ($t = 3.66, p < .01$) and between the 6-7 and the 12-13 year olds ($t = 4.52, p < .01$). Significantly more of the younger children demanded punishment for the principal character as compared with the older children. There was a significant difference of opinion only between the 6-7 and the 9-10 year olds in the Waterglass Story (carelessness). Again, significantly more of the youngest children demanded punishment for the principal character as compared with the older children while a difference of opinion regarding the culpability of the principal character in the Toys Story (intentional) existed only between the 6-7 and the 12-13 year olds ($t = 2.00, p < .05$). All the children in the youngest age level demanded punishment as compared with children in other levels.

among the 6-7 year-olds regarding the culpability of the principal character in the Broken Window A (accident) Story was significant at the .001 level ($t = 34.72$). While the 9-10 year olds and the 12-13 year-olds were almost evenly divided in their judgments regarding the culpability of the principal character. There would seem to be a greater reluctance to prescribe punishment with an increase in age – at least with regard to this story – possibly indicating a greater awareness of the accidental nature of the offense. Differences of opinion regarding the principal character in the Waterglass Story (carelessness) and the Toys Story (intentional) were all highly significant at the .001 level. Children in all three age levels were of the same mind as to the culpability and consequent need for punishment of the two principal characters.

TABLE 8

Significance of Differences Regarding
Culpability Within Each Age Level
Across Stories

AGE	Accident	Carelessness	Intent
6-7	(61 vs. 11) 34.72*	(67 vs. 5) 47.84*	(72 vs. 0) 72.00*
9-10	(41 vs. 31) 1.38	(57 vs. 15) 24.50*	(71 vs. 1) 64.22*
12-13	(33 vs. 39) .50	(60 vs. 12) 32.00	(68 vs. 4) 56.88*

*significant at .001

A difference of opinion between males and females regarding the culpability of a principal character was apparent only in the Waterglass Story (carelessness) with more females advocating punishment. The judgments of both sexes were practically similar with regard to the culpability of the principal characters in the other stories.

A chi-square test was done to see if there were significant differences of opinion within each category regarding the culpability of the principal character in each story. Table 9 indicates that the differences in each category were all highly significant, thus indicating a uniformity of agreement among the males and among the females regarding the culpability and subsequent need for punishment of the principal characters in all three stories.

The questions in Area II were further designed to elicit punishments which the child would prescribe if any should be deemed necessary. Piaget had classified punishments as either retributive or reciprocal. The former are commonly to be found among young children while the latter are supposedly found among the more mature.

Table 8 indicates that a difference of opinion

TABLE 9

Differences Within Each Sex Category Using X^2 Regarding the Culpability of an Act per Story - (Should Punish vs. Should Not Punish)

SEX	Accident	Carelessness	Intent
Male	(67 vs. 41) 6.26*	(81 vs. 27) 27.00**	(106 vs. 2) 100.16**
Female	(68 vs. 40) 7.26**	(103 vs. 5) 88.92**	(106 vs. 2) 100.16**

*significant at .05

**significant at .001

TABLE 10

Types of Punishment Prescribed Across All Three Stories According to Socio-Economic Status

SES	Retributive	Reciprocal
Low	1. spanking - 125 2. kneel - 1 3. no eating - 1 4. clean house - 1	1. scold - 34 2. replace object - 13 3. isolation - 13 4. deprivation - 9
Middle	1. spanking - 81 2. squat - 2 3. tie child up - 2	1. scold - 25 2. isolation - 20 3. replace object - 18 4. deprivation - 11
High	1. spanking - 38 2. stand in corner - 6 3. break glass - 1 4. kneel - 1	1. scold - 59 2. replace object - 26 3. isolation - 25 4. deprivation - 15

The data in Tables 10, 11, and 12 include only the responses of the children who judged punishment to be necessary. These children were further asked to prescribe punishments they thought appropriate. Their responses were classified according to retributive and reciprocal categories of Piaget.

It may be seen from Table 10 that there is a decrease in physical forms of punishment and a corresponding increase in psychological forms prescribed across socio-economic levels. Retributive forms of punishment are prevalent in the lower level (128 retributive vs. 69 reciprocal), both forms are found in almost equal number in the middle level (85 retributive vs. 74 reciprocal) while reciprocal forms are prevalent among children of the upper level (125 reciprocal vs. 46 retributive).

Spanking (paluin) is the most common form of punishment among those classified as retributive. There is a progressive decrease in the number of children who prescribe this form from the lower level (125) to the upper level (38). On the other hand, scolding (pagalitan, pagsabihan, sigawan) is the most common form of punishment classified as reciprocal. There is an increase in the number of times it was prescribed from 34 instances in the lower level to 59 in the upper level.

Perhaps even more illustrative is the idea of replacing the damaged object - simple reciprocity. This form was cited 13 times in the lower level, 18 in the middle and 26 times in the upper level. This set of data is in agreement with Hypothesis 3B.

Table 11 indicates that there is also a progressive decrease in the number of physical forms of punishment and a corresponding increase in the number of psychological forms prescribed across age levels. Again, spanking is the most common form of punishment prescribed for a wrongdoing and its incidence decreases from 135 instances in the youngest age group to 37 instances in the oldest group. Scolding is the most common form of punishment in

TABLE 11

Types of Punishment Prescribed Across All Three Stories According to Age Level

AGE	Retributive	Reciprocal
6-7	1. spanking - 135 2. kneel - 2 3. tie child - 2 4. break glass also - 1 5. stand in corner - 1	1. scold - 33 2. replace object - 9 3. isolation - 9 4. deprivation - 3
9-10	1. spanking - 75 2. no eating - 2	1. scold - 42 2. replace object - 18 3. isolation - 18 4. deprivation - 14
12-13	1. spanking - 37 2. squat - 2 3. clean house - 1	1. scold - 46 2. isolation - 32 3. replace object - 30 4. deprivation - 18

the reciprocal category, increasing from 33 to 46 with an increase in age. The data are in agreement with Hypothesis IB.

Table 12 indicates that there is a noticeable difference between the number of proposed reciprocal and retributive types of punishment only among the female subjects - with more reciprocal forms proposed (132 vs. 149). The male Ss had an almost equal number of proposed retributive and reciprocal punishments (127 to 124). However, if the total number of proposed punishments were to be considered, then the female Ss would have advocated some form of punishment more than did the male Ss. The total number of proposed punishments from the females was 311 as compared with 252 from the males. The data are contrary to Hypothesis 2B.

In summary, the following results were ob-

TABLE 12

Types of Punishment Prescribed Across All Three Stories According to Sex

SEX	Retributive	Reciprocal
Male	1. spanking - 124 2. break window - 1 3. no eating - 1 4. clean house - 1	1. scold - 62 2. replace object - 34 3. deprivation - 18 4. isolation - 10
Female	1. spanking - 121 2. stand in corner - 6 3. kneel - 2 4. tie child up - 2 5. squat - 1	1. scold - 61 2. isolation - 43 3. replace object - 25 4. deprivation - 20

tained for Area II (Punishment)

1. Children in the lower socio-economic level favor punishment significantly more often than do the children in the other two levels for all three stories.

2. There is a progressive decrease in the number of children who advocate punishment in all three stories with an increase in age.

3. There is no difference between males and females regarding the number of instances punishment was prescribed for the stories except in the Waterglass Story (carelessness) when more females advocated punishment.

4. There is a decrease in the number of physical forms of punishment and a corresponding increase in the number of psychological forms across socio-economic levels.

5. There is a progressive decrease in the number of physical forms of punishment and a corresponding increase in the number of psychological forms prescribed across age levels.

6. Females propose more reciprocal forms of punishment as well as give greater number of proposed punishments in both areas than do the males.

Responsibility for a Culpable Act

The questions in Area III were designed to see if the child would suggest punishment in the following situations:

1. the one at fault does not want to tell the truth and the group wishes to shield him (Broken Window B)
2. only the offender knows he did wrong and keeps quiet (Party Story)

TABLE 13

Significance of the Difference of Opinion Using X^2 as to Whether Punishment Should be Administered According to Age, Sex and Socio-Economic Status

	SES	AGE	SEX
Story A	8.97**	25.50***	6.07*
Story B	19.40***	23.38***	3.10

- *significant at .05
- **significant at .01
- ***significant at .001

Table 13 indicates the judgments of children as to whether punishment should be meted out to the offender in the two stories, using a chi-square test. Children across all three socio-economic levels decided that punishment was necessary in both cases (Story A: $X^2 = 8.97, p < .01$ and Story B: $X^2 = 19.40, p < .001$). Children across all the three age levels also decided that punishment was justified in both cases (Story A: $X^2 = 25.50, p < .001$ and Story B: $X^2 = 23.38, p < .001$) while male and female subjects agreed that punishment was deserved only in Story A ($X^2 = 6.07, p < .05$).

More specifically, Table 14 indicates the significance of the difference between any two

TABLE 14

Differences Between Socio-Economic Levels Using t-Test as to Whether Punishment Should be Administered

SES	Story A	Story B
Low vs. Middle	(65 vs. 52) 2.77**	(60 vs. 48) 2.22*
Low vs. High	(65 vs. 52) 2.77**	(60 vs. 40) 3.51**
Middle vs. High	(52 vs. 52) 0.00	(48 vs. 40) 1.35

- *significant at .05
- **significant at .01

proportions (categories) on the socio-economic level. The differences between the lower and middle levels and the lower and upper levels are significant (both $t = 2.77, p < .01$) with regard to Story A. More children from the lower level urged punishment in the Broken Window B Story as compared with children from the middle and upper levels. Differences between the lower and middle levels ($t = 2.22, p < .05$) and the lower and upper levels ($t = 3.51, p < .01$) were also significant for Story B, again with children from the lower socio-economic level urging punishment.

TABLE 15

Differences Within Each Socio-Economic Level Using t-Test as to Whether Punishment Should be Administered

SES	Story A	Story B
Low	(65 vs. 7) 46.72**	(62 vs. 12) 32.00**
Middle	(52 vs. 20) 14.22**	(48 vs. 24) 8.00**
High	(52 vs. 20) 14.22**	(40 vs. 32) .88

- *significant at .01
- **significant at .001

A chi-square test was done in order to see if there were significant differences of opinion

TABLE 16

Differences Between Age Levels
Using t Test as to Whether Punishment
Should be Administered

AGE	Story A	Story B
6-7 vs. 9-10	(69 vs. 56) 3.21**	(62 vs. 50) 2.46*
6-7 vs. 12-13	(69 vs. 44) 5.07***	(62 vs. 36) 4.61***
9-10 vs. 12-13	(56 vs. 44) 2.2*	(50 vs. 46) 2.35*

- * Significant at .05
- ** Significant at .01
- *** Significant at .001

within each category as to whether punishment should be administered. The differences were all highly significant at $p < .001$ so that there was a high degree of agreement as to their opinion. With regard to Story B, agreement of opinion was highly significant for the lower level ($p < .001$) and less for the middle level ($p < .01$) while children from the upper level were almost evenly divided as to whether punishment should be administered.

Table 16 indicates that there were significant differences between any two age levels. Children in the three age levels agreed that punishment should be administered in both Stories A and B. However, this agreement was greatest among the youngest children and steadily decreased with increasing age.

Using a test for the chi-square, Table 17 indicates the degree of agreement within each age category as to whether punishment should be administered. The youngest children are practically unanimous in judging that punishment is necessary in both stories, this degree of unanimity steadily decreasing with increasing age for both stories until the eldest group is evenly split in its judgment regarding the need for punishment in Story B.

Using the chi-square, Table 18 indicates that there was a significant amount of unanimity

within the categories of males and females that punishment was necessary in both cases.

There were no significant differences of opinion regarding the need for punishment between males and females.

TABLE 17

Differences Within Each Age Levels Using
t Test as to Whether Punishments Should be
Administered

AGE	Story A	Story B
6-7	(69 vs. 3) 60.50*	(62 vs. 10) 37.56*
9-10	(56 vs. 16) 22.22*	(50 vs. 22) 10.88*
12-13	(44 vs. 28) 3.56	(36 vs. 36) 0.00

*significant at .001

TABLE 18

Differences Within Each Sex Category using
 X^2 Test as to Whether Punishment Should be
Administered

SEX	Story A	Story B
Male	(90 vs. 18) 48.00**	(80 vs. 28) 25.04**
Female	(79 vs. 29) 23.14**	(68 vs. 40) 7.26*

*significant at .01

**significant at .001

Both decided that punishment was necessary in both cases and in almost equal numbers.

Table 19 indicates that there were significant differences in the judgment of children as to who should be punished. Chi-square results indicate that there were significant differences among the children in the three age levels regar-

TABLE 19

Who Should be Punished – Differences
According to AGE, SEX and Socio-Economic
Status Using Chi-square Test

	Story A	Story B
AGE	31.06**	33.83**
SEX	8.34*	3.05
SES	16.60**	26.38**

*significant at .01

**significant at .001

ding who should be punished. All three age levels indicated that the whole group should be held culpable in Story A while only the two younger levels indicated that the whole group should be responsible in Story B, the eldest group preferring that the individual be held solely responsible. Children in all three socio-economic levels also decided that the whole group be held culpable in Story A while only the two lower levels indicated group responsibility for Story B, the upper level preferring individual responsibility. Results according to sex indicate a significant difference only for Story A with both males and females favoring punishment for the whole group.

TABLE 20

Differences Between Socio-Economic Levels
Using t as to Who Should be Punished

SES	Story A	Story B
Low vs. Middle	3.20**	2.9**
Low vs. High	1.03	.13
Middle vs. High	1.98*	3.06**

*significant at .05

**significant at .01

Table 20 indicates that there were significant differences of opinion between children of different socio-economic levels regarding who should be punished. For both stories, the children had three choices— whether the individual or the group should be punished or that none should be punished. For both stories, the prevalent opinion was that the group should be punished. However, the next choice of children in the lower level was that the individual offender should be punished while children in the other two levels preferred to forget the whole thing for both stories. Children in the upper level, however, refused to punish anyone for the broken vase incident in Story B, preferring to forgive the guilty in order to spare the innocent. For Stories A and B, the data are contrary to Hypothesis 3C. Children in all levels favored collective responsibility in both story situations— whether or not the group knew the offender's identity. However, the children in the upper level refused to punish anyone in Story B, instead preferring that the guilty be set free in order to spare the many innocent.

TABLE 21

Differences Among Age Level Using t-Test
as To Who Should be Punished

AGE	Story A	Story B
6-7 vs. 9-10	1.46	4.56**
6-7 vs. 12-13	3.68**	4.15**
9-10 vs. 12-13	2.37*	1.60

*significant at .05

**significant at .001

Using the significance of the difference between two proportions for the three age levels, it was found that the youngest group was the most

punitive for both stories. They consistently voted that the whole group must be made to suffer for the offense, whether or not they had any knowledge of the real offender's identity, while the oldest group was the most magnanimous. Almost to a man, they refused to betray group solidarity in Story A, preferring that the whole group either be punished or set free while they preferred that the offender go unpunished in Story B rather than punish the innocent others. This set of data is contrary to Hypothesis IC. The data did not hold true for the younger children while indicating that the older children did make a distinction between the two given situations. They favored collective responsibility when the group knowingly shielded the offender and individual responsibility when only the culprit knew he did wrong.

Sex difference was apparent only in Story A ($t=2.71$, $p<.01$). Here, the prevalent opinion was that the whole group should be punished. However, apart from this opinion, it would seem that males were more punitive and individualistic since females voted to punish the whole group or let everyone go free rather than single out an individual for punishment unlike the males whose next choice was to punish the individual. This set of data is contrary to Hypothesis IC. Although both sexes favored group responsibility, significantly more females favored this than did the males in Story A while significantly more females favored the non-punishment of anyone as a second choice while the males chose to punish the individual.

In summary, the following results were found for Area III (Responsibility for a culpable act):

1. Children in the youngest age level favored punishment in both stories significantly more than did the children in the other two levels.

2. Children in the lower socio-economic level favored punishment in both stories significantly more than did children in the other two levels.

3. Both males and females agreed that punish-

ment was necessary in both stories, although more males signified this than did females.

4. Children in all three socio-economic levels favored group punishment for Story A while group punishment was favored by the two lower levels only in Story B. Children in the upper socio-economic level preferred individual punishment.

5. Children in all the age levels favored group responsibility for Story A while only the two younger levels favored group punishment in Story B. The older group preferred individual responsibility.

6. Both males and females favored group punishment in both stories although the second choice of the males was to punish the individuals while that of the females was to forget the whole thing.

DISCUSSION

What is the Basis for Moral Judgment? (Intentionality)

Early childhood is the period of moral realism, according to Piaget, when behavior is evaluated in terms of objective conditions. There must always be a material basis for judgment since that is all the child is capable of comprehending at this age. His intellectual development is such that he can only grasp data available to the senses. With age and experience comes moral maturity. Now the child takes not only the observable into account. He begins to consider not only how much damage was done in each case but more importantly, what happened and why. He begins to realize that forces are at work which bring about these objective conditions, forces which may not be perceptible to the senses. He acknowledges their importance by taking them into account in passing judgment. He becomes cognizant of the fact

that the objective situation may be deceptive, that in fact, these psychic forces must be given greater importance in his evaluations. However, studies have shown that emphasis on motives does not necessarily develop with age but may be affected by other variables such as parental discipline, the presence of appropriate social models, etc. (Kohn, 1959a, 1959b; Bandura and MacDonald, 1963).

The results of the study indicate that children across age, sex, and socio-economic status use motives rather than objective conditions as their basis for judgment. Thus, Piaget's finding and the prediction that younger children will focus on the concrete results of an action were not verified. The prediction of no sex difference was verified, while the prediction that children from the lower socio-economic level would focus on the concrete results of an action while children from the higher level would emphasize motives was not verified. In fact, results indicated a trend towards the opposite, with regard to the socio-economic and age variables. More children from the upper levels in age and socio-economic status opted to punish both principal characters for giving the man the wrong street direction. It did not matter what the child's motives were — whether to deceive or to give well-meaning help — what mattered was that another person had been inconvenienced. The direction of attention has shifted from the individual to others.

Maturity supposedly involves a moving away from the self to others. We are said to be mature when we begin to recognize the existence of others, when our vocabulary expands to include "you" and "they" to our previous "I" and "me". From the infant's previously egocentric nature develops the older child's concern for others. So the older child's emphasis on the consequences of a behavior may be explained in terms of his more socialized nature. There is a greater realization of his relations with others in society, a greater acceptance of his responsibility towards the members of a group.

Nydegger and Nydegger (1966) in a study conducted in Tarong observed that Tarongan

children are given responsibility at an early age. From five onwards, they serve as mother's help-mates, caring for younger siblings, gradually assuming more and more responsibilities as fetching water in small jars, feeding pigs and chickens and picking vegetables. With age comes increasing participation not only in family but also in *sitio* affairs. Since childhood, they are reinforced for reliance, not only on their parents but also on their peers. From childhood, they are trained to be dependent on others for the satisfaction of their needs. Individuality and competitiveness are values which are shunned in Tarong. Instead, the child is taught to be a fully integrated member of a social unit, conscious of his obligations to the other members of society and secure in the knowledge that the others can be depended upon to look after his welfare. "Giving and receiving help are important interpersonal encounters in the Philippines at all ages. The Philippine ideal is not self-sufficiency and independence but rather family sufficiency and a refined sense of reciprocity" (Guthrie and Jacobs, 1966, p. 85).

According to Mendez and Jocano (1974), smooth interpersonal relations in adolescent and adult life are insured through the "refinement and reinforcement of concepts and practices" taught in early childhood. From the time he learns to speak, the child is taught that the world of nature and society is dangerous and one may remain safe only within the family. As a baby, the dangers may be real enough such as stairways, dogs, and knives. As a small child, he learns about demons, ghosts, and other supernatural horrors. He is frightened into obedience by tales of hostile strangers such as the bearded "Bombay". Gradually, the child learns that he can only be sure of comfort and safety within a strong in-group. Seldom will he risk doing anything which would necessitate expulsion from the social group he is born into and into which he becomes an integrated member over the years. Social mechanisms such as *tuhungan* or *bayanihan*, *batares* or *palusong* (helping one another), *damayan*, *abuluyan* (help in time of crisis or distress), *pakikisama* (getting along),

hiya (shame) and *utang na loob* (debt of gratitude) ensure social solidarity over and above family solidarity.

Because the Filipino necessarily has to get along with others for the satisfaction of his needs, he must from childhood cultivate the ability to intuit the other's feelings, moods and meanings. He learns to sense beyond the other's words and actions. Hence, the importance placed, not on the other's words but on the meaning hidden behind the words which may belie what was said, not on the actions but on what prompted the action, not on the perceptible and the tangible but rather on the imperceptible and the intangible.

The most frequent explanations of children from the upper level regarding their reasons for condemning both principal characters regardless of intention reveal a strong concern for truth and integrity.

According to them, it did not matter if Mario/Maria tried to give well-meaning help. He/she should have been honest enough to admit his/her ignorance. Instead, he/she hid this fact and tried to make it appear that he/she knew more than he/she really did. Because of this, a man got lost. "Kasi, hindi niya alam, eh. Dapat sinabi niya agad. Niloko pa niya yung mama." According to them, if he/she really wanted to help, he/she could have found some other way. As for Freddie/Fely, he/she had a God-given talent (intelligence). He/she could have used it for the good and helped the man. Instead, he/she chose to pervert it by playing a cruel joke on the man. For some children, this was rendered unpardonable by the man's having been an utter stranger to the child. Both actions, judged the children, were equally condemnable.

A qualitative difference may be seen in the responses of children in the older level from those in the younger level. While the latter simply judged the child who had deliberately deceived the man as naughtier because he wanted to play a joke, albeit a cruel one, on a hapless stranger, the former judged both children equally

guilty for varied reasons -- citing the first child's failure to admit ignorance as a deception of sorts and the second child's deliberate perversion of a gift. While the responses of those in the younger level were, following Piaget's theory, the more morally mature, still the reasons given indicate a limited and somewhat concrete (since the motives were already given in the story) view of justice. The trend in the responses of those children in the older level, though indicating a less morally mature mind to Piaget, involved deeper insight and a more abstract and complicated reasoning.

Taken in the context of Philippine culture, how would one define moral maturity? Perhaps Piaget's definition, though an excellent one, might not be applicable since it was derived from a Genevan sampling. Which is the more mature -- to judge simply on the basis of motives or to take consequences into consideration? In Philippine society with its high valuation of smooth interpersonal relationships and consideration of others, who could say that the judgment of the older children which considered the plight of the man who got lost and thereby condemned both children regardless of motives to be the less morally mature? Might not the judgment in fact be considered the more socially desirable since it considered the feelings of the other?

An alternative view could be that these children, as a result of their education, may have been made more conscious of motives and the importance of truthfulness and sincerity. Thus they would expect no dichotomy between motive and behavior. What you do is an indication of what you mean and conversely, you make known your feelings or your thought through your actions. For them, meaning and behavior are two aspects of the same thing. Hence, their judgment of both children -- one well-meaning, and the other deceiving -- as equally naughty since both actions resulted in the same end.

Perhaps the previous studies which reported the emphasis of younger children on objective consequences and of older children on subject-

tive responsibility' obtained results which were methodological artifacts of the paradigms used.

Piaget's original comparison paradigms — and which have been used by many researchers — confounded intentionality and consequences. Malicious intent was always thematically combined with small negative consequences while good intentions were always combined with large negative consequences. Hence, the child becomes confused when presented with these stories and unable to focus correctly on the relevant cues when asked to make a judgment. However, a simpler paradigm which manipulates only the intentions and keeps consequences constant directs the child's attention towards the central issue of motives vs. consequences. So centration does really appear to be a major factor in objective moral judgment and that "objectivity does not seem to mean the inability to grasp intention but rather failure to focus on intention when a competing cue is introduced" (Crowley, 1968).

Retributive Vs. Reciprocal Punishment

Results indicate that the youngest age group was the most punitive demanding punishment whether the offense was due to carelessness, accident, or done intentionally. Perhaps this might be explained in terms of their limited experience.

Parents rarely bother to do a lot of explaining to a young child. Operating on the principle that actions speak louder than words and believing that he is too young to understand them anyway, they react to any offense swiftly and immediately. More often than not, the child is spanked. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the young child's ready reply when suggesting punishment would be spanking, drawn from his own painful and personal experiences. Guthrie and Jacobs (1967) report in their study of child-rearing practices that 58% of Philippine parents in their sample admitted using physical punishment at least fairly frequently and 15% more used it very often, making a total of 73% of Philippine parents who admitted to using physical punishment. Older children are seldom treat-

ed in this manner. Instead, they are often made to feel shame for any misdeed (Hindi ka na ba nahihiya? Yang kalaki-laki mo na, eh, ganyan pa ang ginagawa mo.). Besides, as some 12-year-old boys rather neatly put it, "A scolding is better since psychological punishment lasts longer," and "If you punish him, he would forget easily. But if you explain it to him, why he should not do it, he will learn."

This differential treatment might also be explained in terms of the cognitive level of the child. The young child is incapable of comprehending abstract concepts and reasons; hence, he is dealt with on the only level at which he can comprehend matters — the physical. The older child is already capable of being reasoned with. So, the parents can be seen to react to their children according to their level of ability.

At this age level, the child also becomes a fully integrated member of a peer group so that the cruelest punishment for him would be separation from this group. Hence, the most frequent answers regarding their choice of punishment were scolding and isolation from the group.

An interesting point of deviation between Filipino subjects and the children in the previous studies done abroad may be apparent in their focus of interest in the stories for Area II. The stories used in the present study are modifications of the stories utilized in these other studies. However, where the other children readily focused on the material damage done and gave their judgment, the Filipino subjects seemingly ignored the damage and instead focused on the interpersonal dynamics in the stories.

The Waterglass Story involved unwilling compliance with the mother's request which, the subjects felt, was not unreasonable since the child was not asked to forgo playing. He/she was merely asked to do his/her duty before going out to play. Because of haste, he/she drops a waterglass. The children's answers revealed that they were upset, not because of the broken glass, but because of the principal character's reluctance to help the mother, "He/she should

help the mother first before going out to play," they moralized. "He/she was bad because he/she did not like to help the mother." This viewpoint is indicative of the value attached by the culture to the child's obedience and respect (Flores, 1961).

The Toys Story was primarily concerned with the deliberate destruction of an object because of an inability to get one's own way. Instead of focusing on the shocking destruction of the toy, the subjects instead chose to focus on what to them was the more shocking behavior of the older child to his/her younger sibling. The older child should have respected the wishes of the younger, went their arguments. Being the older, he/she should have been more understanding and accomodating. Interestingly, no mention was made of the greater right of the younger to the toy. Since it belonged to the younger, he/she had the greater right to play with it for a little while. Even if the younger sibling was in the wrong (presumably for refusing permission to the older to take it for a little while), still the older child should have made allowances for his/her behavior because he/she was the older and the other was the younger.

The Filipino's extremely close kinship ties, his almost obsessive concern for the well-being of the nuclear family are here manifested already in the children's replies. As soon as they are able, older children are quickly given the responsibility for their younger siblings. They take charge of them while mothers look after the cooking and cleaning chores. Herein is seen the concept of reciprocity as it is practiced in the larger society. The older children look after the younger, teaching them games, the rudiments of learning perhaps, patiently tutoring them on skills to be needed later on and even disciplining them. In return, the younger ones give to the older respect and obedience, second only to that accorded the parents (Mendez and Jocano, 1974).

The children's replies reveal an orientation towards others outside of the self in the growing child. Revealed also is the tendency to judge

a case not only on its own merits but in terms of rights, duties, and the society's values.

The subjects' concern for the interpersonal dynamics in the stories and their indifference to the material damage suffered are reflective of the Filipino's value on interpersonal relationships. The Philippine social system is such that each individual must be alert to the concerns of others. The closeness of ties and even of proximity require that the person must learn vigilance early in life regarding the feelings of others and seek above all to minimize stresses. This may be achieved through observation of patterns of deference, reciprocal obligations and hospitality. Filipinos place great emphasis on politeness, on concern for others' feelings and on humility (Guthrie and Jacobs, 1967).

Children from the lower socio-economic level were the most punitive. This may be explained in terms of the values of their parents who would emphasize appearances and be quick to utilize physical punishment for any misconduct to a greater extent than middle-class parents. Hence, since the children's experiences with punishment are limited to the physical, especially spanking, it is not surprising that this is their ready answer.

There were no significant sex differences in determining whether any of the offenders should be punished save in the case of Jose/Josie (Waterglass Story - carelessness). More females judged Josie guilty of a misdeed since she did her task sloppily. They also censured her for breaking a glass since "... mahal ang baso," already evincing a concern regarding household finances which they would soon manage.

This significant difference in results might be an artifact of the task involved. Clearing up after a meal is regarded as a typically feminine task. Therefore, for Josie to have performed her duty unwillingly because of a preference for play was clearly a cause for scandal among the female Ss. Coupled with her reluctant obedience to her mother, this was a bit too much for them and so more females prescribed punishment.

Collective Vs. Individual Responsibility

Generally, children were reluctant to prescribe punishment when there was no clear knowledge regarding the circumstances surrounding a misdeed. They could see the point in punishing a whole group though only one was guilty since the group willingly assumed responsibility for the incident. Their responses indicated that the group in Story A really should have been punished because of the nature of the group and the nature of their activity. They all shared in the guilt since they were all playing and the accident was the outcome of their game. Even if they had not decided to shield their companion, they would still have all been guilty since it was their responsibility to have been more careful, went the trend of the children's comments.

However, a qualitative difference was apparent between Stories A and B. While the prevalent opinion was still to punish because "*nakakahiya naman!*" Now the reason for advocating punishment was not because of the deed but because it was seen as an appeasement of the offended mother. The guiding principle of the children was no longer one of guilt or innocence but concern for the feelings of others. They had been guests in her home and one of them had abused her hospitality, putting them all to shame. Therefore, punishment was expected. A misdeed had been committed. A misdeed necessarily involves punishment. By punishing everyone, justice is satisfied.

The youngest group was found to be the most punitive, repeatedly advocating punishment for the group while the oldest was the most magnanimous. Again, the punitiveness of the youngest group may be explained in terms of their limited experiences. It has been their experience that anything done against the wishes of their parents and other powerful adults results in physical punishment. Therefore, they could only draw upon this when asked for their judgments. The oldest group's emphasis on solidarity in Story A with everyone sharing the

punishment or forgiveness is reflective of the growing child's consciousness of his identity as a member of the collective. In Story B, they judged that everyone should be spared since no one knew who had done it and no one was willing to confess. It would serve no useful purpose to punish everyone, hoping thereby to punish the guilty one. In fact, to punish the innocent would have been more unjust than letting the guilty one get off so lightly. Besides, the mother must have been very wealthy to live in such an impressive house. She could very easily afford to forget a broken vase, reasoned the children in the oldest group and those in the higher socioeconomic level.

Sex differences were revealed with the males being more punitive and inclined towards individual responsibility while the females were less willing to prescribe punishment and more inclined towards collective responsibility. Males are expected by society to be aggressive, competitive, and, therefore, individualistic. In contrast, females are expected to be compassionate, merciful, generous and to maintain amiable relations with everyone. Hence, the different choices as to whether anyone should be punished and who should be punished are due to societal expectations regarding the roles of the sexes.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR RESEARCH

In conclusion, the data reveals the Filipino child's outstanding concern for interpersonal dynamics. Thus, it was this consideration which guided his judgments in the story situations presented him. In essentially the same stories Piaget used to derive the data for his theory regarding moral development, the Filipino child failed to conform to predictions based upon this theory. Predictions regarding sequential stages for age regarding intentionality and responsibility did not find verification. The children's responses revealed that interpersonal considerations had prompted their choices.

Perhaps this should have been expected because of the Filipino culture's emphasis on the importance of interpersonal relationships, an emphasis which has already been internalized by the children as manifested in their replies. So overriding any influences due to age and socioeconomic differences regarding the Filipino child's bases for moral decisions are those influences of culture which society, through peers, kin, and especially the parents, inculcates.

Future studies could be taken along this line to ascertain the validity of this assertion, exercising greater control with regard to the variables in this study and including others such as religious instruction, parental differences in discipline, values, goals, and expectations and delving especially on child-rearing practices.

Perhaps the age range could be extended beyond that studied here in order to see whether children beyond the age of 13 would decide to emphasize consequences still or whether the relationship would prove to be curvilinear beyond this age. The variable of socio-economic status is a complicated one in the absence of a reliable indicator. It is also felt that this variable may interact with other variables such as parental attitudes towards discipline, values, and expectations as well as child-rearing practices that it would be difficult to really study the effects of this variable alone on the development of moral judgment. An important consideration, especially in urban areas would be the mother's occupation which the investigator failed to note and which would have an important bearing on the economic status of the family. An interesting question with regard to child-rearing and child-training practices appears. It has repeatedly been emphasized in this study that interpersonal considerations had guided the children's judgments, that moral judgments are taught and therefore can be learned at an early age and that the concept and content of morality must come as a result of inculcation. Could child-rearing practices prove to be the most important variable, therefore, in the development of moral judgment in children? Another interesting area of

research would be the urban/rural differences. It would be expected that there should be a difference between these two especially with regard to differences in values, goals, and child-rearing practices and emphases — but how and in what ways would results from these two areas vary?

A problem which arises with regard to methodology is that there is no obvious way of knowing whether a child bases his judgment on motives or consequences by focusing exclusively on the intent or the result or whether his judgment involves a balanced coordination of both intent and consequences. An either/or dimension is poorly suited to ascertain the relative contribution of consequences and intentions in any moral judgment. A systematic pairing of stories involving multiple levels of intentions and consequences would enable us to ascertain the relative importance they assign to such factors. Perhaps, it would also be well to construct a response measure whereby children may be able to articulate their choices and their reasons and enable us to see those processes which lead them to make their decisions. And perhaps it may be well to really examine the relationship between cognitive and moral development since studies have shown that they may be related. However, how they are related and how each influences the other (if at all) have not yet been well determined.

All these considerations indicate the vast complexity regarding the area of moral judgment. And yet, it is also an extremely important field which, properly understood, sheds a great deal of knowledge regarding our culture, its emphases in terms of values and goals and expectations, its child-rearing practices, among them. This study, an exploration into that vast unknown and exciting area called moral judgment has tried to make a beginning and it is hoped that others, made bolder and more knowledgeable by its tentative findings, continue and extend this investigation.

REFERENCES

ARMSBY, R.E. A re-examination of the development

- of moral judgments in children. *Child Development*. 1971, 42, 1241-1248.
- ARMSBY, R.E. and MACDONALD, F. The influence of social reinforcement and the behavior of models in shaping children's moral judgments. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 1963, 67.
- BOEHM, L. Development of independence. *Child Development*. 1957, 28, 85-92.
- BOEHM, L. The development of conscience: a comparison of American children of different mental and socio-economic levels. *Child Development*. 1962a, 33, 575-590.
- BOEHM, L. The development of conscience: a comparison of upper middle class, academically gifted children attending Catholic and Jewish parochial schools. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 1963, 59, 101-110.
- BOEHM, L. and NASS, M. Social class differences in conscience development. *Child Development*. 1962, 33, 565-574.
- CHANDLER, M., GREENSPAN, S. and BARENBOIM, C. Judgment of intentionality in response to videotaped and verbally presented moral dilemmas: the medium is the message. *Child Development*. 1973, 44, 316-321.
- CROWLEY, P. Effect of training upon objectivity of moral judgment in grade school children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1968, 8, 228-232.
- DAVIS, A. & HAVIGHURST, R. Social class and color differences in child rearing. *American Sociological Review*. 1946, 11, 698-710.
- DOLGER, L. AND GINANDES, J. Children's attitude toward discipline as related to socio-economic status. *Journal of Experimental Education*. 1946, 15, 161-165.
- DURKIN, D. Children's concepts of justice in comparison with the Piaget data. *Child Development*. 1959a, 30, 59-67.
- DURKIN, D. Children's concepts of reciprocity as a justice principle. *Child Development*. 1959b, 30, 289-296.
- DURKIN, D. Sex differences in children's concepts of justice. *Child Development*. 1960, 31, 252-257.
- FLORES, P. Immanent justice in Filipino children. In Pura Flores, *Socio-Psychological Development of Filipino Children*. 1969.
- GRINDER, R. E. Relations between behavioral and cognitive dimensions of conscience in middle childhood. *Child Development*. 1964, 35, 881-891.
- GUTHRIE, G and JACOBS, P.J. Child-rearing practices and moral development: generalizations from empirical research. *Child Development*. 1963a, 34, 295-318.
- HOFFMAN, M. Power assertion by the parent and its impact on the child. *Child Development*. 1960, 67, 129-143.
- HOFFMAN, M. Personality, family structure and social class as antecedents of parental power assertion. *Child Development*. 1963, 34, 869-884.
- HOFFMAN, M. and SALTZSTEIN, H. Parental discipline and the child's moral development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1967, 5, 45-57.
- ILAN, L. and TAN, A. Attribution of punishment among Filipino children. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*. 1969, 2, 4-7.
- JOHNSON, R. Early studies of children's moral judgments. *Child Development*. 1962, 33, 603-605.
- KING, M. The Development of some intention concepts in young children. *Child Development*. 1971, 42, 1145-1152.
- KOHN, M. Social class and parental values. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1959a, 64, 337-351.
- KOHN, M. Social class and the exercise of parental authority. *American Sociological Review*. 1959b, 24, 352-366.
- KOHN, M. Social class and parent-child relationships: an interpretation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1963, 68, 471-480.
- MENDEZ, P.P. AND JOCANO, F. L. *The Filipino in its Rural and Urban Orientation: Two Case Studies*. Manila: Centro Escolar University Research and Development Center, 1974.
- NYDEGGER, W. and NYDEGGER, C. Tarong: An Ilocos barrio in the Philippines. In Whiting, Six Culture Series Vol. VI. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1966.

O'TOOLE, A. L. *Elementary Practical Statistics*. MacMillan Co., 1960.

PIAGET, J. *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. First edition. New York: Free Press, 1948.

PORTEUS, B. and JOHNSON, R. Children's responses to two measures of conscience development and their relation to sociometric nomination. *Child Development*. 1965, 36, 703-712.

TAYAG, A. *Filipino Children's Moral Judgment*. Philippine Normal College Doctoral thesis. 1964.

WHITEMAN, P.H. and KOSIER, K.P. Development of children's moralistic judgments: age, sex, IQ and certain personal-experiential variables. *Child Development*, 1964, 35, 843-850.

APPENDIX

English Version

Area I. SUBJECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY vs. OBJECTIVE CONSEQUENCES

1. LOST STORY A (from Piaget)

Mario/Maria and his/her family had just transferred to Quezon City so that he/she didn't know his/her neighborhood very well. One day, a man stopped to ask him/her where Mayon Street was. Mario/Maria did not know where Mayon Street was but he/she wanted to help the man. So he/she pointed just anywhere and said, "There." The man kept walking and walking until he got lost.

2. LOST STORY B

Once there was a boy/girl named Freddie/Fely. He/she was a smart boy/girl and knew his/her neighborhood very well. One day, a man stopped to ask him/her where Mahinhin Street was. Freddie/Fely knew where Mahinhin Street

was but he/she decided to play a joke on the man. So he/she pointed to some other place and said, "There." The man kept walking and walking until he got lost.

1. What happened in the stories?
2. Were the two boys/girls naughty, was only one boy/girl naughty or was no one naughty?
3. Why?

Area II. RETRIBUTIVE vs. RECIPROCAL PUNISHMENT

3. BROKEN WINDOW A (from Piaget)

Carlos/Carla was playing with his/her new ball outside the house. It hit the glass window of a neighbor's house. The window was broken.

1. Do you think anything should be done to Carlos/Carla?
2. What should be done to Carlos/Carla?
3. Why?

4. WATERGLASS STORY

Jose/Josie was asked by his/her mother to help clear the table after eating. Jose/Josie was hurrying because he/she wanted to go out to play. The glass he/she was holding fell and broke to pieces.

1. Do you think anything should be done to Jose/Josie?
2. What should be done to Jose/Josie?
3. Why?

5 TOYS STORY

One day, Tito/Tita wanted to play with his/her brother's fire engine. But his/her brother was already playing with it. He/she said to his/her brother, "Give me the fire engine."

But the little brother said, "No, I don't want to."

Tito/Tita got very angry, grabbed the fire engine and smashed it against the wall.

1. Do you think anything should be done to Tito/Tita?
2. What should be done to Tito/Tita?
3. Why?

Of the three boys/girls (Carlos/Carla, Jose/Josie and Tito/Tita), who do you think did the most serious (naughtiest) thing? Why?

Area III. COLLECTIVE vs. INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

6. BROKEN WINDOW B (Johnson type)

A group of children were playing kickball. One of them kicked the ball hard and it hit a nearby glass window. The owner of the house came out very angry and asked the boys who broke his window. The boy who kicked the ball did not want to tell the truth and the other boys did not want to tell on him. The owner kept asking who broke his window over and over again but no one would tell the truth.

1. What should be done in this situation?
2. Why?

7. PARTY STORY (Johnson type)

One day, a group of children and their teacher were invited to a classmate's house for a birthday party. This classmate lived in a big house filled with many beautiful decorations like vases and figurines. While the children were busy looking at everything in the house, one of them hit a vase which fell and broke. Nobody saw the boy who hit it. When the classmate's mother saw the vase, she asked, "Who broke this vase?"

"We don't know," the children answered.

Both the mother and the teacher kept asking,

"Who broke the vase?" but nobody could tell who broke it and the boy who broke it would not tell.

1. What should be done in this situation?

2. Why?

Filipino Version

Unang Bahagi

I. ANG PAGWAWALA I

Kalilapat lamang nina Mario/Maria sa Quezon City kaya't hindi pa niya kabisado ang kanyang paligid. Isang araw, may mamang nagtanong kung nasaan ang Kalye Mayon. Hindi alam ni Mario/Maria kung nasaan ito nguni't ibig niyang tulungan ang mama. Kaya't nagturo na lang siya ng kahit saan at sinabing doon ang Kalye Mayon. Naglakad ng naglakad ang mama hanggang nawala siya.

2. ANG PAGWAWALA II

Noon, may isang batang naggangalang Freddie/Fely. Matalino siya kaya't kabisado na niya ang kanyang paligid. Isang araw, may mamang nagtanong sa kanya kung saan ang Kalye Mahinhin. Alam niya kung saan ito nguni't naisipan niyang lokohin ang mama. Kaya't nagturo siya sa ibang lugar at sinabing doon ang Kalye Mahinhin. Naglakad ng naglakad ang mama hangga't siya'y nawala.

1. Ano ang nangyari sa dalawang kuwento?

2. Masama ba ang dalawang bata, isang bata ba lamang ang masama o wala sa kanila ang masama?

3. Bakit?

Ikalawang Bahagi

3. BINTANANG BASAG A

Pinaglalaruan ni Carlos/Carla ang kanyang bagong bola sa labas ng bahay. Natamaan niya ang salamin na bintana ng kanilang kapitbahay at nabasag ito.

1. Sa iyong palagay, may nararapat bang mangyari kay Carlos/Carla?

2. Ano ang dapat gawin kay Carlos/Carla?

3. Bakit?

4. ANG BASO NG TUBIG

Hiniling ng ina ni Jose/Josie ang kanyang tulong sa pagliligpit ng kanilang kinainan. Nagma-madali si Jose/Josie sapagka't ibig niyang mag-laro sa labas. Nahulog niya ang hinahawakan niyang baso at ito'y nabasag.

1. Sa iyong palagay, may nararapat bang gawin kay Jose/Josie?

2. Ano ang dapat gawin kay Jose/Josie?

3. Bakit?

5. ANG LARUAN

Isang araw, ibig paglaruan ni Tito/Tita ang trak na pamatay-sunog ng kanyang kapatid. Pero pinaglalaruan na ito ng isa. "Akin na ang laruan 'yan," sabi niya sa kanyang kapatid.

"Ayoko nga," ang sagot nung isa.

Nagalit si Tito/Tita, sinunggaban niya ang laruan at hinampas ito sa dingding.

1. Sa palagay mo, may nararapat bang gawin kay Tito/Tita?

2. Ano ang dapat gawin kay Tito/Tita?

3. Bakit?

Ikatlong Bahagi

6. BINTANANG BASAG B

May mga batang naglalaro ng kiltbol. Malakas ang pagsipa ng isa sa kanila ng bola kaya't tinamaan ang salamin na bintana ng isang bahay na malapit. Lumabas ang may-ari na galit na galit at tinanong sa mga bata kung sino ang nakabasag ng kanyang bintana. Ayaw aminin ng batang nagsipa ang kanyang pagtakasala at ayaw naman siyang isumbong ng kanyang mga kaibigan. Paulit-ulit ang tanong ng may-ari sa mga bata kung sino ang nakabasag ng kanyang bintana. Nguni't ayaw magsabi ng totoo ang mga bata.

1. Sa palagay mo, ano ang dapat gawin dito?

2. Bakit?

7. ANG PARTY

Naimbita ang isang klase kasama ang kanilang titser sa bahay ng isang kaklase noong birthday niya. Siya ay naninirahan sa isang malaking bahay na punong-puno ng mga magagandang bagay gaya ng mga plorera at mga "figurines." Habang nililibot ng mga bata ang buong bahay, isa sa kanila ang nakabasag ng plorera. Walang nakakita sa gumawa nito. Noong nakita ito ng ina ng batang nag-imbata, tinanong niya kung sino ang nakabasag nito.

"Hindi ho namin alam," ang sagot ng mga bata.

Paulit-ulit ang pagtatanong ng titser at ng ina kung sino ang nakabasag ng plorera, nguni't walang makapagsabi kung sino ang gumawa nito. Walang nakakita sa nangyari at ayaw namang umamin ang nakabasag nito.

1. Sa palagay mo, ano ang dapat gawin dito?

2. Bakit?

Forthcoming in the PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY (In Press)
Volume 10, Number 1
January-June, 1977

- | | |
|--|---|
| <i>Virgilio G. Enriquez</i> | Filipino Psychology in the Third World |
| <i>Exaltacion C. Ramos</i> | Assessment of Psychological Testing in the Philippines: Focus on Industries and National Education |
| <i>Lucita S. Lazo</i> | Psychological Testing in Schools: An Assessment |
| <i>Manuel Flores Bonifacio</i> | An Exploration into some Dominant Features of Filipino Social Behavior |
| <i>Fumio Watanabe, Charito S. Borromeo, and Virgilio G. Enriquez</i> | Racial Preferences in Three Social Context: A Comparison Among Primary, Intermediate and College Students |
| <i>Rita H. Mataragnon</i> | A Conceptual and Psychological Analysis Of <i>Sumpung</i> |
| <i>Virgilio G. Enriquez and Richard W. Brislin</i> | The Measurement of Affective Content In Translation and Interpretation: American English and Filipino |
| <i>Renato M. Daquiz</i> | The Assessment of Fear: Sex Differences And Effects of Social Desirability |