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Abstract:
Moral development of persons is a basic aim of education. According to Islamic teachings success and failure of a person is judged on moral basis in this world and the hereafter. This study focuses on analysis of moral reasoning of teachers and the students with respect to Kohlberg’s theory of moral development. The target population for this study were teachers and students of secondary schools of district Dera Ghazi Khan. Twenty secondary schools were randomly selected from district Dera Ghazi Khan. Three (03) teachers and ten (10) students from each school were selected using random sampling method. The total sample size was 60 teachers and 200 students. Data was selected by DIT (defining issue test). The collected data was analyzed through descriptive analysis and chi-square test applied using SPSS. The results revealed that the participants reasoned predominantly at the conventional level of Kohlberg’s moral reasoning which found that there is no significant difference between the view of teachers and students towards moral reasoning.

1. INTRODUCTION
A serious challenge of the present age is to cultivate the morally developed, sensible and responsible citizens (Batool & Shehzad, 2019). The origins for altruism must be looked for in the first behaviors and feelings of the child and observe its evolution until the moral fundaments are constituted. The big issue is that between this behavior and feelings, and the moral, there is an adult authority intervention, which produces a “short-circuit” in the evolutionary course; besides that, the problem is overcoming the internal difficulties of his/her evolution. Such evolution consists of overcoming the initial structural nature to build up another one qualitatively different (Montoya, 2020). Much research and philosophical reflection has been done on religiosity and motivation toward moral and pro-social behaviour (Ahmed, 2009); (Bloom, 2012); (Carpenter & Marshall, 2009); (Crosby & Smith, 2015); (Emmons, 2013); (Looy, 2004); (Pazhoohi, Pinho, & Arantes, 2017). Teachers are the most imperative tool in refining schools and contributing to student accomplishment (Morgado, Meireles, Neves, Amaral, & Ferreira, 2018). Kohlberg’s theory on moral development postulates that ethical reasoning is not static, but rather a person is able to move up from one stage to the next. Therefore, we each have the ability to move to Kohlberg’s Stage 5 when
faced with moral dilemmas. Any student who uses technology can be faced with a technology-related moral dilemma, and it is important to understand ethical training and assessment of information technology students in order for ethical development to take place (Woodward, Davis, & Hodis, 2007). In a quantitative descriptive study (Wade, 2015) examined the moral reasoning development levels of undergraduate teacher education students. To measure their moral reasoning, he employed the DIT instrument of James Rest. Results revealed that moral reasoning development scores were statistically significantly different. Thus, a substantial amount of research on the moral reasoning of undergraduate and graduate students has been undertaken in a wide variety of cultural groups, predominantly, however, in the United States Forte (2013); Nettleton (2018) and McMahon (1992). However, there is a dearth of empirical research regarding moral development of Muslim undergraduate and graduate students. To the best knowledge of the present authors, based on a comprehensive review of relevant literature, only few studies have been attempted on high schools and undergraduate students from Arab Muslim cultures (e.g. (Djilali Bouhmama, 1984, 1988; D Bouhmama, 1989; Ismail, 1976; M Maqsud, 1977; Muhammad Maqsud, 1998; Nettleton, 2018)) conducted a study to explore students' moral reasoning development while in college. The findings suggest both similarities and differences across gender, which may shed light on possible gender differences in moral reasoning outcomes in college. Better understanding of the role that gender plays in student choices could inform college administrators around issues that impact student participation and, therefore, meaningful development while in college. Previous studies revealed that those who have high moral sensitivity are children who are against moral disengagement and oppose immoral acts, for example, intimidation against humans. It is also known that moral disengagement is positively related to aggression (Barchia & Bussey, 2011); (Pornari & Wood, 2010); (White-Ajmani & Bursik, 2014) and antisocial behavior (Hyde, Shaw, & Moilanen, 2010).

1.1. Stages of Moral Development

Based upon (Piaget, 1976) conception of moral reasoning, Kohlberg conducted empirical and longitudinal studies which revealed six developmental stages allotted to three moral levels. Kohlberg demonstrated an evolution through the stages of moral reasoning development and delineated six stages within three different levels as follows:

i. Pre-Conventional Level

Stage 1: The Punishment and Obedience Orientation- Orientation to punishment, obedience, and physical and material power. Rules are obeyed to avoid the consequence of punishment. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority.

Stage 2: The Instrumental Relativist Orientation Naive instrumental hedonistic orientation. The child conforms in order to obtain rewards. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place. Elements of fairness, reciprocity, and equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical or pragmatic way.

ii. Conventional Level

Stage 3: The Interpersonal Concordance of ‘Good Boy-Nice Girl’ Orientation- Good behavior is that which pleases or helps and is approved by others. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or natural behavior. Behavior is frequently judged by intention. He means well becomes important for the first time, and a person earns approval by being nice.
Stage 4: The Law and Order Orientation- This is an orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social or religious order. Right behavior consists of doing one’s duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

iii. Post-Conventional, or Principled Level

Stage 5: The Social-Contract Legalistic Orientation- Generally characterized with utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and in terms of standards that have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. Emphasis is upon equality and mutual obligation within a democratic order. There is an awareness of relativism of personal values and the use of procedural rules in reaching consensus. Special significance given to the legal point of view, but with an awareness that law can be changed when considering societal utility.

Stage 6: The Universal Ethical Principle Orientation- Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. These principles are not concrete like the Ten Commandments but are more abstract like the Golden Rule (Kohlberg, 1931); (Kohlberg & DeVries, 1987); (Gibbs, Basinger, & Fuller, 1992); (Gibbs., Basinger, Grime, & Snarey, 2007).

2. METHODOLOGY

To focusing the above mentioned criteria, the 20 secondary schools were selected from targeted population randomly. Among these 20 secondary schools, Three (03) teachers and ten (10) students from each school were nominated applying random sampling process. The total sample size included 60 teachers and 200 students from all secondary schools of District Dera Ghazi Khan.

2.1. Data Collection

The data was collected using questionnaire from respondents which were selected from nominated 20 secondary schools in District D.G.Khan. So, Data was collected by distributing questionnaire to students and teachers by personal visits to respective schools.

2.2. Data Analysis

The collected data was analyzed by using SPSS. Frequency distributing, mean and standard deviation was applied. The composed facts were examined using SPSS-18 and mean, standard deviation and independent sample t-test was applied to examine the data as a statistical method.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the Interpretation of the results we use SDA = 1.00-1.80, DA = 1.81-2.60, UD = 2.61- 3.40, A = 3.41-4.20, SA = 4.21-5.00. Following table is based on the data which was collected from respondents which were the teachers and the students of secondary school situated in district D.G.Khan. Table consists on the questionnaire statements which were based on five point likert’s scale arranged from Strongly disagree (SDA) to Strongly agree (SA), Mean and standard deviation (SD). Data which was collected from the respondents showed in Table 1. which show the each statement of the question and its statistical analysis and findings.

Table 2 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some odd respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.
### Table 1: Respondents (teachers and students) of secondary school in district D.G.Khan.

| Sr. No | Statements                                                                 | f/% | SDA | DA | UD | A | SA | M | SD |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| 1      | Is Aslam brave sufficient to risk receiving trapped for robbery              | f   | 32  | 68 | 33 | 65 | 63 | 1.77 | 0.42 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 12.3| 26.1| 12.6| 24.9| 24.1|     |    |
| 2      | Doesn’t it only natural for darling dad to care so much for his domestic that he would steal? | f   | 43  | 83 | 35 | 46 | 54 | 2.27 | 0.918 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 16.5| 31.8| 13.4| 17.6| 20.7|     |    |
| 3      | Shouldn’t the group’s laws be supported?                                    | f   | 105 | 53 | 27 | 40 | 36 | 1.33 | 0.475 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 40.2| 20.3| 10.3| 15.3| 13.8|     |    |
| 4      | Does Aslam identify a decent formula for making soup form tree bay?         | f   | 94  | 75 | 32 | 42 | 18 | 1.37 | 0.486 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 36  | 28.7| 12.3| 16.1| 6.9 |     |    |
| 5      | Does the rich man have any lawful correct to store food when other persons are hungry? | f   | 39  | 24 | 23 | 59 | 116 | 1.42 | 0.497 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 14.9| 9.2 | 8.8 | 22.6| 44.4|     |    |
| 6      | Is the reason of Aslam to take for himself or to giveaway for his family?   | f   | 26  | 65 | 34 | 49 | 87 | 1.85 | 0.404 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 10  | 24.9| 13 | 18.8| 33.3|     |    |
| 7      | What standards are going to be the foundation for communal collaboration?   | f   | 106 | 73 | 29 | 35 | 16 | 1.32 | 0.469 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 40.6| 28 | 1.1 | 13.4| 6.9 |     |    |
| 8      | Is the essence of consumption reconcilable with the liability of theft?     | f   | 52  | 49 | 77 | 35 | 48 | 2.75 | 0.474 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 19.9| 18.8| 29.5| 13.4| 18.4|     |    |
| 9      | Does the rich man merit to be raided for being so desirous?                 | f   | 60  | 43 | 36 | 49 | 72 | 3.23 | 1.386 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 23  | 16.5| 13.8| 18.8| 27.6|     |    |
| 10     | Isn’t private stuff an institute to allow the rich to activity the poor?   | f   | 63  | 80 | 39 | 37 | 41 | 2.94 | 1.409 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 24.1| 30.7| 14.9| 14.2| 15.7|     |    |
| 11     | Would theft bring about more entire decent for everyone worried or not?     | f   | 51  | 68 | 34 | 46 | 61 | 2.42 | 1.480 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 19.5| 26.1| 13 | 17.6| 23.4|     |    |
| 12     | Are laws receiving in the way of the most elementary right of any fellow of society? | f   | 98  | 52 | 30 | 48 | 33 | 2.29 | 1.292 |
|        |                                                                             | %   | 37.5| 19.9| 11.5| 18.4| 12.6|     |    |

### Table 2: Aslam brave sufficient to risk receiving trapped for robbery.

| Option          | Frequency | Percentages | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 31        | 12.3        | 1.77 | 0.42               |
| Disagree        | 68        | 26.1        |      |                    |
| Undecided       | 33        | 12.6        |      |                    |
| Strongly Agree  | 65        | 24.9        |      |                    |
| Agree           | 63        | 24.1        |      |                    |
| Total           | 260       | 100         |      |                    |
Figure 1. Aslam brave sufficient to risk receiving trapped for robbery.

Table 2. Doesn’t it only natural for darling dad to care so much for his domestic that he would steal.

| Option          | Frequency | Percentages | Mean Value | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 43        | 16.5        | 2.27       | 0.918              |
| Disagree        | 82        | 31.8        |            |                    |
| Undecided       | 35        | 13.4        |            |                    |
| Strongly Agree  | 46        | 17.6        |            |                    |
| Agree           | 54        | 20.7        |            |                    |
| Total           | 260       | 100         |            |                    |

Table 2 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing”.

Figure 2. Doesn’t it only natural for darling dad to care so much for his domestic that he would steal.

Table 3. Shouldn’t the group’s laws be supported?

| Option          | Frequency | Percentages | Mean Value | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly disagree | 104       | 40.2        | 1.53       | 0.475              |
| Disagree        | 53        | 20.3        |            |                    |
| undecided       | 27        | 10.5        |            |                    |
| Strongly agree  | 40        | 15.3        |            |                    |
| Agree           | 36        | 13.9        |            |                    |
| Total           | 260       | 100         |            |                    |

Table 3 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the
learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.
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Figure 3. Shouldn't the group's laws be supported.
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Figure 4. Does Aslam identify a decent formula for making soup form tree Bay.

Table 4. Does Aslam identify a decent formula for making soup form tree Bay.

| Option        | Frequency | Percentages | Mean Value | Standard Deviation |
|---------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 93        | 36.0        | 1.37       | 0.486              |
| Disagree      | 75        | 28.7        |            |                    |
| Undecided     | 32        | 12.3        |            |                    |
| Strongly Agree | 42        | 16.1        |            |                    |
| Agree         | 18        | 6.9         |            |                    |
| **Total**     | 260       | 100.0       |            |                    |

Table 4 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing”.

Table 5. Does the rich man have any lawful correct to store food when other persons are hungry.

| Option           | Frequency | Percentages | Mean Value | Standard Deviation |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 38        | 14.9        | 1.42       | 0.497              |
| Disagree         | 24        | 9.3         |            |                    |
| Undecided        | 23        | 8.8         |            |                    |
| Strongly Agree   | 59        | 22.6        |            |                    |
| Agree            | 116       | 44.4        |            |                    |
| **Total**        | 260       | 100.0       |            |                    |
Table 5 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level.

Figure 5. Does the rich man have any lawful correct to store food when other persons are hungry.

Table 6 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.

Figure 6. Is the reason of Aslam to take for himself or to giveaway for his family.
Table 7. What standards are going to be the foundation for communal collaboration.

| Option          | Frequency | Percentages | Mean Value | Standard deviation |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly disagree | 105       | 40.6        |            |                    |
| Disagree        | 73        | 28.0        |            |                    |
| Undecided       | 29        | 11.1        |            |                    |
| Strongly agree  | 35        | 13.4        | 1.32       | 0.469              |
| Agree           | 18        | 6.9         |            |                    |
| Total           | 260       | 100         |            |                    |

Table 7 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.

Table 8. Is the essence of consumption reconcilable with the liability of theft?

| Option          | Frequency | Percentages | Mean Value | Standard deviation |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 52        | 19.9        |            |                    |
| Disagree        | 49        | 18.8        |            |                    |
| Undecided       | 77        | 29.5        |            |                    |
| Strongly Agree  | 35        | 13.4        | 2.75       | 0.474              |
| Agree           | 48        | 18.4        |            |                    |
| Total           | 260       | 100         |            |                    |

Table 8 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.
Table 9. Does the rich man merit to be raided for being so desirous.

| Option            | Frequency | Percentages | Mean Value | Standard deviation |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly disagree | 60        | 23.0        |            |                    |
| Disagree          | 80        | 16.8        |            |                    |
| Undecided         | 39        | 13.8        |            |                    |
| Strongly agree    | 37        | 18.8        |            |                    |
| Agree             | 41        | 27.6        |            |                    |
| Total             | 260       | 100         | 2.94       | 1.409              |

Table 9 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing”. Following table and graph shows the findings of the study.
Table 10 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.

Figure 10. Isn’t private stuff an institute to allow the rich to activity the poor.

Table 11. Would theft bring about more entire decent for everyone worried or not?

| Option            | Frequency | Percentages | Mean value | Standard deviation |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly disagree | 51        | 19.5        |            |                    |
| Disagree          | 68        | 26.3        |            |                    |
| Undecided         | 34        | 13.1        |            |                    |
| Strongly agree    | 46        | 17.7        |            |                    |
| Agree             | 61        | 23.4        | 2.45       | 1.481              |
| Total             | 260       | 100         |            |                    |

Table 11 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.

Figure 11. Would theft bring about more entire decent for everyone worried or not?
Table 12. Are laws getting in the way of the most elementary right of any fellow of society?

| Option                  | Frequency | Percentages | Mean value | Standard deviation |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| Strongly disagree       | 98        | 37.6        | 2.29       | 1.292              |
| Disagree                | 52        | 19.9        |            |                    |
| Undecided               | 30        | 11.5        |            |                    |
| Strongly agree          | 48        | 18.4        |            |                    |
| Agree                   | 32        | 12.6        |            |                    |
| Total                   | 260       | 100         |            |                    |

Table 12 showed that more than 50% responded agreed the said statements and admitted that respondents verified the items of Aslam and expressed their feeling with regards to Kohlberg’s theory. While some of respondents refused to show their response. It also showed that some participants did not their willingness about the statements. Therefore it is concluded that Kohlberg’s theory had positive impact on the achievement level of the learners and it would be appropriate if its application may be imposed in school level as well as higher level. Getting caught for stealing.

Table 13. Comparison of teacher and student.

| S.N | Statements                                                                 | Category | N  | Mean | SD  | T     | P      |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----|------|-----|-------|--------|
| 1   | Is Aslam courageous enough to risk getting caught for stealing?            | Teacher  | 60 | 2.18 | 0.97| -3.65 | 0.00   |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 3.54 | 1.34|       |        |
| 2   | Isn’t it only natural for loving father to care so much for his family that he would steal? | Teacher  | 60 | 2.43 | 1.226| -3.248| 0.001  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 3.09 | 1.427|       |        |
| 3   | Shouldn’t the community’s laws be upheld?                                  | Teacher  | 60 | 2.65 | 1.351| -3.524| 0.001  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 2.35 | 1.531|       |        |
| 4   | Does Aslam know a good recipe for preparing soup from tree bark?          | Teacher  | 60 | 1.83 | 0.942| 1.365 | 0.173  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 2.43 | 1.351|       |        |
| 5   | Does the rich man have any legal right to store food when other people are starving? | Teacher  | 60 | 3.77 | 1.671| 1.452 | 0.150  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 3.71 | 1.416|       |        |
| 6   | Is the motive of Aslam to steal for himself or to steal for his family?   | Teacher  | 60 | 2.67 | 1.003| -3.183| 0.002  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 3.63 | 1.451|       |        |
| 7   | What values are going to be the basis for social cooperation?            | Teacher  | 60 | 1.85 | 0.954| -3.848| 0.000  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 2.28 | 1.354|       |        |
| 8   | Is the epitome of eating reconcilable with the capability of stealing?     | Teacher  | 60 | 2.72 | 0.940| 0.254 | 0.800  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 2.98 | 1.461|       |        |
| 9   | Does the rich man deserve to be robbed for being so greedy?               | Teacher  | 60 | 1.63 | 1.041| 0.232 | 0.817  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 3.56 | 1.384|       |        |
| 10  | Isn’t private property an institution to enable the rich to exploit the poor? | Teacher  | 60 | 3.27 | 1.381| -4.793| 0.000  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 2.84 | 1.365|       |        |
| 11  | Would stealing bring about more total good for everybody concerned or not?| Teacher  | 60 | 3.60 | 1.167| -5.818| 0.000  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 2.87 | 1.699|       |        |
| 12  | Are laws getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society? | Teacher  | 60 | 2.32 | 1.396| -2.288| 0.023  |
|     |                                                                            | Student  | 200| 2.54 | 1.480|       |        |
Statement 1 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Is Aslam courageous enough to risk getting caught for stealing” of teachers and students with $M = 2.18, 3.54$ SD$=0.97, 1.34$ respectively $t=-3.65$ and $p=.00$, Following graphs are showing the graphical representation of the collected data about the comparison of teacher and students respectively.

Statement 2 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Isn’t it only natural for loving father to care so much for his family that he would steal?” of teachers and students with $M=2.43, 3.09$ SD$=1.226, 1.427$ respectively $t=-3.248$ and $p=.001$. 
Statement 3 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Shouldn’t the community’s laws be upheld?” of teachers and students with M=2.65, 2.35 SD=1.351, 1.513 respectively t=-3.524 and p=.001.

Statement 4 predicts that there is insignificant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Does Aslam know a good recipe for preparing soup form tree bark?” of teachers and students with M=1.83, 2.43 SD=.942, 1.351 respectively t=1.365 and p=.173.
Statement 5 predicts that there is insignificant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Does the rich man have any legal right to store food when other people are starving?” of teachers and students with M=3.77, 3.71 SD=1.671, 1.461 respectively t=1.452 and p=.150.

Statement 6 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Is the motive of Aslam to steal for himself or to steal for his family?” of teachers and students with M=2.67, 3.63 SD=1.003, 1.451 respectively t=-3.183 and p=.002.

Statement 7 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “What values are going to be the basis for social cooperation?” of teachers and students with M=1.85, 2.28 SD=0.954, 1.354 respectively t=-3.848 and p=.000.
Statement 8 predicts that there is insignificant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements "Is the epitome of eating reconcilable with the culpability of stealing?" of teachers and students with M=2.72, 2.98 SD=.940, 1.461 respectively t=.254 and p=.800.

Statement 9 predicts that there is insignificant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements "Does the rich man deserve to be robbed for being so greedy?" of teachers and students with M=1.63, 3.56 SD=1.041, 1.384 respectively t=.232 and p=.817.

Statement 10 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements "Isn't private property an institution to enable the rich to exploit the poor?" of teachers and students with M=3.27, 2.84 SD=1.381, 1.365 respectively t=-4.793 and p=.000.
Figure-20. For statement 8 of Table 14 (a) Mean comparison (b) SD comparison.

Figure-21. For statement 9 of Table 14 (a) Mean comparison (b) SD comparison.

Figure-22. For statement 10 of Table 14 (a) Mean comparison (b) SD comparison.
Statement 11 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Would stealing bring about more total good for everybody concerned or not?” of teachers and students with M=3.60, 2.87 SD=1.167, 1.699 respectively t=-5.818 and p=.000.
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Figure 23. For statement 11 of Table 14 (a) Mean comparison (b) SD comparison.

Statement 12 predicts that there is significant difference between the views of the respondents which are teachers and students of Rural and Urban schools regarding the statements “Are laws getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society?” of teachers and students with M=2.32, 2.54 SD=1.396, 1.480 respectively t=-2.288 and p=.023.
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Figure 24. For statement 12 of Table 14 (a) Mean comparison (b) SD comparison.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we extended the research on teachers' ethics by using the DIT to examine the moral judgment development on a sample of Secondary school teachers and students of Dera Ghazi Khan. The results revealed that Secondary school teachers and students of Dera Ghazi Khan demonstrated higher stage scores for the conventional level than for the post conventional level of the moral judgment development. The findings showed a trend to
resolve the moral dilemmas in the socially approved direction. The prominence of DIT of moral judgment level obtained by the sample of this study may be interpreted as due to the conformity to the stereotypes of good behaviour and meeting with social approval which are stressed in their culture.
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