

# The Development of Moral Judgment in Filipino Urban Children

MA. CARMEN C. JIMENEZ  
University of the Philippines

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.

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, labeling 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 preoperational 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 preoperational 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.

From a review of the literature on the variables affecting moral development, it has been found that:

1. Socioeconomic 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.

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 socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic 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.

5. **RESPONSIBILITY FOR A CULPABLE ACT**—an 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

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 socioeconomic levels with regard to

*A. Intentionality*

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

*B. Punishment*

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

*C. Responsibility for a culpable act*

Children in the lower socioeconomic level will favor individual responsibility while children in the higher socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic 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 (1962) 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.

Paiget'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 individual 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 socioeconomic 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 1 (ages 6-7), Grade 3-4 (9-10) and Grades 5-6 (12-13). They were chosen at random from list 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 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 were 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 to 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 experiment effect. The subject's reasons for their answers were always 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.



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. With regards to consequences on motives children, all ages level from the lower and middle socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic level will emphasize objective consequences while children in the higher socioeconomic level will emphasize subjective responsibility. Children across all three levels consistently chose to consider motives over objective consequences as their basis for judgment.

With regards to consequences of children across all three age levels consistently chose to consider motives rather than consequences at 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, the data 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.

The data 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.

Analysis also showed no significant differences between any two categories on the socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic 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 years old ( $t=25$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and significantly less 12-13 years old chose to consider motives when compared with the 6-7 year olds ( $t=3.88$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and the 9-10 years old ( $t=2.53$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

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

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

1. Children across all three socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic 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 years old.
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)

Data analysis reveal significant differences of opinions as to whether punishment is necessary in Broken Window A (accident) between the children in the lower and middle socioeconomic levels ( $t=3.59, p < .001$ ) and between the children in the lower and middle socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic level. In the Waterglass Story (carelessness), there was a significant difference of opinion only between the lower and the 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.

There were no significant differences in the Toys Story (intentional) regarding the principal character's culpability between any two levels on the socioeconomic 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 reveal such that 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 culpability of the principal character in the Toys Story (intentional) was almost unanimous for the children in all three socioeconomic levels.

The data analysis revealed 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 years olds ( $t = 3.66$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and between the 6-7 and the 12-13 years old ( $t = 4.52$ ,  $p < .01$ ). 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 years old 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 years old ( $t = 2.00$ ,  $p < .05$ ). All the children in the youngest age level demanded punishment as compared with children in other levels.

The data indicates that a difference of opinion among the 6-7 years 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 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.

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. The data 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.

The data in Tables 1, 2, and 3 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.

Table 1. Types of Punishment Prescribed Across All Three Stories According to Socioeconomic Status

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

It may be seen from Table 1 that there is a decrease in physical forms of punishment and a corresponding increase in psychological forms prescribed across socioeconomic 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 2 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

common form of punishment in the reciprocal category, increasing from 33 to 46 with an increase in age. The data are in agreement with Hypothesis 1B.

Table 2. Types of Punishment Prescribed Across All Three Stories According to Age Level.

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

Table 3 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 punishments were to be considered, then the females Ss would have

Table 3. Types of Punishment Prescribed Across All Three Stories According to Sex

SES	Retributive	Reciprocal
Male	1. spanking 124	1. scold 62
	2. breaking window 1	2. replace object 34
	3. no eating 1	3. isolation 10
	4. clean house 1	4. deprivation 18
Female	1. spanking 121	1. scold 61
	2. stand in corner 6	2. isolation 43
	3. kneel 2	3. replace object 25
	4. tie child up 2	4. deprivation 20
	5. squat 1	
High	1. spanking 38	1. scold 59
	2. stand in corner 6	2. replace object 26
	3. break glass 1	3. isolation 25
	4. kneel 1	4. deprivation 15

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 obtained for Area II (Punishment):

1. Children in the lower socioeconomic 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 prescribed across socioeconomic 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.

Further analysis indicates the significance of the difference between any two proportions (categories) on the socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic level urging punishment.

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

The result 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, analysis reveal that 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 test, 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. Both decided that punishment was necessary in both cases and in almost equal numbers.

Results show 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 regarding 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 socioeconomic 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.

Statistical analysis indicates that there were significant differences of opinion between children of different socioeconomic 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.

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 sets of data is contrary to Hypothesis 1C. 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 apparently 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 ore 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 socioeconomic level favored punishment in both stories significantly more than did children in the other two levels.
3. Both males and females agreed that punishment was necessary in both stories, although more males signified this than did females.
4. Children in all three socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic 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, 1959).

The results of the study indicate that children across age, sex, and socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic 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 socioeconomic and age variables. More children from the upper levels in age and socioeconomic status opted to punish both principal characters for giving them 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 helpmates, 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 to 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, 1955, 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 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 *tulongan* or *bayaniban*, *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 action. 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 only 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 reveals 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 others?

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 subjective 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 childrearing practices that 58 percent of Philippine parents in their sample admitted using physical punishment at least fairly frequently and 15 percent more used it very often, making a total of 73 percent of Philippine parents who admitted to using physical punishment. Older children are seldom treated 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 years 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 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 sent to react to their children according to their level of ability.

At this age, 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 accommodating. 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 feelings and on humility (Guthrie and Jacobs, 1967).

Children from the lower socioeconomic 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 Jose 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 females 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 through 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 "...*nakakahiyang 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 done 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 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 childrearing 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 socioeconomic 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 childrearing 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 childrearing 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 childrearing 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 childrearing 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 influence 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 childrearing 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

- Crowley, P. (1968). Effect of training upon objectivity of moral judgment in grade school children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 228-232.
- Flores, P. (1969). Immanent justice in Filipino children. In Pura Flores, *Socio-Psychological Development of Filipino Children*.
- Guthrie, G. & Jacobs, P. J. (1963a). Child-rearing practices and moral development: generalizations from empirical research. *Child Development*, 34, 295-318.
- Johnson, R. (1962). Early studies of children's moral judgment. *Child Development*, 33, 603-605.
- Kohn, M. (1959). Social class and parental values. *American Journal of Sociology*, 64, 337-351.
- Mendez, P. P. & Jocano, F. L. (1974). *The Filipino in its Rural and Urban Orientation: Two Case Studies*. Manila: Centro Escolar University Research and Development Center.
- Nydegger, W. & Nydegger, C. (1966). Tarong: An Ilocos barrio in the Philippines. In Whiting, *Six Culture Series* Vol. VI. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Piaget, J. (1948). *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. First edition. New York: Free Press.

## 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 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 other boys 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*

#### 1. Ang Pagwawala I

Kalilipat 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 doo ang Kalye Mayon. Naglakad ng naglakad ang mama hanggang nawala siya.

#### 2. Ang Pagwawala II

Noon, may isang batang nangangalang 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, iisang bat ba lamang ang masama o wala sa kanila ang masama?
3. Bakit?

### Ikalawang Bahagi

#### 4. 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. Nagmamadali si Jose/Josie sapagka't ibig niyang maglaro sa labas. Nahulog niya ang hinahawakan niyang baso at ito'y nabasag.

1. Sa inyong palagay, may nararapat bang gawin kay Jose/Josie?
2. Ano ang dapat gawin kay Jose/Josie?
3. Bakit?

#### 4. 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 laruang '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

#### 5. Bintanang Basag B

May mga batang naglalaro ng kikkol. 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 pagkakasala 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 ditto?
2. Bakit?

#### 6. Ang Party

Naimbita ang isang klase kasama ang kanilang titser sa bahay ng isang kklase 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 ng 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 naman alam," ang sagot ng mga bata.

Paulit-ulit ang pagtatanong ng titser at ng ina kung sino ang nakabasag ng prolera, 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 ditto?
2. Bakit?