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ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF STRUCTURALIST AND SOCIAL LEARNING THEORIES OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

by

Pamela Rudman

Master of Arts in Educational Psychology

This study examined Structuralist and Social Learning theories of moral development with the intent of determining which theory, if either, presented a more comprehensive definition and method of measurement for moral development. Particular critical emphasis was placed on the relationship of the conceptualization of moral issues to actual moral behavior in the overall assessment of each theory. The analysis suggests that neither theory, in and of itself, provides what is considered to be a "comprehensive" explanation for the various components of moral development. Suggestions for further study are also discussed.
I. Introduction
Introduction

During the course of everyday life, individuals are confronted by what often seems to be a constant bombardment of "moral dilemmas". Whether to accept too much change from the supermarket clerk, whether to cheat on income taxes, or whether to tell a "little white lie" to a friend are only a few examples of actual dilemmas which make it necessary for an individual to decide what is "right" and "wrong", and choose a course of action in accordance with that decision. More or less mundane moral issues give way to those of greater ramification when, for example, decisions must be made as to whether to break a law that is felt to be unjust, when one reacts to news that public officials are corrupt, or when a determination is necessary as to whether it's time to cease administrating "extraordinary" life-saving measures to a terminally ill person. All of these situations, whether thought to be simple or complex, require an individual to formulate a "moral judgment" and determine a course of "moral behavior".

Though people may share some very basic similarities, such as age, income, education, and life style -- all of which would seemingly predispose them to particular modes of thought and behavior -- the way these people interpret their world and formulate their moral judgments and determine their moral behavior are not necessarily very similar at all. Each person seems to come to the decision of what is right and fair, and the choice of how to act on those beliefs, as the result of some fairly universal -- and some very individual -- values and methods of reasoning, coupled with the ability or lack of ability to act on a particular belief at a particular time. Understanding moral development means understanding all of these "moral variables".
Issues To Be Explored

It is therefore my desire, as it has been of countless moral philosophers before me, to understand the basic theories of moral development. What accounts for the differences and similarities in moral reasoning and moral behavior between individuals? How do contemporary moral theories define "morality"? What is meant by "moral development" and how is it "measured"? How do theorists explain the conception of "moral judgment"? How do they rationalize "moral behavior"? How does moral judgment correlate with moral behavior in actual moral dilemmas? What are the most significant variables influencing either moral judgment or moral behavior?

Purposes Of The Study

For the purpose of this study, I have selected what I believe to be the two most popular and contemporary theories of moral development, Structuralist Theories and Social Learning Theories because they account for the most significant advances in moral development today. The main objective of this study is to critically examine these two theories, at least in part in regards to the aforementioned questions, with particular emphasis on the issue of the relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior. The goal is to determine if either theory can singularly provide a comprehensive analysis and explanation of moral development that encompasses what will be deemed to be all -- or most -- of the relevant variables affecting morality. The actual criteria to be used to evaluate these theories of moral development will be defined and discussed in a later section of this report.
Background Information

A brief overview of Structuralist and Social Learning Theories brings the following basic principles to light. Structuralists define moral development as an internally motivated developmental process based on basic, universal, cognitive judgments of right and wrong. One's grasp of the concept of "justice" is the key element underlying progression through a developmental sequence of discrete "stages". As an individual is better able to understand the concept of treating others as he would like to be treated, and as he is increasingly able to adopt the perspective of others with whom he is interacting ("role taking"), then he moves up the developmental structure. It is important to note that judgments are the primary criteria by which moral development is measured according to Structuralist Theories. Behavior is regarded as far less significant. Moral values are highly personal, and as a result it is only the change in the cognitive processing of one's own values that reflects any meaningful, measurable change through a growth sequence.

According to Social Learning Theories, moral development is an externally motivated process based on cultural, relative teachings by significant others of socially accepted rights and wrongs. This theory rests on the concept of "role modeling"; morality is seen as the ability to fit into a social order as demonstrated by behavior which effectively models (imitates) the "right behavior" of others. Social Learning Theorists argue that cognitions are a less significant aspect of morality. They state that behavior is the manifestation of one's level of morality, and behavior can be modified without dealing with cognitive processes (as in
Rationale For This Study

Each of these two "schools of thought" consider some important issues and ignore others. Structuralists provide a sort of "vacuum philosophy", as if values and morality have a life of their own, existing in a purely cognitive context. How an individual acts is basically irrelevant, how he thinks is significant. Social Learning Theorists, on the other hand, place far less emphasis on the cognitive aspect. Structuralists are concerned with "role taking", Social Learning Theorists with "role modeling"; one with an internalized process, one with an externalized process. And, according to both theories, the relationship between moral reasoning and moral behavior is difficult to measure with consistency. What, then, is morality? Is it merely the ability to think or act on a particular plateau of fairness and justice? Or would morality be better seen as the ability to think and act on one's thoughts and understanding of the concepts of right and wrong, fairness and justice? If an individual is capable of a sophisticated level of moral reasoning but behaves on a primal level, where would he be placed on a scale of moral development?

Conceptual Assumptions

The questions exist, then, whether 1) either of these two theories, by itself, provides an adequate model for moral development; 2) either theory is "better" than the other; 3) the relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior is significant in the overall assessment of morality; and 4) a better theoretical
model might be derived, encompassing some components of existing theories and adding new ones.

**Hypothesis**

A study of current literature regarding Structuralist and Social Learning Theories of moral development, with the rationale as detailed earlier in this section, suggests the following hypothesis to be examined in light of the literature:

1. **Structuralist Theories** provide a comprehensive and meaningful model for the development and measurement of "morality".

2. **Social Learning Theories** provide a comprehensive and meaningful model for the development and measurement of "morality".

3. There is an observable relationship between moral judgment and moral behavior, but the lack of consistency in this relationship results in insignificant correlations according to present methods of measurement. (Consequently, little emphasis is given to the overall significance of the relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior).

4. The variable of "self interest" is a powerful influence on operative levels of morality in actual moral dilemmas.

5. "Morality" is relative to specific cultures.

**Limitations**

There are both specific and existential limitations of this study and anticipated findings. They are:

1. More in-depth research may uncover criticisms or embellishments of existing theories which were not discovered in this report.
2. Any "new" theory which may be proposed will be as yet untested, and will be presented as a vehicle for new thoughts and discussion, rather than intended as absolute in its present form.

3. Some facets of a "new" theory will be unsupportable by actual research and will be, instead, based on the knowledge and intuition of this researcher.

4. Studies of morality fall into the category of studying man's "humaness", and as such are more the result of an art than necessarily a science. The biases of the researcher, as well as the inclinations of the subjects, are responsive to the very human qualities of being somewhat inconsistent and colored by individual interpretations.

5. Interpretations of existing theories of moral development, as well as any newly proposed theories and judgments of morality, are seemingly relative to American culture, since this researcher is basically unfamiliar with other cultures and cannot, therefore, at this time attest to any "universality" of particular concepts.

Summary

To summarize the concept of this paper, research seems to indicate that neither "mature moral judgment" nor "mature moral behavior" can, in and of itself, be considered "moral", one without the other. Mature judgments must be supplemented by corresponding behavior, and vice versa. Morality is a system of values and corresponding behaviors which demonstrate a concern for "justice" and an altruistic regard for all individuals and groupings of individuals. If moral development is defined as "a progression through a sequence of specific structures, functions, or stages
from a position of 'non-moral' to 'moral'' (See Definition of Terms, this section), then maturity in moral development would suggest that as reasoning becomes more sophisticated and altruistic, so must behavior. An individual actually does what is morally "right" in accordance with a cognitive process that involves internalized values of right and wrong that are based on a sense of fairness, consideration, and respect for others. A "comprehensive" model for moral development must consider morality in these terms.

OUTLINE OF THE REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

The body of this report will assume the following format:

Chapter 2 -- details of the structure and goals of the study, including the conceptual impetus, and the criteria established for evaluating the chosen theories of moral development.

Chapter 3 -- a detailed review of Structuralist theories of moral development, including some criticism.

Chapter 4 -- a detailed review of Social Learning Theories of moral development, including some criticism.

Chapter 5 -- a summary to synthesize research findings with my interpretations. Questions proposed in the introduction will be answered, suggestions for further study will be made, and the impact of this report will be considered.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Moral: relating to principles (comprehensive and fundamental laws) having to do with what is fair and just, right and wrong, in regards to one's interaction with others. A cognitive, deliberate value chosen by an individual that reflects his or her understanding of the rights and needs of others as being at least as significant -- if not more significant -- than his own. "Moral principles override other sorts of principles and rules. Moral principles are not merely matters of opinion, custom or legality." ("The Moral Person", John Schulte and Stanton Teal).

Moral Judgment: the cognitive process of organizing one's reasoning according to the principles of what is "moral".

Moral Behavior: the behavioral repertoire which corresponds to the principles of what is "moral". Moral behavior is distinguished from simple "reflexive" or "non-moral" behavior in that it has the following characteristics:

1) Moral behavior is that in which the "person must have sufficient cognitive concepts and abilities to have some measure of understanding of the act and its consequences for others;

2) "Moral behavior is that in which the person must have had some reasonable alternative way of acting open to him or her at the time...

"In order for a person to 'have an alternative' and make a judgment concerning whether or not it is 'reasonable' he or she must A) be able to 'see' the alternatives, and B) have sufficient empirical knowledge of how people behave in that or similar situations so
that he or she can make fairly accurate predictions about what would happen if the various alternatives were acted upon. C) A person must also have some standard of value to use in judging which of the various predicted outcomes is better, and hence, which alternative is more reasonable." (Schulte and Teal) D) A person must not be forced into a particular mode of behavior by irresistible physical forces.

**Moral Development:** a progression through a sequence of specific structures, functions, or stages, from a position of "non-moral" to "moral". The specific characteristics of the continuum are defined by the particular theory supporting it.

**Structuralist Theory:** a theory of moral development based on the development of cognitive structures. There are well defined, discrete stages of moral judgment based on the concept of "justice". The Structuralist view offers insights into the way moral judgments and reasoning take place, as opposed to the occurrence of moral or immoral behavior. Moral development is seen as an increasingly sophisticated construction of universal concepts of right and wrong or of justice.

**Social Learning Theory:** a theory of moral development based on the acquisition of socially learned behaviors. Moral principles are defined by one's society; moral learning is socially learned behavior. The Social Learning view offers insights into the way moral behavior takes place, as opposed to the occurrence of moral or immoral reasoning.

**Ethics:** the study of the distinction between good and evil; the study of morality. The systematic examination
of the characteristics of value judgments such as "good", "bad", "right", "wrong", etc., and the general principles which justify their application to a subject. (Encyclopedia of Psychology, Volume 1, 1972)

Environment: the aggregate of social, cultural, and emotional conditions that influence the life of an individual.
II. Structure and Goals of the Study
The Inception of this Study

An overview of information on the subject of moral development resulted in a major change of focus for this study from its original intent. Initially a study of "honesty" was planned, with the goal of determining and understanding how and why "average" people made seemingly arbitrary decisions regarding whether they would act in an honest or dishonest manner. In order to pursue this subject, it was necessary to first accomplish several major tasks. First a definition of "honesty" was needed. A simple Webster's dictionary definition of honesty provided the following: "Truthfulness; freedom from fraud, deceit, etc." An interpretation of the definition, however, brought up many complex questions. If we are to assume that total honesty is absolute truthfulness, then we might accept that this would be the highest point at one end of a continuum, with absolute dishonesty--or complete lack of truthfulness--at the other extreme. The question immediately arose as to how we were to distinguish the various differentiations in between the extremes. In addition, many situations seem to contain "significant" variables. Were we to equate a "little white lie", (for example telling a friend that a dress was lovely when in fact it was thought to be atrocious) with financial fraud, (for example, setting up a fictitious company and selling shares of worthless stock to unsuspecting buyers). If, indeed there is a difference in the value of the honest of dishonest act, (or in the "truthfulness" or lack of "truthfulness"), how would one establish criteria for evaluating this importance? Is there a difference between stealing medicine to save a life and stealing money simply for greed? To what point, if any, was motive to be considered when actual behavior was evaluated?
Isolating Theories For Study

The logical next step was to locate an established theory of moral development against which these variables and concerns could be weighed. An examination of the research on this subject provided more questions than answers. Of the three main "schools of thought" on moral development, Psychoanalytic, Structuralists, and Social Learning Theories, none seemed to provide a comprehensive model which included the importance of both action and motivation.

Studies of childrens moral development are polarized, theoretically as well as methodologically, in either behavioral or cognitive contexts. M. L. Hoffman (1970) explains this polarization as arising from three basic philosophical doctrines. The doctrine of "original sin", represented in a modified form by the Psychoanalytic theorists, holds that immoral behavior will produce a varying amount of guilt during the preparation of the act, and that the impact of this guilt in combination with the active intervention of adults will determine relative moral behavior. The Psychoanalytic theory implies that all children possess the seeds of immoral behavior, and it is dependent on what they are taught and how they process what they are taught, as to what they will consequently feel and do.

The doctrine of "tabula rasa" holds that a child is born with neither good nor bad inclinations, but that he essentially determines his own destiny -- moral and otherwise -- due to his own individual resources coupled with the powerful influences of adult intervention. These beliefs are represented by Social Learning Theorists who propose that morality is learned, based on the concept of reward and punishment, with little emphasis on accompanying rationale. According to this
theory, the act is the manifestation of the level of morality; the process by which the decision is made regarding how or why one will act is secondary.

The third doctrine, "innate purity", emphasizes the corrupting influence of society. It is assumed that the child starts life pure, and that his innate capacities for cognitive development, along with -- to some degree -- the influence of his interactions with his peers and adults, determine his moral development. How the child sees and interprets his moral choices are the significant determinants of the level of morality. Structuralists follow this doctrine. According to this theory, the cognitive processes in reaching moral decisions are the important and measurable qualities of morality, the actual behavior is relatively insignificant.

A Change of Emphasis

At this point in the study, it became apparent that there were various aspects of different theories of moral development which seemed relevant to the overall examination and evaluation of the concept of "honesty", but no one theory which appeared to encompass all of the variables which were felt to be significant. It now seemed important to forego the specific topic of honesty in favor of in-depth study of these main theories of moral development. Was one particular theory actually "better" than the others? Was the concern for a model that included both the cognitive and behavioral aspects of moral development a realistic concern, or was it based on a lack of knowledge regarding the subject?

Considerable deliberation resulted in the following decisions. An in-depth study of moral development was planned with the goal of processing as much information
as was deemed reasonable in order to better understand the main premise of each of the major contemporary theories of moral development. Personal biases of this researcher resulted in the elimination of Psychoanalytic theories from this study. This decision was based on the belief that a thorough understanding of the Psychoanalytic view of moral development would necessitate a thorough understanding of Freudian theories, which would -- in and of itself -- be an overwhelming undertaking, not necessarily of pertinent contribution to this study.

The two remaining philosophies, Social Learning Theories and Structuralist Theories, and in some cases theories or thoughts relating to each of these two main "schools of thought", were selected for examination.

A library study involving research into the basic principles of these theories led to the formulation of specific questions and hypothesis as outlined in other sections of this report. Further study into the work of related researchers provides both substantiation and refutation of these questions and hypothesis.

Criteria For Evaluating Theories of Moral Development

Ultimately, criteria for judging these theories needed to be established. Some of these criteria are based on factual information, and some on the intuition of the researcher. The main concerns with which the findings of this research are to be critically evaluated are these:

1) What are the theoretical justifications for studying moral development in terms of either moral judgment or moral behavior, as oppose to studying moral development in terms of both moral judgment and behavior? What is the relationship of moral judgment to
moral behavior? Is this relationship, or lack of relationship, significant to the overall assessment of moral development?

2) Are moral values relative to specific cultures and/or eras? Can universal generalizations regarding moral development be substantiated?

3) What impact do specific environmental influences (sub-cultural forces) have on moral development?

4) Does the issue of "self-interest" affect the development of moral judgment or the behavioral manifestation of morality?

5) With particular consideration of the above issues, does either the Structuralist or Social Learning Theory of moral development offer a "better" model than the other? Is either model comprehensive in and of itself?

To Whom Should a Model of Moral Development Apply?

This study is particularly concerned with finding an applicable model of moral development for "average" Americans, although the model would ideally encompass all Americans (but would not necessarily relate to pathological deviates). The intent of this study is to determine and understand what motivates "normal" individuals to particular types of judgments and behaviors. Financial status, education, age, background, etc., are all significant variable influences. However, if it is assumed that all of these people have similar moral options available to them, even if the scope of the options are somewhat different, then it is possible to arrive at some generalizations about morality as it relates to specific cultures. Persons with emotional and/or physiological problems do not necessarily realize these same options due to their own capacities or actual
physical limitations put upon them.

It would be of particular interest to eventually test a model of moral development against what Gail Sheehy describes in her book, *Passages*, as "America's Pacesetter Group" -- "motivated people who either began in or have entered the middle class...because the educated middle class has the greatest number of options and the least number of obstacles to choosing their lives." They have the most options available to choose from in determining their lives, they are not hampered by finances, traditions, or obligations. Therefore, the choices they make are more related to their own development than to external pressures.
III. Structuralist Theories of Moral Development
Exploration of Fundamental Concepts of Structuralist Theories

Structuralist theories of moral development are thought to have developed from the philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724 - 1804), a German philosopher concerned with the nature and limits of human knowledge. He held the belief that human beings direct and organize their own experiences according to their innate capacities to comprehend a situation and arrange this knowledge into specific patterns. Therefore, all things that can be experienced are experienced in these logical patterns.

More contemporary Structuralist theorists have leaned heavily on this philosophy of "logical organization" while continuing to expand -- and in some cases, modify -- these early contentions. Structuralist views offer insights into the way moral judgment and reasoning take place, according to predictable, "logical" structures, as opposed to considering moral behavior and its consistency or lack of consistency. As William Damon explains (1980), "although a diversity of behaviors may be representative of each particular moral mode, the (Structuralist) assumption is that there is an underlying organization that gives this diversity a basic coherence."

Structuralists contend that external influences, such as one's environment, family or peers are important only in so far as they affect an individual's ability to cognitively process and reorganize this influence. An individual's logical interaction with his world is what determines his movement in the developmental sequences. Damon contends that because life situations vary so much, one can only determine a consistency in how one organizes his thoughts as the underlying principle for
behavior; there is no necessary consistency in the behavior itself.

The Structuralist assumption that there is a logical, predictable, sequential structure for moral development lends support to the following hypothesis (numbers correspond to those assigned in Chapter One):

1) Moral development can only be discussed and measured in terms of reasoning and judgment, since it is only possible to determine a consistent pattern of moral cognitions. Moral behavior is often inconsistent and/or seemingly irrational and is, at best, immeasurable with any degree of accuracy.

3) The relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior may be inconsistent, often irrational, and immeasurable.

4) At least at higher levels of moral development, the element of self interest would not affect moral judgments. Altruistic moral reasoning transcends the needs of the individual in favor of the needs or best interests of the majority.

5) Moral development structures are based on human cognitive predispositions, not cultural influences or diversities. Therefore, moral development can be discussed in universal terms as they apply to all human-kind.

These concepts will be dealt with at length during the following discussion.

Prominent Structuralist Theorists

Jean Piaget

Jean Piaget (1896 - 1980), was an early pioneer in the research of moral development. His work, The Moral
Judgment of the Child, published in 1932, is now a classic study of children's responses to rules within a game of marbles. Based on this study, Piaget formulated specific stages of cognitive development that he bases on the assumption that certain cognitive structures develop with age through interaction with one's environment. This interaction revolves around a child's response to "rules".

Though Piaget's early work is concerned with rules primarily as they affect and reflect mental development, he also acknowledges an obvious link between rules and moral development. According to Piaget, "...all morality consists in a system of rules, and the essence of all morality is to be sought for in the respect which the individual acquires for those rules." (1932, Page 13). Observance of rules occurs on two levels, the first being a consciousness of or respect for the rules, and the second is the actual practice of the rules. Linking morality to rules, and the understanding of rules to cognitive-development, facilitates an obvious extension of Piaget's theories to the realm of moral development.

Piaget's model of cognitive-structural development consists of four sequential stages which encompass a child's mental development from birth through the middle teens. (Figure 1) The first stage, from birth to about age two, is identified as the "Sensiomotor Period", characterized by "symbolic play" where the very young child invents rules with no real concept of what rules are. Stage 2, from age two to approximately age six, is the "Pre Operational Period", where the child begins to learn to organize his thoughts in a systematic manner, and the beginnings of understanding moral obligation takes place. Two broad stages of development occur during the third, or "Concrete Operational Period", from
age six to about age twelve. During the early stage, identified as "heteronomy", rules are external laws which are sacred because they have been laid down by adults. Rules are arbitrary; their meaning is not important, though their observance is. This is a period of objective responsibility, where the actions are important, not necessarily the intentions. During the later stage, characterized as "autonomy", a child develops a mutual respect for his peers, and he begins to see rules as cooperative agreements, useful to all. Rules now take on meaning; they are subjective and changeable, having been established through free choice for the smooth running of the group. The "intent" behind a moral judgment also takes on increasing significance. At this point, the child sees himself as an individual participating in a group based on mutual respect. In the last stage, "Post Operational Period", beginning at about age twelve, there is the development of second-order reasoning abilities. An "Ideological" mode of moral reasoning develops, with the ability to construct new rules to cope with all possible situations. Although Piaget does propose an age limit for this last stage, from age twelve to about age fifteen, the age span covered by this last stage could -- theoretically -- be infinite, since most people never achieve this level of development.

It is the distinction between these concepts of enforced rules and mutually accepted rules that is the basis of Piaget's theory of moral development. In the earlier stages Piaget refers to "moral realism", where rules are sacred and to be obeyed without question. In later stages, children become more flexible in their thinking, and cooperation and the concept of justice come into play; rules are seen to be more the product of mutual agreement than of some external force.
The concepts of "disequilibrium" and "justice" play a major role in Piaget's theories. Disequilibrium is the mechanism by which thoughts and structures are reorganized to recreate equilibrium. A child's cognitive processes are disturbed by a situation in which previous ideas no longer suffice to solve or calm a dilemma. Therefore, he must re-evaluate his thinking and determine a more reasonable -- and thus more complex -- line of thinking. As one better understands the reciprocity of human relationships (the Golden Rule), he can therefore make more autonomous decisions about morality. It is in this manner that previously externally enforced rules eventually become internalized into one's own way of thinking. It also follows, according to Piaget's thinking, that in the course of development, active knowledge may come before theoretical knowledge. William Damon (1980) explains this last concept as a result of knowledge being worked out on a practical plane and only later becoming reflective. A child may act on a higher plane than he can think because of an intuitive or learned sense of "right" before he is actually able to reason about his action.

Piaget contends that peers are the primary motivators of moral development because autonomy increases as a child experiences societies of mutual respect. Family circles are less likely to encourage autonomy because of the superior-inferior relationships that naturally exist and which often elicit unilateral respect. Piaget does, however, allow for some flexibility in the interpretation of his theories, and states, "The concept of structure does not imply just any kind of totality and does not mean that everything is attached to everything else." (1967 p. 143)

The development of the rule of "justice" is a
natural outgrowth of a child's increasing sense of autonomy. As a child begins to feel less constrained by arbitrary, externally imposed laws, he begins to function, instead, on a principle or reciprocity. The pursuit of justice best serves the achievement of equilibrium in one's social structure. Piaget claims that as peer group ties become more solid, the notion of justice supercedes all other motivations for maintaining the "right" behaviors. One makes moral decisions based on a sense of fairness. Because of this, however, developing concepts of justice can come into conflict with adult authority, and Piaget states, "justice has no meaning except as something that is above authority."

There are three broad stages of development in Piaget's concept of justice. The first is obedience, where rules must be obeyed regardless of their apparent "fairness", ("Even though I didn't do it, I was told to fix it so I will"). The second is "equality", where "unfair" commands or rules are resisted (I didn't do it, so I won't fix it!) The third stage is "equity", which is essentially being able to understand the situation from the perspectives of others, weighing all the circumstances, and then choosing a response, ("It would be a nice thing to do, so I'll do it").

In "The Development of Sociomoral Knowledge", (1980), Hugh Rosen synthesizes Piaget's structural theory into the proposal of two basic functions which all living organisms maintain. The first function is "organization", which is the internal arrangement of cognitive structural elements; learning new concepts and skills and coordinating their interrelationships. The second function is "adaptation". Adaptation can be broken down to assimilation, the interpretation of reality according to one's level of structural development; and accommodation, which is changing
structural elements in order to allow for new discoveries in one's environment. (Pages 4-5)

Following Piaget's examination of children's responses to rules during game playing, Piaget presented children with hypothetical moral dilemmas and examined the criteria upon which they made their moral decisions. (Appendix 1) The children's responses were organized into three general and successive areas in keeping with his proposed structurally-developmental theory. First, a child regards an act to be "wrong" because it is punishable. Next, it is wrong because it is simply known to be wrong. Lastly, it is wrong because it is thought to be unfair or unjust to others.

In summary, Piaget's moral philosophy is that moral development follows a series of sequential cognitive developments in which a child first sees only himself and his needs, later recognizes externally imposed rules and order, and eventually understands and accepts his place with others and the impact that mutually accepted rules have on maintaining this order for all. "Role taking" within a peer group allows for the enhancement of this last and highest level of moral development; one treats others as he would like to be treated, and the intent underlying a behavior is therefore fundamentally important.

Based upon the foregoing interpretation of Piaget's theory, support is found for the following hypotheses: (Numbers correspond to those in Chapter One)

1. Moral development is structural, following specific, sequential stages.

3. The relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior is not significant. A child may act at a particular stage of moral development because of adult direction with little or no understanding of the true cognitive significance. At the higher stages of moral
development, however, it is assumed that cognitive intent directs actual behavior although the relationship is not absolute.

4. The pursuit of one's self interest is not a major influence on moral judgment. Only at the earliest and youngest stage do individuals exclusively consider their own needs, and at that stage judgments are not really considered "moral", but are instead conditioned responses. At higher stages it is assumed that the best interests of the majority transcend the needs of the individual.

5. "Moral" development is viewed as a basic developmental process, intrinsic to all human beings. Specific developmental patterns vary only insofar as an individual's capacity for cognitive growth according to this universal sequence may vary. Therefore, moral development is not relative to specific cultures, but follows a universal pattern; cultural influences only serve to enhance or inhibit development according to this pattern.

Vast amounts of research have been done in the attempt to verify or challenge Piaget's theories of moral development. Thomas Lickona, in "Research on Piaget's Theory of Moral Development", reviews Piagetian research and draws the following conclusions:

1) "...while Piaget's analysis of the cognitive basis of moral judgment is well formed, his speculations about its affective side are on shaky grounds". Basically, Lickona is saying that children "develop" respect for adults and rules over a period of time; obedience is not necessarily out of respect as much as it may be a realistic understanding of being overpowered.

2) Lickona asserts that evidence does substantiate Piaget's theories on developmental changes regarding
moral judgments, but that information regarding specific areas is both pro and con. He believes that much of the negative criticism of Piaget may be the result of poorly developed critiques.

3) Lickona concludes that moral developmental advances are slower than Piaget originally suggested.

4) Lickona supports a cognitive foundation for moral development (rather than behavioral).

5) Lickona's review of the research supports the importance of peer interaction, but questions the importance of adult interaction (as mentioned in conclusion #1).

M.L. Hoffman, in "Moral Development" (1970), reports that his review of the literature did not support Piaget's assertion of a universal stage consistency. Hoffman found that variables such as intentionality affect judgments and consequently may disrupt the limitations of particular stages.

Irwin and Moore (1971) validated Piaget's assertion that the concept of intention is slower to develop than the concept of restitution. Armsby (1971), however, found that Piaget's moral dilemmas did not adequately differentiate accidental from deliberate behavior, and further concluded that children make moral judgments governed by intent at an earlier age than Piaget proposed. Berndt and Berndt (1975), found that the concepts of motive and intention developed with age, and further examined the results of moral judgments in terms of a theory which included both cognitive and socially learned influences.

Still other researchers, Durkin (1959 b. 1961), and Boehm and Nass (1964) found that actual characteristics of the moral situations influenced the children's moral decisions as well as their cognitive ability to decipher the situations. Strauss (1954) studied the awareness of
rules governing transactions and concluded that child-peer relationships were not more significant than child-adult relationships. The contention that the consequences of an action were primary influencing factors of moral judgments was found by Buchanan and Thompson (1973) and Gutkin (1973).

In his study, "Durkheim and Others: Some Philosophical Influences on Piaget's Theory of Moral Development" (1976), Dr. Robert Paul Craig discussed Piagetian theory and its relationship to Durkheim and Kant. Craig explains Piaget's theory of cognitive and moral development to be genetic as opposed to logical, a theory therefore heavily inspired by Durkheim rather than Kant. Genetic development allows for freedom of expression on the individual's part; the individual learns to manipulate objects and only then can move on to manipulate thoughts. Craig's interpretation of Kantian philosophy asserts that human development is based on logic, and that much adult intervention is necessary to insure logical development of the individual, while Piagetian theory, on the other hand, holds that only as the individual frees himself from adult authority does he truly develop "moral judgment". Piaget follow Durkheim's line of thinking that morality consists of the elements of 1) discipline, 2) attachment, and 3) autonomy; each element getting its meaning from society (similar also to the thinking of John Dewey). "Discipline" is a response to society, imposed by society. "Attachment" is when one identified willingly with that society and acts in accordance with its rules because he wants to. "Autonomy" is when the individual can understand the social rules and still make his own judgments based on internal motivations not social sanctions. Simply stated, an individual learns at an early age what behavior is expected of him, and
only after he is able to function within this framework does he begin to understand the philosophical concepts underlying the behavior and eventually recognize all the options available to him.

Lawrence Kohlberg

Piget's theories are acknowledged as being a prime influence on the research and theoretical proposals of Lawrence Kohlberg. Kohlberg, (1927 - ), is currently a Professor of Education and Social Psychology at Harvard University, and is widely recognized in the annals of moral development literature as being a chief spokesman for Structuralist theories.

Although Kohlberg is greatly influenced by the work of Piaget, he is, nevertheless, critical of the content of Piaget's moral stage system. Accepting some notions and disregarding others Kohlberg used Piagetian theories as a foundation for the modified and expanded theories that he subsequently proposed Kohlberg's criticism of Piaget's theories begin with the following arguments:

1) Kohlberg believes that Piaget's stages are inadequately formulated. Where Piaget's model has four stages, Kohlberg's has six (with the possibility of a seventh). Kohlberg's age differentiations are consequently also different.

2) Kohlberg believes that Piaget wrongly describes a child's progression from heteronomous to autonomous morality as a result of the child's responsiveness to his peers rather than to adults.

3) Kohlberg believes that there are several stages of autonomous morality, some extending into adulthood.

4) Kohlberg believes that stages of moral development occur in invariant sequence, while Piaget believes that more than one dimension can exist at one
time.

These, and other arguments, are expanded in a later section of this report.

Kohlberg's research began with the study of a group of fifty American males, 10-28 years of age, who were interviewed every three years for eighteen years. Kohlberg's studies concentrate on the subject's reasons for recommending a specific course of moral action, and it is important to distinguish it from research which concentrates on moral behavior. Kohlberg's concept of morality is philosophical (ethical) rather than behavioral.

Kohlberg defends his philosophical approach with the contention that a child and an adult may both resist stealing an apple, and in such a situation their behavior is the same. However, because of the difference in their moral maturity, the motivations for not stealing are different; a child is motivated by his fear of being punished, while an adult is presumably motivated by the knowledge that it is wrong to steal. Kohlberg developed a series of "moral dilemmas" to probe for reactions and reasons for moral choices. (Appendix 2 -- Dilemmas)

The Kohlbergian theory of moral development is characterized as a progression through a sequence of discrete stages. An individual's cognitive development establishes the boundaries of that individual's progress through moral stages. As cognitive structures become more complex, a corresponding complexity of moral reasoning becomes available.

Development within Kohlberg's framework of morality is not automatic. The quality of the social environment is seen to have a significant influence on the rate of development and the level of development one achieves, although it will be substantiated later that the environment does not alter the sequence of development,
or the content of the particular stages. Similar to Piagetian theory, the motivating principle of development according to Kohlberg's model is also the pursuit of "equilibrium", the resolution of cognitive conflict. Therefore, the more complex the environment, the more inherent the dis-equilibrium which is essential for moral development. Likewise, an intellectually impoverished environment would not motivate development because only minimal structures are needed for coping.

Kohlberg's theory of moral development is comprised of three levels, each level having two stages. (Figure 2) Level 1 is the "Pre-Conventional" level. At this level, the child responds to rules exclusively on the basis of the consequence of his actions. At stage 1, the consequence of inappropriate moral judgments is punishment. At stage 2, the consequence of the moral judgment is the satisfaction (or lack of same) of one's needs, and occasionally the needs of significant others. At this stage, the concept of moral reciprocity begins to bud, but only as it is seen as the equal exchange of favors.

Level 2 is the "Conventional" level. At this level, the child begins to understand the concept of maintaining the expectations of others, in this case, those persons closest to the individual, regardless of the consequences. A sense of loyalty has begun to develop, which becomes significant in and of itself. At stage 3, "good behavior" helps others and is approved by them. There is considerable emphasis on conformity to what is considered to be the "right" behavior, and therefore, the intentions behind a moral judgment are also important for the first time. At stage 4, an awareness of and adherence to the rules applies not only to one's immediate social circle, but to the social order as a whole. Fixed rules of the society become
important, as well as a respect for authority.

Level 3 is "Post-Conventional", or the "Principled" level. A respect for individual rights develops at stage 5, and there is an increasing awareness that rules may have to be adjusted to better suit those individual needs. The emphasis, however, is on one's ability to change rules in order to make them better suit the individual needs that are identified and agreed upon by one's society. The significant change which takes place at stage 6 is the recognition that ethical principles are self-chosen, rather than necessarily agreed upon or determined by society. Although based upon the Golden Rule and the concept of justice, an individual's judgements are dictated by his own conscience.

Kohlberg outlines the qualities of a stage development theory. He sees stage development as being invariant; one must pass through the stages in order. He justifies his psychological theory as to why moral development is upward and sequential in essentially the same manner that he substantiates his philosophical claim that a higher stage is more adequate and more "moral" than a lower stage -- because a more mature stage of thought is more structurally adequate. As a Formalist, Kohlberg emphasizes the importance of adequate moral judgments. As reasoning abilities become more complex, alternatives in moral reasoning become available and the individual can better order his value priorities.

Kohlberg also contends that subjects can't comprehend moral reasoning at a stage more than one stage beyond their own. This, again, is due to the fact that as the stages progress, reasoning becomes more complex, and the transition must be made between the more simple variations in thought before the wider conceptual gaps can be bridged. Kohlberg does argue that subjects are cognitively attracted to reasoning one
level above their own predominant level, as those concepts are within the individual's grasp.

Finally, Kohlberg affirms his belief that movement through stages is effected when "cognitive dis-equilibrium" is created; when a more sophisticated solution is needed for a moral dilemma, its achievement is sought. Although Kohlberg states that a higher stage of moral development may be "more moral" than a lower stage, he also adds that a higher stage is not necessarily "better". Judgments of persons as morally good or bad are not justified by the existence of moral principles. Kohlberg further differentiates his moral stages from mere cognitive stages of development. Correlations between Kohlberg's test scores and test scores of mental comprehension show a relationship, but indicate the presence of another dimension within Kohlberg's test that distinguishes -- to Kohlberg's mind -- simple cognitions from moral judgments.

The ability to think on a sophisticated level doesn't indicate a sense of morality or a true concern for others. And, sometimes a seemingly "less moral" act is actually the "more moral" choice because of the philosophical base for judgment. There is a hierarchy of morality; it may be justifiable to steal if it is to save a life, as it may be justifiable to kill is that will ultimately benefit a society as a whole (as killing Hitler). Therefore, moral judgments involve more than the ability to reason; it is the arrangements of the reasoning that is significant.

Kohlberg's emphasis on the principles and rationalizations behind moral judgments rather than on the actual judgment itself or the behavioral manifestation of that judgment derives from his formalist orientation. According to the formalist philosopher William Frankena, "The formalist maintains
that there is something which may be called the moral point of view. This point of view can be described in purely formal terms -- readiness to think and make practical decisions by reference to principles which one is willing to take as supreme, even in the light of the best available knowledge. A judgment, however it is worded, is moral only if it is made from this point of view, only if it is supported by reasons involving principles chosen in this spirit, whatever the content of these reasons be." (1963 Page 8).

Moral philosophers believe that morality can be defined in strictly formal terms, without undue concern to content. Kohlberg claims, "like most moral philosophers from Kant to Hare, Baier, Aiken, etc., we define morality in terms of the formal character of a moral judgment or a moral point of view, rather than in terms of its content. Impersonality, ideality, universality, and preemptiveness are among the formal characteristics of a moral judgment. These are best seen in the reasons given for a moral judgment, a moral reason being one which has such properties as these." Kohlberg adds that, "To my knowledge, those who object to a formalist definition of morality have no positive alternative to offer..." (Kohlberg, 1971).

Most formalists agree that the primary foundation underlying moral principles is universality; a moral judgment is applicable to everyone, it is impartial, general, supreme, and overriding. Similar to Piaget, Kohlberg defines morality as "justice". Justice is seen to be a universal concern, and therefore moral development is not tied to any particular culture, or specific environment. As a matter of fact, Kohlberg insists that even family participation provides only a negligible impact on moral development. Children can't "model" their parents because they are at different
levels of development and consequently at different levels of reasoning; the child cannot necessarily comprehend the parent's perspective. Therefore, exposure to higher stages of thinking is not, by itself, a sufficient condition for moral development.

There is, however, a limited effect of one's social environment due to the opportunities that are presented for "role taking". Kohlberg differentiates "role taking" from "role modeling". Role taking is the ability to accept the perspectives of others, from one's own stage of reasoning and understanding; it is a cognitive, empathetic process. Role modeling, however, is only imitation; there may or may not be cognitive involvement in the resultant behavior. Role taking is an active process, role modeling is passive.

Kohlberg limits the influence of the environment to providing a stimulating atmosphere for moral growth. The environment doesn't cause the moral development, it only encourages it. The more complex the environment and the more other people involved, the greater the interaction with other individuals, groups, and institutions and the greater the potential for "cognitive conflict" and resultant stimulus for change. Yet the extent and the speed of the change are determined by the individual's resources, and his ability to cognitively decipher this stimulus, not the stimulus itself.

Kohlberg's explanation of "cognitive conflict" can be directly compared to Piaget's theory of "dis-equilibrium". Cognitive conflict occurs when a situation or circumstance arises for which previous cognitive moral structures no longer suffice to resolve the inherent dilemma. The individual must therefore reorganize his moral thinking to a more sophisticated level in order to resolve the conflict. This
reorganization follows Kohlberg's moral development structure.

At this point, an excerpt from Kohlberg's own writings is in order to most clearly develop these previously mentioned issues. "In general, when theorists attempt to extract the culturally universal essence of morality, they turn to 1) rules, 2) sympathy or concern for others, and 3) justice. Developmental theory's conception of role-taking embraces all three, in the sense that all morally relevant rules and institutions are conceived of as interpreted through processes of role-taking directed by concerns about both welfare and justice... When we move from role-taking to the resolution of conflicting roles, we arrive at the 'principle' of justice. A moral conflict is a conflict between competing claims of men: you versus me, you versus him. The precondition for a moral conflict is man's capacity for role-taking...where such conflicts arise, the principles we use to resolve them are principles of justice. Usually expectations or claims are integrated by customary rules and roles. The principles for making rules and distributing roles (rights and duties) in any institution from the family to the government are principles of justice or of fairness. . . .The most basic principle of justice is equality: treat every man's claim equally." (Kohlberg, 1971). The other form of justice is reciprocity; punishment for something bad and rewards for something good.

"The concepts of role-taking and justice, then, provide concrete meaning to the assumption that moral principles are neither external rules taken inward nor natural ego-tendencies of a biological organism, but rather the interactional emergents of social interaction". (Kohlberg, 1971).
The relationship of role-taking to moral judgment is documented by S.R. Ambron and D.M. Irwin (1975). In their study, they found a significant correlation ($r = .36, p < .001$) between role-taking and moral judgment.

Kohlberg makes a major point of the subject of the universality of ethical principles. In his paper titled "Stages of Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education", (1971), he provides a detailed argument to support his contention that "ethical principles are distinguished from arbitrary conventional rules and beliefs and that the stimulation of their development is a matter quite different from the inculcation of arbitrary cultural beliefs" (Page 26.)

Kohlberg illustrates his belief in the universality of moral values by presenting a list of twenty-eight basic aspects of morality that he feels can be found in any culture. Kohlberg studied foreign cultures and found what he claims to be "marked similarities" to American moral values, which he contends documents his claim that values transcend cultural limits.

Kohlberg takes issue with other moral development theories that argue for ethical relativism. "Most contemporary psychologists and sociologists who write about moral values in child development and education start with the assumption that there are no universal, nonarbitrary moral principles and that each individual acquires his own values from the external culture. The following definition of moral values clearly reflects such a relativistic view: 'moral values are evaluations of actions generally believed by the members of a given society to be either "right" or "wrong",' (Berkowitz, 1964 Page 44). While there are major theoretical differences among sociological role-theorists, psychoanalytic theorists, and learning theorists, and among different learning theorists
themselves, they all do have a common characteristic: they view moral development and other forms of socialization as 'the whole process by which an individual, born with behavioral potentialities of enormously wide range, is led to develop actual behavior which is confined within a much narrower range -- the range of what is customary and acceptable for him according to the standards of his group' (Child, 1954 Page 655). Thus, development is defined as the direct internalization of external cultural norms." Kohlberg, 1971 (Page 26-27). In opposition to this definition, Kohlberg's theory holds that moral development transcends the limits of specific cultures, that moral values are universal, and that there is a natural, sequential development in social functioning and thinking through which a child learns to understand and accept the reasons and ethical principles behind the rules.

Kohlberg states, "The doctrine of ethical relativity assumes that different cultures or groups hold different basic fundamental moral values or hierarchies of values, and that these different values or value hierarchies cannot themselves be judged as more or less adequate or more or less moral. When extended to individual differences within cultures, the doctrine holds that individuals, too, have different values because of differences in basic needs, and that these values also are determined by extramoral considerations and so cannot be judged as more or less adequate morally....

"In contrast to both schools of relativism (normative and moderate), we have first pointed out that there are universal moral concepts, values, or principles....Second, we have pointed out that the marked differences which exist between individuals and cultures are differences in stage or developmental
status." (Kohlberg, 1971 Page 35).

In 1928, Hartshorne and May conducted research aimed at isolating general moral traits like honesty that would specifically relate to behavioral tendencies. After years of study with thousands of subjects, they were unable to document any correlation between the two. Instead, they formed the following conclusions:

1) There is no correlation between character traits and actual behavior. Virtues like honesty or dishonesty are not overriding traits but specific behaviors that adjust to certain situations. (This is their concept of "specificity".)

2) Moral behavior is not consistent in one person from one situation to another. A person who doesn't cheat in one situation may cheat in another, depending on the circumstances. Consistency in behavior from one situation to another is only because the circumstances of the situations are similar.

3) There is no necessary relationship between what people say about morality and the way they act. People who express great disapproval of stealing and cheating may actually steal and cheat as much as everyone else.

4) Cheating is normally distributed around a level of moderate cheating — that is, normally everyone cheats a little.

Kohlberg and Krebs in "Moral Judgement and Ego Controls" (1973), found, however, that moral judgment was predictive of actual behavior, and that internal dispositions (such as the ability to resist distraction) affected behavior. These findings led to the redefining of Hartshorne and May's results.

Hugh Rosen, in The Development of Sociomoral Knowledge, (1980), discusses the findings of Hartshorne and May, and Kohlberg and Krebs. Rosen suggests that while Hartshorne and May were accurate "in rejecting a
simplistic notion of all-or-none honesty trait that imparts consistency across all situations, they were incorrect to give little credence to an internal disposition that influences moral behavior independently of situational forces..." (Page 102). Rosen agrees with Kohlberg and Krebs that these internal dispositions, such as the ability to resist distraction, affected behavior in a fairly consistent manner regardless of specific situational influences.

Kohlberg insists that "thought and action cannot be separated." Throughout his work, reference can be found regarding this claim. "There are moderate correlations between levels of moral judgment and behavioral measures of resistance to various types of adult and peer pressure to change or violate moral beliefs", (1963 Page 324). Kohlberg adds that the consistency between thought and action is higher in adulthood than at earlier stages. Furthermore, "To act in a morally high way requires a high stage of moral reasoning. One cannot follow moral principles (Stage 5 and 6) if one does not understand or believe in them. One can, however, reason in terms of such principles and not live up to them". (1976 Page 32).

Kohlberg further postulates that maturity of moral thought should predict maturity of moral action; that certain behaviors require specific and related moral judgments as motivation. Kohlberg also believes that cognitive dispositions enable an individual to define situations and determine a course of action. The situation itself does not define the action.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted in an attempt to validate Kohlberg's judgment-action relationship. One study by Fodor (1972) involved the administering of Kohlberg's interview to forty delinquent and forty non-delinquent adolescent boys.
The delinquents received substantially lower (.001) judgment scores than the non-delinquents, substantiating a relationship between higher stages of moral cognitions with higher behavioral levels of morality.

Much of Kohlberg's research has dealt exclusively with the solicitation and examination of moral reasoning. Some studies have begun with the solicitation of moral reasoning and have continued with a subsequent study of moral behavior. Relatively few studies, however, have been structured with behavior as a major focus, with the behavior either naturally occurring or being solicited first, and the study of cognitive motivations coming afterwards. A significant study of this later design by Milgram (1963), was a study of obedience to authority. In this structured laboratory study, subjects were instructed to administer increasingly severe punishment (electric shocks) to "victims" in the guise of performing a learning experience. Victims were actually confederates who -- at a particular level of severity of the supposed electric shocks -- first protested and refused to answer further questions, and finally discontinued any response, leaving the subject to wonder if the "victim" had been harmed. "Shocks" ranged from "1" to "30" in intensity. Twenty-six subjects obeyed their instructions fully, and administered the largest shock on the generator. Fourteen subjects refused to continue at some point. Milgram's analysis (1974), in which he reevaluates his earlier study in an attempt to relate moral reasoning to behavioral choices according to Kohlberg's theory, is that there is no clear increase in the maturity of moral behavior corresponding to developmental stages. On the contrary, Milgram assumes a social-learning theory posture in claiming that subjects obeyed their directions because of a "contractual
agreement" with authority figures. He believes that subjects fulfilled what they saw as expectations and didn't, for the most part, think independently.

Kohlberg's analysis of Milgram's study yields a different conclusion, however. According to Kohlberg (1965, 1969a), after interviewing 32 of Milgram's subjects, the mean moral reasoning score for those who refused to shock, was significantly higher than for those who continued, which would support the theory that a higher level of reasoning leads to a higher level of behavior. Kohlberg found that Stage 6 subjects were more likely to refuse to cooperate at some point because they felt they had a choice. Stage 5 subjects thought similarly, but focused on the "agreement" that they and the "learner" had made beforehand and so continued. Stage 3 and 4 subjects simply bowed to authority.

Another study which allowed for a reflective analysis of earlier behavior was that done by Haan, Smith, and Block (1968). In this case, behavior occurred spontaneously when the administration officials at the University of Berkeley restricted the political activity of students, and many students and other activists protested by acting in violation of the prohibitions. A random sample of the participants in the "rebellion" was asked to respond to Kohlberg's dilemmas in order to determine the individual's motivation for involvement. According to the analysis of the study, Stage 2 participants showed a concern for individual rights in a conflict of power. Stage 3 protestors focused on the failure of the administration in their role as good authorities. Stage 4 participants were concerned with the administration as violators of legal understandings. The proportion of Stage 6 participants was significantly the greatest of the group as a whole. Stage 6 individuals recognized the principles involved in issues
of civil liberties and rights; they were least likely to comply with requirements of authority which to them seemed unjust and unsupportable. The Stage 6 motivation was principled civil disobedience. Therefore, the "Free Speech Movement at Berkeley", as it is called, enabled researchers to study a singular form of behavior and relate it to different motivations which clearly reflected different structural processes. A later study by Haan, Smith, and Block, done in 1969 and reported in 1975, reaffirmed that the majority of activists used principled (Stage 6) reasoning as a primary process for resolving the hypothetical dilemmas, while only a smaller proportion of non-activists did (which may explain why they were not activists). Finally, Hugh Rosen claims that the sit-in was the result of months of debate among the students and disagreement with the administration, reducing if not eliminating the likelihood that the protest was impulsive or that participation was due to a "bandwagon" effect. Rather it appeared to have been deliberate and thoughtful, (Rosen, 1980).

A study by McNamee in 1977, undertaken in the context of a controlled laboratory situation, produced conclusions similar to those by Kohlberg and Hann, Smith, and Block. McNamee determined that an individual's definition of a situation, based on the stage of moral reasoning used, significantly influenced behavioral choices. His research interrelated actual behavior, moral stage assessment, and motivations for behavior. In an experimental situation, subjects could perform either a "helping" response by intervening and helping a confederate drug user, or an "obedient" response by failing to intervene and instead comply with the researcher's expectations to participate in the experiment. A clear, linear relationship between the
stage of moral reasoning and the behavioral choice resulted; subjects at higher stages were more likely to intervene and help, than those at lower stages, and at stage 6, every subject chose to intervene. There was also a clear relationship between the justifications that individuals expressed for their behavioral choice and their overall stage assessment. Interviews following the experiment, asking the subjects about their decisions, also showed that the "level of motivation" was similar to the level assessed by the moral judgment interview. McNamee therefore concludes that behavioral choices and the qualitative meanings for situations change with stage.

If Kohlberg had accomplished little else, he would still deserve credit for stirring up an incredible amount of controversy regarding moral development theories. Numerous studies have been undertaken, in an attempt to either substantiate or cast doubt on Kohlberg's theories. Some of his "supporters" fill the pages to follow in this report; some studies, either supportive or critical of Kohlberg, are best discussed here.

Israela Ettenberg Aron, in "Moral Education: The Formalist Tradition and the Deweyan Alternative" (1980), criticizes Kohlberg for his formalist philosophy. She contends that formalist philosophers expend most of their energies with the existential consideration of ethical discussion itself ("metaethics"), rather than dealing with the consideration of actual moral issues ("normative ethics"). Many formalists are of the belief that morality can be defined in terms of form alone, without considering the content of the judgment. Kohlberg attempts to combine metaethics with normative ethics by using hypothetical dilemmas to stimulate and provide the substance of moral discussions by which he
then measures the form of the moral judgment. One problem, however, as Aron states is that "...they [the dilemmas] are so abstracted and oversimplified that they bear only a faint resemblance to actual human experience." (Munsey, page 406) She feels that if the content of formalist moral discussion is thereby invalidated, all that remains is the form of the judgment; if only the form remains, she questions whether anything substantial is left except for the determination of cognitive development. Aron's proposal is that moral philosophers turn to Thomas Dewey for a more complete ethical theory. It is her belief that the substance of the actual moral dilemma, along with all of the circumstantial variables, need to be considered in the Deweyan manner.

Alston (1971) comments on Kohlberg's 1971 paper, "From Is to Ought". Alston believes that habit and affect are important considerations in the assessment of moral judgment. He contends that Kohlberg overlooks the significance of habitual styles of moral reasoning, and that Kohlberg is -- in actuality -- measuring these habitual patterns when he uses his methods of classifying stages of moral development. Alston differentiates, however, between having a concept and habitually using a concept. As a result, "the hypothesis that are confirmed by empirical studies using these stage assignments, hypothesis concerning the causes and consequences of stage membership and stage transition, cannot themselves be construed as hypothesis about the causes and consequences of stages of conceptual development." Alston suggests that a better test of Kohlberg's theory would be "...the development of a test for possession of moral concepts, analagous to the test of typical mode of moral reasoning..." to determine if, indeed, there is a relationship between
having a concept and using it. Alston also proposes that the conflict between physical desires and conscience poses a moral crisis, which is in contrast to Kohlberg's thinking wherein physical desires are not acknowledged as a particular influence on moral judgments. Alston also accepts Kohlberg's stage theory, but debates the method that Kohlberg uses in assessing actual stages. In addition to the influence of "habit", Alston argues against Kohlberg's premise that the concept of "justice" is the supreme moral principle. Alston feels that many other principles or motivations can be just as significant. He believes, overall, that Kohlberg has enriched moral psychology with his theories, but that he "...has not been able to resist the temptation to overstate his case." In particular, Alston questions Kohlberg's assignment of insignificance to moral behavior, cultural norms, and habit.

Peters (1971) shares Alston's complaints, in particular taking exception to Kohlberg's lack of emphasis on "habit". Peters states, "This lack of importance assigned to habit goes against a whole tradition of thought about moral development stemming from Aristotle." Peters indicates that learning habits in a meaningful way can provide a base for later, more sophisticated judgments based on these earlier ingrained manners of thought and behavior. He feels that while a child may not grasp a concept such as "justice", he can understand at his own level the concept of "being fair and following rules. This will lend to later developmental understandings of more intricate values. Habituation may thus help to lay down a pattern of response that may be used in the service of more appropriate motives at a later stage." Peters adds that certain "traits", such as integrity, courage, consistency, etc., influence moral judgments by
beginning as externally motivated habits and later becoming internally integrated reasonings.

Simpson (1974) pursues Alston's references to Kohlberg's lack of objectivity by stating that Kohlberg doesn't distinguish between what is really scientific evidence and his own opinions. In his emphasis on universality, Simpson feels that Kohlberg fails to take into account the impact of sociocultural forces. In questioning Kohlberg's "universal" application of his moral theory, Simpson also refers critically to the research of Turiel (1966) and Rest (1969) which supports Kohlberg's claims. Simpson feels that Kohlberg's theories are based on Western philosophies, which does not represent moral values of other cultures, particularly Eastern cultures. She states that moral principles may be learned values of particular cultures and therefore we cannot set up a hierarchy of "universal values" intended to apply to all cultures. She further explains that even what Kohlberg holds as supreme values, such as the right to life, cannot be unquestionably accepted as an overall value since "...in every group it is not that life is valued overall or not valued, but that it is valued situationally in highly culturally-specific ways". (Page 93) She also adds that Kohlberg fails to describe how his dilemmas might be adapted to various other cultures. Finally, Simpson further supports her claim for the significance of environmental influences by stating that "Kohlberg's stage 6's are not functioning independently of their socialization; they have been very thoroughly socialized into the company of intellectual elites who value and practice analytic, abstract, and logical reasoning."
(Page 95) 

Support for Kohlberg's theory of the "universality" of moral development can be found in the work of White
White initially questioned Kohlberg's predominant use of American males as subjects for his lab tests, however, White's own studies of Bahamian school children provided consistent findings with Kohlberg's. White still contends that more evidence is necessary to document Kohlberg's sweeping contentions.

Grimely (1974), did a cross cultural study of moral development involving subjects from Zambia, U.S., Hong Kong, Japan, and England. His study confirmed that sequential stages of moral development are to be found in different cultures.

Gibbs (1977) reviews and revises Kohlberg's Stage theory. He supports the contention that Kohlberg's first four stages are, as Piaget also proposed, "naturalistic" stages in that they are universal and that behavior associated with these stages comes from unconscious processes that are sequential in nature. He further believes, however, that the last two stages are existential rather than naturalistic. He believes that the principled levels of morality require a conscious and deliberate decision on the individual's part. Principled morality requires a self consciousness, and a willingness to separate oneself -- in a philosophical sense -- from one's "world" in order to take a more objective stand. In regards to the issues of universality and self interest, then, Gibbs may be interpreted as saying that at the higher levels of moral development an individual's sense of morality arises to some degree from his own experiences, and from his ability to put aside moral positions that might be more personally rewarding in order to achieve a position that is most responsive to higher principles. This view, then, discards the notion of universality at higher stages, while certainly acknowledging the influence of self interest on moral judgments.
According to the preceding analysis of Lawrence Kohlberg's theories of moral development, the following hypothesis are substantiated: (Numbers correspond to those in Chapter One)

1) Moral development is best interpreted in terms of a cognitive-developmental process that occurs in an invariant, timely, upwardly sequential direction. While the ability for "role-taking" is significant (being able to see life from the perspective of others), the influence of "others" as occurs in "role-modeling" is not important.

3) Kohlberg substantiates a claim for the importance of the relationship of moral thought to moral behavior only in terms of behavior supposedly following corresponding judgments. The actual study of moral behavior, and the specific correlates of moral behavior to moral judgment is not regarded as significant, nor does Kohlberg detail a specific method of "measuring" or analyzing behavior.

4) Kohlberg does not acknowledge an influence of "self interest" on the development of moral judgments, except as lower stage moral judgments may be made with the intent of winning approval which would serve one's own interests. At higher stages, the orientation is towards serving the interests of one's social order, and ultimately towards recognizing the rights of the individual, but in the sense of supreme laws of morality rather than acknowledging one's own needs.

5) Kohlberg makes a strong case for the universality of moral development structures. He considers the environment to influence morality only insofar as it may stimulate or retard growth, not as it may cause or stop development. Kohlberg specifically states that morality transcends specific cultural limits; ethics are not relative, they are universal.
A major criticism of Kohlberg's empirical validity is offered by Kurtines and Grief (1974) in their review of Kohlberg's literature. Their critique delineates several conceptual and methodological problems with Kohlberg's theory, much of their debate centering on the Moral Judgment Scale. Kurtines and Grief cite the lack of consistency in application and reporting of results of the measurement tool, as well as the variance in interviewers' questions and attitudes. They further consider the lack of evidence for reliability and validity of the Scale, and propose that there is no evidence that moral judgments are maintained with any particular degree of stability over even brief time periods. Finally, they assert that there is relatively little predictive validity of the Kohlberg test; that judgment doesn't necessarily correlate to action despite Kohlberg's claims that there is a probable relationship. Kurtines and Grief allow the possibility that refinement of Kohlberg's measurement tool might provide more definitive results and correlations, but assert that at present the meaningfulness of the Scale and the corresponding theory is debatable.

JAMES REST

The moral development theories of James Rest "evolve" from those of Lawrence Kohlberg. Working through the University of Minnesota, Rest published Development in Judging Moral Issues in 1979. The central thesis of this book is, as Rest states that, ...the differences among people in the ways they construe and evaluate moral problems are determined largely by their concepts of fairness, that it is possible to identify and describe these basic concepts,
and that more adequate and complex concepts of fairness develop from less adequate simple ones." Rest develops this thesis by 1) explaining and substantiating a claim for structural organization; 2) defending a developmental sequence; 3) defending moral judgment as being cognitive; 4) dismissing the importance of behavior to the overall assessment of moral development; and 5) developing a "new" test (actually a modification of Kohlberg's dilemmas with a modified means of evaluating results).

Rest's theories are said to "evolve" from Kohlberg's because they share some basic foundational similarities but modify and expand upon others. Whereas Kohlberg relies upon a simple stage theory, assuming that a subject is either at a particular stage or is not, Rest uses a complex stage theory. Rest contends that the types of cognitions an individual formulates and the frequency with which he uses similar cognitions operate together, and fluctuation between adjacent stages is expectable. Rest further claims that developmental assessment is "probabilistic"; that with fluctuation, one can only assume that in most instances one would exhibit particular development. Kohlberg, on the other hand, contends that development is absolute and invariant in sequence. Also, Rest challenges the concept of the "step by step" development that Kohlberg proposes. Rest believes that one can move upward, encompassing significant aspects of more than one stage higher than the predominant stage the individual is at. Kohlberg claims that an individual cannot comprehend aspects of a stage more than one step above his own.

Like Piaget and Kohlberg, Rest recognizes that individuals use different patterns of thought depending on their age and maturity. He also describes these patterns of thinking as being coherent arrangements of
thought with predominant attributes at particular times. Which increase in sophistication with the passage of time. However, Rest argues that there is not only one organization of thinking available at one time, or even two if the individual is in transition between stages. Rather, Rest proposes that combinations of significant thought attributes are available to individuals at various points in time. Therefore, his theory relies on "stages" which "...still represent qualitatively different logical systems of thinking, but a subject is not assigned one-for-one to a stage. This view acknowledges that people use various organizations of thinking, are somewhat inconsistent, and that the kind of logical organization they bring to a problem is considerably influenced by the particular content and properties of the problem." (Page 252)

Rest defines "morality" in terms of social interactions; morality does not concern individual values that do not affect other people. Moral judgments are concerned with how the rewards and responsibilities of social cooperation are to be distributed, and circumstances and situations as well as individual inclinations affect those judgments. Rest operates under the assumption that individuals pursue their own interests. He believes that if theories of morality can deal with the most self serving of people in understanding how they establish rules of cooperation, then it would follow that even altruistic individuals would be likely to fit into this system of cooperation.

There are six "stages" in Rest's moral development structure, each with sub-stages for further definition and ease of "scoring". These stages can be outlined as follows:

1) Obedience: "You do what you are told."

2) Instrumental Egoism and Simple Exchange: "Let's
make a deal" (Each person has his own "values", and the exchange is a trade-off.)

3) Interpersonal Concordance: "Be considerate, nice and kind and you will get along with people." (This is reciprocal "role taking"; empathy with awareness that others are also empathetic.)

4) Law and Duty to Social Order: "Everyone in society is obligated and protected by the law". (This is based on mutual understanding of one's own social group.)

5) Societal Consensus: "You are obligated by whatever arrangements are agreed to by a due process procedure." (You can choose from alternative systems of law or social arrangements than those dictated by ones own social group. The development of new systems can lessen the seemingly arbitrary inequities of old systems. Basic human rights are important, and so safeguards must be incorporated into systems that protect everyone.)

6) Nonarbitrary Social Cooperation: "How rational and impartial people would organize cooperation provides the definition for 'moral'." (There is a balance of interests; one supports a system because it seems most fair to all.

Rest "borrows" heavily from Kohlberg, but his structure differs "architecturally" by having more sub-topics, and attempting to differentiate between what may be seen in Kohlberg's analysis as subtle conceptual variations which ultimately result in similar cognitive choices.

Rest's criticism of Kohlberg's use of moral dilemmas to determine placement on a moral development structure revolves around the inconsistencies in scoring. Rest finds Kohlberg's method of assessment to be indefinite, and often subject to the interpretive inclinations of
the scorer. As a result, Rest developed another method of identifying a person's developmental progress, which is based on a modification of Kohlberg's dilemmas. At the University of Minnesota, Rest formulated a "test" which is derived from Kohlberg's basic theories, but which uses a multiple choice format and therefore can be objectively scored, (Rest, 1976; 1979). This test is called the Defining Issues Test (hereafter referred to as "DIT"). (Appendix 3) The DIT is based on Kohlberg's structural theory that people at different developmental levels interpret moral dilemmas differently and will choose different statements, in different orders of priority, to reflect their thinking. Scores represented on Kohlberg's scale as "P scores", representing "principled morality" equivalent to his level 3, are revised for the DIT to produce a "D score", representing a weighted multidimensional scale. Rest developed a multiple choice questionnaire as a more feasible and manageable alternative to Kohlberg's interviews. He believes that his new scoring system eliminates the problems inherent to the processing of interview data. The structure of Rest's test is said to specify limits of structural categories, devise a taxonomy that scorers can use with consistency, and relate the differentiations used for scoring to theoretically meaningful categories.

Recognizing that the multiple choice method might be easier for a subject to fake or distort, Rest incorporated features into his test to detect false responses. Davison and Robbins (1978) summarized several reliability studies of the DIT and determined that there are internal consistencies in the major indices of the test, and short term test-retest correlations in the high .70's and .80's. McGeorge (1975) examined the susceptibility to faking of the DIT
and concluded that subjects were unable to fake high scores.

Although Kohlberg's interview can be used with children as young as seven or eight years old, the DIT cannot be used with subjects younger than 13 or 14. "Studies comparing the two tests show correlations in the .60's and .70's when heterogeneous populations are used (varying in age) but much smaller correlations when the populations are homogeneous, indicating that the two tests are not equivalent. Furthermore, the DIT systematically scores a subject as developmentally more advanced than does Kohlberg's test -- that is, subjects produce scores at lower stages in Kohlberg's test than they endorse as important issues in the DIT." (Rest, 1979) In his book, Rest continues that "...Although the DIT is not equivalent to Kohlberg's test, it is more highly correlated than some versions of Kohlberg's test are with each other. Therefore, some of the variation in correlations with Kohlbergian measures may be due to variations in the Kohlbergian measures themselves, in addition to sample differences." (Page 154) (Table 1) Rest also adds that the DIT credits subjects with more advanced development because it is a "recognition" task as opposed to Kohlberg's test which is a "production" task, and therefore more difficult by design.

In substantiating his claim that moral judgment reflects predominantly cognitive processes rather than simple affective processes, Rest refers to research relating I.Q. scores to moral judgment assessments. Kohlberg (1964) argues that significant correlations with I.Q. indicates that moral judgment development was primarily cognitive rather that the simple acquisition of habits or role modeling. Furthermore, "Significant correlations (up to the .60s) suggest that subjects who can comprehend high stage concepts do tend to make
judgments using those concepts, whereas subjects who do not make high stage judgments cannot understand the concepts." (Page 248) Rest continues that "...some suggestive support for the notion that moral judgment is governed by deep-seated cognitive processes comes from educational intervention studies, which indicate that moral judgment is very slow to change and difficult to manipulate...If moral judgment reflected more simply a person's preference for certain concepts (rather than capacity for concepts), it is difficult to explain why the interventions don't produce more dramatic shifts."

Rest adds that, "...something distinct about moral thinking separates it from other aspects of general cognitive development. It is argued that more advanced moral concepts evolve from less advanced moral concepts, rather than that higher moral concepts are derived from the application to moral content of more generalized forms of intellectual development...Cognitive developmentalists want to claim that moral judgment is related to real life decision making, and is not value-neutral, purely cerebral sophistry or intellectualism." (Page 249). Table 2 documents a moderate correlation between I.Q. and achievement and moral judgment. However, verbal subtests are not more highly correlated with the; DIT than non verbal subtests, suggesting that this correlation is not based exclusively on verbal skills, but more on general intelligence.

Mischel and Mischel (1976) argue that what people say, (including their moral judgment pronouncements) has only a tenuous relationship with what they will actually do. They contend that development in moral judgment is simply a reflection of general cognitive and linguistic development. They say, "It would not be parsimonious to believe that the latter [moral judgments] reflect more
than the growth of cognitive competencies interacting with socialization practices." (1976 Page 97) Rest debates Michel's arguments by stating that: 1) measures of moral thinking are more highly correlated among themselves than with measures of general intelligence (Rest 1979), and 2) moral judgment has a significant and unique predictive power to behavior even when I.Q. and other variables are controlled or statistically partialled out (G. Rest 1978; McColgan 1975).

Rest also refers to the research done by Alston (1971), as did Kohlberg. Alston's argument is that "habit" and "affect" influence moral judgments. In his study, he asks for some sort of documentation that moral judgments reflect capacities for certain types of decision making, rather than the mere habitual possession of a concept or behavioral tendency. Rest believes that "The problem that Alston raises applies equally to the DIT. It is a logical possibility that age trends on the DIT as well as on Kohlberg's test reflect age trends in preference for certain forms of moral judgment (an 'affective' matter), rather than age trends in capacity to think in new ways." (Page 150) Rest debates Alston's concerns by referring to studies which, using measures of moral comprehension, produce significant correlations with moral judgment scores. (Table 3) Rest further claims that these high correlations are particularly significant considering what he contends to be the poor reliability of comprehension tests. He believes that more reliable tests of moral comprehension would produce even higher correlations with the DIT. With the tests being what they are, subjects who have lower moral judgment scores nevertheless tend to produce lower comprehension scores, while subjects with high comprehension scores tend to have high DIT scores. Rest concludes that moral judgment
development is part of general cognitive development, though it is a distinguishable part.

Rest discusses the relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior and determines that, "...moral judgment is an important factor in real life decision-making, but that the interaction with other factors complicates the relationship so that simple, linear correlations cannot be expected...Moral judgment scores tell us something about the general interpretive frameworks that a person brings to a moral problem, and presumably the way a person interprets a problem has a bearing on his decision making." (Page 260) Rest dismisses the importance of the actual behavior, however, and substantiates instead his claim that the way in which an individual sets up a moral problem and deals with the consideration of all of the participants in that dilemma is what is significant. Like Kohlberg, Rest proposes that moral judgment is concerned with the kinds of considerations that are taken into account by an individual in establishing priorities for behavior, not necessarily with the behavior itself. Moral judgment is not seen as the mere possession of "high principles" either, but the organization of those principles in the overall structure of one's thinking.

Rest comments on studies relating moral judgment to behavior: cheating, helping, delinquency, protests, etc., (Reviews by Kohlberg, 1969, and Rest, 1979). These studies show positive, though modest relationships, leading Rest to conclude that there are other variables which influence this relationship. In Chapter six of his book, he suggests such variables, as well as studies to document them:

1) Ego strength or self-regulation (Krebs, 1967, Mischel 1974);

2) Situation and performance (Huston & Korte 1976,
Latane & Dailey 1970);
3) Other values besides moral values (Damon 1977);
4) Distinction between operative and reflective planes of thought (Piaget 1932, Aronfreed 1976);
5) Deliberate misrepresentation.

In documenting his claims for a developmental sequence for moral development, Rest relies on the main hypothesis of the structuralist theory that people change over time, and that their thinking develops to a more sophisticated level as they get older. He documents this claim with the research results based on the DIT, (Rest, Davison, and Robbins 1978). In these studies, over 5,000 subjects from all over the United States, at different ages and educational levels, were given the DIT. Moral judgment scores were higher as age and educational levels increased. This provides evidence as a "cross-sectional" study, in that it compares subjects at different ages and in different groups. Longitudinal studies, testing the same subjects over a period of time, also show differences in sophistication according to age. In 1963, Bandura argued that there was no evidence to support a developmental process, later claiming that although this may be an outdated proposition, there is nevertheless not strong enough evidence to support Kohlberg's claims that all subjects move through the developmental sequence.

Rest summarized his findings of 100 studies based on the DIT with the contentions that 1) moral judgment is developmental, variations caused by age and the complexities of the social environment; 2) moral judgment is based on cognitive processes; 3) moral judgment is based on "moral" values, not cognitive abilities; and 4) environment provides the context in which individuals function morally, but does not cause
the moral process itself either as a reaction to the environmental atmosphere or by conditioning an individual to particular responses.

Kohlberg based his paper, "Stage and Sequence: the Cognitive Developmental Approach to Moralization", (1969), on the research done by Rest. Kohlberg believes that Rest has successfully completed "second phase research", building on the "first phase" completed by Kohlberg, himself. Kohlberg credits Rest with having greatly contributed to the establishment of a "paradigm" of research in moral development. A paradigm, as defined Kuhn (1962), being "relative agreement in a field on A) problems requiring explanation, B) theoretical assumptions for such explanations, C) methods of measurement, and D) types of study design so that different researchers can do studies leading to similar conclusions or at least conclusions meaningful to all concerned."

Rest's research supports the following hypotheses: (Numbers correspond to those in Chapter 1)

1) Moral development is cognitive, following a specific, sequential structure. Movement through this structure may, at times, be variant.

2) The relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior is tenuous, as circumstances can cause discrepancies between judgment and subsequent behavior.

4) Individuals do pursue their own self interests, affecting, at least somewhat, their moral judgments.

Elliott Turiel

Elliott Turiel, as a structuralist, also sees moral development as being a construction of concepts of right or wrong or of justice which follow a sequential structure, but proposes several concepts that
distinguish his theories from that of Kohlberg and Rest. In 1966, Turiel's research provided "...experimental documentation that the amount of assimilation of material at other stages was predicted by the stage-order hypothesis; that is, groups of adolescents exposed to the next stage up would assimilate judgments to which they were exposed more than would groups exposed to stages two above or one below their own." However, Turiel claims that structuralism doesn't necessarily imply one unitary structure which would govern all thinking, and further argues that it is necessary to differentiate "social conventions" from "moral issues".

In his paper, "The Development of Social-Conventional and Moral Concepts", (1980), Turiel explains that "social judgments" concern the "conventions" of one's society, and that these social judgments often determine behavior in a manner that does not involve "valuing", or moral judgments at all. Turiel is particularly concerned with proving a relationship between structure and content, and judgment and behavior, and he attempts to validate the assertion that "Reasoning is related to action", (1973 Page 750), by demonstrating the distinction between social conventions and moral judgments.

Turiel believes that there are basic patterns or expectations of behavior that determine how individuals function within social systems. These are arbitrary rules, such as styles of dress, or manners of speech. These sorts of social judgments are concerned with externally determined rules, and do not involve "valuing". Moral Judgments, on the other hand, transcend the arbitrary rules of social orders. Moral judgments are seen to be fundamental judgments based on
the concept of right and wrong and justice; these are not arbitrary, but are internally determined concepts. Whereas social conventions explain an individual's understanding of his social world, moral orders explain an individual's own understanding and reaction to more fundamental values. The acceptance of a social convention need not show any value judgment about the convention's "worth", but the acceptance of a moral judgment does imply a value judgment.

Turiel's concept of social convention arises from an individual's interaction with and processing of his environment. Like Kohlberg, Turiel states that the environment itself does not cause a social or moral judgment, but rather stimulates the individual to react and formulate a judgment. Turiel defined seven levels of "social convention", which follow the same cognitive developmental philosophy as structural developmentalists; namely that an individual passes through organized structures of thought and action, but he adds the dimension of interaction with the social and physical environment to previously defined structures based exclusively on cognitive elements. His description of the levels of social convention are outlined in Table 5.

William Damon

William Damon is a "structural developmentalist" who investigates the developing concept of justice on both a cognitive and behavioral level. In his paper entitled, "Structural-Developmental Theory and Moral Development", (1980), Damon relates a child's moral judgment to individual understandings of justice in direct relation to how that individual understands authority. In basic terms, Damon describes a child as having a "primitive"
reaction to authority up until the age of four, at which time the child begins to recognize "legitimate" forms of authority and responds behaviorally according to the sophistication of that recognition.

Damon feels that it is important to distinguish between the various issues that Kohlberg lumps together under the title of "morality". While Kohlberg considers issues of rules, responsibilities, life, authority, and various other concepts to be inherent to moral judgments, Damon follows a line of thought more akin to Turiel in arguing that issues concerned with the concept of justice should be differentiated from issues relating to social conventions (behavioral expectations of one's society). Damon is also concerned with the issue of moral consistency; developing his argument that behavior maintains a basic coherency as life situations vary. Unlike Kohlberg, however, Damon maintains that life forces do, indeed, influence the degree of that consistency.

Damon explains his concept of moral development and consistency according to three main principles. The "structural" principle holds that a person organizes moral beliefs according to main principles of justice and authority which vary in sophistication according to the age and maturity of the individual. This is the basic, underlying concept of structuralist theories. The "developmental" principle holds that social development is multi-faceted, and that moral development is only one dimension of this overall development. Also, there is no one structure by which all individuals develop, nor is there a necessarily consistent manner in which an individual passes through a structure. Damon contends that the concept of "development" itself implies dynamic transition, and that inconsistency is inherent to any phase of such change. Damon's research (1977)
documented this inconsistency, as well as validating the concept of a basic developmental structure. In comparing children's responses to hypothetical moral dilemmas with their actual behavior in real life situations, he determined that while moral reasoning appears to follow a stage and age related structure, individual behavior in actual contexts did not follow such reasoning in an invariant manner. Neither, for that matter, did hypothetical reasoning necessarily correlate with actual motivations for real behavior. Damon concludes, however, that inconsistencies appear to stabilize as moral knowledge and behavior begin to stabilize with increased age and reduced developmental flux. The "functional" principle deals with the variance in social issues and situations and the influence of that variance on moral judgments and behavior. Being that no two life situations are ever identical, different moral principles must be applied to different circumstances, and these principles will not always be a part of any one coherent system. Damon does add, however, that it is reasonable to expect a certain degree of consistency in that some people will usually act in a "moral" manner, while others will not. He refers to the writings of Hoffman (1970), when Hoffman claims that "both specificity and generality can be found in moral behavior as in any other trait. Individuals do vary between their general predispositions towards honesty and dishonesty but their actual behavior in moral conflict situations is not an all-or-none matter."

In regards to this notion of "specificity", Damon discusses the research and findings of Hartshorne and May (1928), and their conclusions that consistencies within an individual's moral behavior were exclusively due to similarities in the circumstances of the
situations. Damon suggests that Hartshorne and May might have missed the elements of consistency that do exist in the moral behavior of individuals. While Damon expresses agreement to some degree with the notion of situational influences, he nevertheless argues that there are some basic similarities in the patterns of an individual's moral judgment and behavior that are exclusive of external influences. Furthermore, he suggests that Hartshorne and May's tests dealt with their subject's knowledge and responses to hypothetical issues, and Damon has stated that hypothetical responses are not necessarily correlated with real life responses which makes for inconsistencies in and of itself. In defending his own findings of sometimes consistent and sometimes inconsistent relationships between hypothetical and real life decision making (Damon, 1977), Damon discusses the influence of the issue of self interest. He explains that in some contexts self interest is of minimal concern, and therefore has minimal impact. In the earlier section of his study, dealing with authority, concerns of self interest played a very little part in the overall decision making, and therefore greater consistency was found between hypothetical behavior and real life behavior. In the later section, however, the issue of justice was involved, wherein pursuing one's self interest was an integral part of the overall decision. In this instance, greater discrepancy was noted between hypothetical behavior and real life behavior. This further illustrates the difference in behavior as it relates to different social issues.

Overall, Damon supports a structural developmental theory of moral development and links moral development to cognitive development. He insists, however, that there is not one unitary structure governing the
judgments and behavior of all individuals within a society or universally. There is, instead, a flexible framework that sets up basic ideas and stages of development. Damon also recognizes a strong affiliation between judgment and behavior, but contends that situational forces affect both, sometimes causing apparent inconsistencies. It is Damon's contention that there are consistencies to be found within these inconsistencies, which enable researchers to make basic assumptions about moral development. Damon further asserts that personal predispositions, such as concerns of self interest, as well as situational variances stimulated by the environment, also affect moral judgments and moral behavior. He thereby acknowledges the effect of external influences on an individual's moral development to a far greater degree than either Kohlberg or Rest.

Golda Rothman

Golda Rothman, also a structuralist, discusses "The Relationship Between Moral Judgment and Moral Behavior" (1980). She explains structural-developmental theory as focusing on the relationship of the maturity of moral thought to the maturity of moral action, rather than as concerning what a person says he will do and what he actually will do. In taking this stance, Rothman refers to a statement by Kohlberg which substantiates this point of view; "Individuals behavior must be compared to his or her judgments of right and wrong about the situation. Whether or not a person chooses to steal in a real-life situation will then depend upon the way the situation and one's rights and duties in that situation are defined. Moral reasoning influences moral behavior by providing the individual with concrete definitions of
those rights and duties in the behavioral situation." (Kohlberg 1969a)

Rothman emphasizes the process by which people decide what to do, and the relationship of that process to the resulting behavior. She contends that if individuals at different stages of moral reasoning define right and wrong in a situation differently, and if that definition influences behavior, there should be a correspondence between the stage of reasoning and the behavioral choice. She believes that some discrepancies in the relationship between reasoning and behavior, as shown in some research results, arise from the hypothetical moral dilemmas being too remote from the real life moral conflicts. Her concern is with discerning a relationship between the development of moral reasoning and the development of actual moral behavior.

The general conclusion that Rothman draws from research studies is that there is a relationship between stage of reasoning in response to hypothetical dilemmas and behavioral choices. She believes that behavioral choices can often determine how the individual defines the situation, rather than reasoning necessarily defining behavioral choices. Rothman's claim is that factors such as ego strength, capacity for sympathy and role-taking, and affect can predispose an individual to particular modes of behavior, and that their justifications for that behavior will then be based on these "unconscious" factors. This philosophy is similar to that of William Damon, who believes that similar self-motivated interests influence judgments and behavior.

Damon, it may be recalled, also questioned the relevance of some hypothetical dilemmas to real life contexts. While acknowledging the possible
inconsistencies between hypothetical and real situations, Rothman feels that these discrepancies are to be expected. She explains that in instances where the moral decision actually affects an individual, certain issues take on greater or different meaning than they might in a strictly hypothetical situation. She also argues that the particular issues inherent to the hypothetical dilemma can affect the decision making process and the relationship of that decision to behavior. She refers to the study by McGeorge (1974) as documentation. Rothman concludes, however, that "Parallel thought processes are involved in hypothetical and concrete contexts, and that 'both reasoning in response to hypothetical dilemmas and behavior in concrete situations seem to reflect structural processes'. (Rothman 1976 Page 405).

As do most other structuralists, Rothman contends that the relationship between moral judgment and moral behavior becomes more consistent at higher levels; that persons reasoning at stage six are more likely to act at stage six than persons at stage four, for example, who might act at stage three or five. This same contention was made by Kohlberg (1969b) and Turiel (1973). However, whereas Kohlberg proposes that increasing levels of maturity in moral judgment encourage increased corresponding levels of behavior, Rothman suggests that it is also possible that behavior may develop to a higher level before reasoning, and thereby encourage an increased corresponding level of thought. Rothman's main point, in any case, is that the relationship between moral judgment and moral behavior exists, and is significant. She believes that moral development follows a structure, and that it is affected by external factors as well as internal predispositions.
TABLE 1

Correlations of DIT with Kohlbergian Tests of Moral Judgment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan (1979)</td>
<td>45 physicians</td>
<td>Kohlberg's 1976 Scoring System</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloeie (1976)</td>
<td>91 students, combined college and high school</td>
<td>Kohlberg's 1972 Issue Scoring</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(57 college students (52 junior highs—see</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Froming and McCollan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs and Federink</td>
<td>41 college students</td>
<td>Gibbs' scale of principled moral thinking</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest et al. (1974)</td>
<td>47 students and adults</td>
<td>Kohlberg's 1958 Scoring System</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froming and McCollan</td>
<td>215 students, combined college and high school</td>
<td>Kohlberg's 1972 Issue Scoring</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1977)</td>
<td>(159 college students (74 junior high students of very low academic ability</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll and Rest (1977)</td>
<td>88 subjects, 18 to 22 yrs.</td>
<td>Short, written modification of Kohlberg's 1972 system</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 subjects, 20 to 24 yrs.</td>
<td>Short, written modification of Kohlberg's 1972 system</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bode and Page (1978)</td>
<td>52 college students</td>
<td>Written version, Kohlberg Test (no year given)</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

Relations of DIT with IQ, Aptitude, and Achievement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen and Kickbus (1976)</td>
<td>450 9th graders</td>
<td>Iowa Test of Basic Skills (used percentiles rather than raw scores)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coder (1975)</td>
<td>58 adults</td>
<td>Quick Word Test (Nunnally, 1972)</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper (1972)</td>
<td>40 junior highs</td>
<td>Iowa Test of Basic Skills-verbal</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-nonverbal</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Differential Abilities Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-verbal subtotal</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-nonverbal subtotal</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-abstract reasoning</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-spatial reasoning</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-mechanical reasoning</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-clerical skills and spelling</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-composite verbal and nonverbal</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposto (1977)</td>
<td>87 Science-major undergraduates</td>
<td>College Board Exams</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 Humanities-major undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froming and Cooper (1976)</td>
<td>35 college students</td>
<td>S.A.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. of Texas</td>
<td>-total</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-verbal</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-quantitative</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia (1976)</td>
<td>10 college science majors</td>
<td>S.A.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-verbal</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-quantitative</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 college humanities majors</td>
<td>S.A.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-verbal</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-quantitative</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masanz (1975)</td>
<td>54 high school girls</td>
<td>Large Thorndike IQ</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American College Testing Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-English</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mathematics</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Social Studies</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Natural Sciences</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Composite</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masanz (1975) (continued)</td>
<td>Iowa Test of Basic Skills</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reading comprehension</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Language word usage</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Language total</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Work study</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mathematics I</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mathematics II</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class rank</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grades (from last semester junior year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Natural sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- English</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McColgan (1975)</td>
<td>29 delinquents</td>
<td>IQ (Shipley-Hartford)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reading</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Spelling</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McColgan (1975)</td>
<td>52 junior highs</td>
<td>IQ (Shipley-Hartford)</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, Toews, and Rest (1975)</td>
<td>67 9th graders</td>
<td>Differential Abilities Test</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Composite verbal and nonverbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders (1976)</td>
<td>49 junior highs</td>
<td>SCAT; verbal reasoning</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprecher (1976)</td>
<td>35 7th graders</td>
<td>CTP (Educational Records Bureau)</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- verbal aptitude</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- total aptitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker (1974)</td>
<td>98 8th graders</td>
<td>IQ (Lorge Thorndike)</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3

Correlations of DIT with Moral Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alozie (1976)</td>
<td>91 junior highs and college students</td>
<td>.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37 college students only)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest et al. (1974)</td>
<td>67 students, ages 14 to adulthood</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160 students, junior high to graduate school</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9th graders only, n = 73)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest, Davison, Robbins (1977)</td>
<td>54 subjects, age 19-22</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coder (1975)</td>
<td>87 adults (age 24 to 49)</td>
<td>.49†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest (1975)</td>
<td>88 subjects, age 17-20</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masanz (1975)</td>
<td>54 high school girls</td>
<td>.57†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulgan (1975)</td>
<td>52 junior high delinquents and controls</td>
<td>.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 delinquents</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowder (1976)</td>
<td>55 volunteers from Naval base</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Used shorter six item form of Comprehension Test.
†Used shorter form of DIT with four stories.

TABLE 4. Turiel's Levels of Social Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Convention as descriptive of social uniformity. Convention is viewed as being descriptive of uniformities in behavior. Convention is not conceived as part of the structure or function of social interaction. Conventional uniformities are descriptive of what is assumed to exist. Convention is maintained to avoid violation of empirical uniformities.</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negation of convention as descriptive of social uniformity. Empirical uniformity is not seen as a sufficient basis for maintaining conventions. Conventional acts are regarded as arbitrary. Convention is not conceived as part of the structure or function of social interaction.</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Convention as affirmation of the rule system; early concrete conception of the social system. Convention is seen as arbitrary and changeable. Adherence to convention is based on concrete rules and authoritative expectations. One's conception of conventional acts is not coordinated with the conception of rules.</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Negation of convention as part of the rule system. Convention is now seen as arbitrary and changeable regardless of the rules. Evaluation of rules pertaining to conventional acts is coordinated with evaluation of the act. Conventions are &quot;nothing but&quot; social expectations.</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Convention as mediated by the social system. Systematic concepts of social structure emerge. Convention is regarded as normative regulation in a social system built on uniformity, fixed roles, and static hierarchical organization.</td>
<td>14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Negation of convention as societal standards. Convention is regarded as codified societal standards. Uniformity in convention is not considered to serve the function of maintaining the social system. Conventions are &quot;nothing but&quot; societal standards that exist through habitual use.</td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Convention as coordination of social interactions. Conventions are regarded as uniformities that are functional in coordinating social interactions. Shared knowledge, in the form of conventions, among members of social groups facilitates interaction and operation of the social system.</td>
<td>18-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1

Outline of Piaget's Periods of Cognitive Development

SENSORY-MOTOR PERIOD (FIRST TWO YEARS)

Stage I (0–1 month)—Characterized by neonatal reflexes and gross, uncoordinated body movements. Stage of complete egocentrism with no distinction between self and outer reality; no awareness of self as such.

Stage II (1–4 months)—New response patterns are formed by chance from combinations of primitive reflexes. The baby's fist accidentally finds its way into his mouth through a coordination of arm moving and sucking.

Stage III (4–8 months)—New response patterns are coordinated and repeated intentionally in order to maintain interesting changes in the environment.

Stage IV (8–12 months)—More complex coordinations of previous behavior patterns, both motor and perceptual. Baby pushes aside obstacles or uses parent's hand as a means to a desired end. Emergence of anticipatory and intentional behavior; beginning of search for vanished objects.
FIGURE 1 (continued)

Stage V (12–18 months)—Familiar behavior patterns varied in different ways as if to observe different results. Emergence of directed groping toward a goal, and of new means-end manipulations for reaching desired objects.

Stage VI (1½–2 years)—Internalization of sensory-motor behavior patterns and beginnings of symbolic representation. Invention of new means through internal experimentation rather than external trial and error.

PREOPERATIONAL PERIOD (TWO TO SEVEN YEARS)
Characterized by egocentric thinking expressed in animism, artificialism, realism, and magic omnipotence.

Preconceptual Stage (2–4 years)—Development of perceptual constancy and of representation through drawings, language, dreams, and symbolic play. Beginnings of first overgeneralized attempts at conceptualization, in which representatives of a class are not distinguished from the class itself (e.g., all dogs are called by the name of the child's own dog).

Perceptual or Intuitive Stage (4–7 years)—Prelogical reasoning appears, based on perceptual appearances untempered by reversibility (e.g., Grandma in a new hat is no longer recognized as Grandma). Trial and error may lead to an intuitive discovery of correct relationships, but the child is unable to take more than one attribute into account at one time (e.g., brown heads cannot at the same time be wooden beads).

CONCRETE OPERATIONAL PERIOD (SEVEN TO ELEVEN YEARS)
Characterized by thought that is logical and reversible. The child understands the logic of classes and relations and can coordinate series and part-whole relationships dealing with concrete things.

FORMAL OPERATIONAL PERIOD (ELEVEN YEARS TO ADULTHOOD)
Characterized by the logic of propositions, the ability to reason from a hypothesis to all its conclusions, however theoretical. This involves second-order operations, or thinking about thoughts or theories rather than concrete realities.

Definition of Moral Stages

I. Preconventional level

At this level the child is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right and wrong, but interprets these labels in terms of either the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favours), or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels. The level is divided into the following two stages:

Stage 1: The punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. 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 (the latter being stage 4).

Stage 2: The instrumental relativist orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfied 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, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours", not of loyalty, gratitude, or justice.

II. Conventional level

At this level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it. At
FIGURE 2 (continued)

this level, there are the following two stages:

Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance or "good boy-nice girl" orientation. Good behaviour is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or "natural" behaviour. Behaviour is frequently judged by intention — "he means well" becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being "nice".

Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation. There is orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behaviour consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

III. Postconventional, autonomous, or principled level

At this level, there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles, and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups. This level again has two stages:

Stage 5: The social-contract legalistic orientation, generally with utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights, and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus. Aside from what is constitutionally and democratically agreed upon, the right is a matter of personal "values" and "opinion". The result is an emphasis upon the "legal point of view", but with an emphasis upon the possibility of changing law in terms of rational considerations of social utility (rather than freezing it in terms of stage 4 "law and order"). Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract is the binding element of obligation. This is the "official" morality of the American government and constitution.

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 abstract and ethical (the Golden Rule, the categorical imperative); they are not concrete moral rules like the Ten Commandments. At heart, these are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

Porter (1972) refers to speculation by Kohlberg on the possibility of a Stage Seven.

IV. Social Learning Theories of Moral Development
Exploration of Fundamental Concepts of Social Learning Theories

Social learning theories of moral development are believed to have developed from the philosophies of John Locke and John Watson (1920). These behaviorist psychologists proposed the concept that human beings begin as "clear slates" on which society writes the experience for the individuals. Moral learning is socially learned behaviors, initiated through direct teaching and modeling and imitation, and maintained by positive reinforcement. An individual eventually internalizes these behaviors, but only after sufficient exposure to them. According to this theory, the manifestation of specific values and behavior is important, not the process of learning to value, nor the motivations behind the behavior.

Parents are seen to be important to the development of morality by serving as role models and authority figures. The basic moral system of an individual is formed early, between the ages of five and eight, and its development is encouraged by "induction", or reasoning and discussion between the child and significant adults in the child's life. Cultural norms, including beliefs about right and wrong, are internalized in the child at this early age, and become the foundation for his moral system.

Reinforcement is a key factor to social learning theories of moral development. The types of reinforcement a child receives determine which behaviors will be internalized and which will be avoided. Aronfreed (1976) states that reasoning coupled with reinforcement is the most effective means of inducing moral development since it introduces cognitive content as to why particular behaviors are important.
social learning theorists, however, dismiss the significance of this cognitive content. Bandura (1969) notes that parents are not solely responsible for either providing reinforcement or role models. He contends that other adults, peers, and symbolic models are also imitated. Since, in this frame, the developmental influence is from a combination of factors, the child's resulting behavior becomes uniquely his or her own. Also according to Bandura, changes in moral judgment reflect the changes in these influences. As specific behavioral controls diminish, the individual assumes more responsibility for his own actions. Whereas adults use absolute control over very small children, social sanctions replace these physical controls at a later age, and eventually the individual internalizes and acts upon his own understandings of the rules and values that have been taught.

Maccoby (1968) suggests that the social learning view of moral development can only explain a child's development to the equivalent of Kohlberg's stage four, or "conventional" level. He believes that social learning theories cannot explain how individuals behave in situations where there are no previously established alternatives. It remains questionable as to why he believes that children cannot model their parents or other's altruistic behavior after that point.

The bulk of the research regarding social learning theories deals primarily with responses to situations in laboratory settings; Bandura and McDonald (1963) study modeling and imitation, Grinder (1962) deals with resistance to temptation, Aronfreed (1970) considers the concept of altruism. A significant change takes place, however, when the emphasis of the research and conclusions varies from the consideration of only behavioral manifestations to the consideration of the
cognitive changes which take place in an individual's understanding of the social world. At this point, social learning theories are often referred to as "cognitive social learning theories". Prominent researchers pursuing this concept are Mischel and Mischel (1976), Bandura (1977), and Aronfreed (1976).

While no one particular spokesman stands out as significant for social learning theories of moral development, the previously mentioned researchers, as well as some others yet to be mentioned, make a substantial case for their philosophy. Social learning theories provide support for the following hypothesis (numbers correspond to those assigned in Chapter One):

2) Moral development is best discussed in terms of behavioral manifestations of socially learned values. Cognitive involvement is considered only as the process by which these socially learned judgments and behaviors are eventually understood and internalized.

3) While there may be a relationship between moral judgment and moral behavior, the relationship is inconsistent and difficult to measure. Because social variables affect moral expressions, it is not possible to establish any invariant standard of correlation between moral judgment and moral behavior. Also of significance is the concept that moral judgment and moral behavior develop independently of each other, further confusing the relationship.

4) The pursuit of one's self interest affects moral judgment and moral behavior to a greater degree as external controls lessen. At earlier stages, social constraints imposed by external forces preclude the consideration of one's own concerns. As external controls give way to the internalization of moral knowledge, behavior may reflect more personal considerations.
5) Moral development is based on cultural influences and diversities, and therefore cannot be considered in terms of universal attributes or predispositions.

Joan Sieber

While John Watson argues that there is no such thing as "consciousness", and that all learning is dependent upon the external environment, Joan Sieber significantly modifies this theory of behaviorism to include the influence of personal factors. In her paper, "A Social Learning Theory to Morality" (1980), she claims that people "learn" the judgments and behaviors that have to do with morality, and that both environmental and personal attributes affect the performance of moral acts. She sees Social Learning Theories as a development of Watson's behavioristic movement, following the concept that properties of stimuli relate to those of subsequent observable behavioral responses. Sieber, however, argues that recently Social Learning Theories have grown away from the traditional theories of Watson to incorporate other concepts which help to predict and explain how people learn new ways of behaving in social situations.

Sieber explains the basic concepts of learning theories according to specific, identifiable variables which either stimulate behavior, or reduce it. According to the concept of "classical" or "operant" conditioning, a particular consequence, or reinforcement, is linked by the individual to particular behaviors, thereby encouraging the continuation of similar behaviors in similar situations or reducing an individual's inclination to such behavior. In operant conditioning, a desired response is rewarded until it is identified by the individual as positive, even without the
continuation of the actual reward. In such an instance, a child may be given candy for producing an appropriate behavior until the association is made that such a behavior is positive, and desirable, and will be reproduced even in the absence of the actual reward of candy. In classical conditioning, a neutral stimulus is paired with a reinforcement until the behavior produced by the stimulus eventually is associated with that stimulus. An example of classical conditioning is the pairing of a ringing bell with the reward of candy. Soon the ringing of the bell will produce the associated behavior even in the absence of the candy.

"Reinforcements" can be either positive or negative. A reinforcer can be any stimulus that increases the probability of a response. A positive reinforcer causes a desired behavioral response, while a negative reinforcer reduces or eliminates a response. "Punishments" are penalties associated with particular behaviors. "Extinction" occurs when a conditioned response is progressively reduced by the lack of reinforcement. "Suppression" is a variety of processes whereby behavioral tendencies are kept from expression. "Generalization" is the extension of the association of positive or negative reinforcement from particular behaviors to other similar behaviors. "Discrimination" is separation of positive behaviors from negative behaviors. Finally, "modeling" is the imitation of behaviors.

Sieber incorporates aspects of the cognitive philosophy of Structuralism into her theory of moral learning. She contends that there is an order of development of specific structures of functions (such as locomotor abilities or the capacity for moral reasoning). She further asserts that there are sequences of behavior which correspond to these stages.
of cognitive development. She also feels that there are genetic stages of development which establish the limits of variability within which learning and behavior occur. Similar to the claims of Piaget and Kohlberg, Sieber states that meaningful learning can only occur when the individual is at a stage at which he is ready for the particular learning experience, either physically, intellectually or emotionally.

The specific structural aspect that Sieber endorses is that an individual advances to higher stages of moral development only after mastering a prior stage, and only when the situation creates dissonance between prior forms of reasoning and resolution of the dilemma. She draws away from Structuralism however, in adding that particular moral values and moral behaviors are acquired through social learning. She contends that while it is possible to predict what a person is likely to do, based upon the understanding of general aspects of human development, it is only possible to understand and explain particular behaviors in the context of one's social environment.

Sieber explains morality as a philosophical concept, having to do with the respect of rights and claims of others. She believes that the intention and reasoning underlying behavior, encompassing both what is right and wrong, produces an individual's "moral code". At each stage of development, however, stages are to be defined, there is a pattern of moral reasoning and associated behavior. She includes herself in the classification of "modern moral philosophers" who agree that: 1) moral codes have are concerned with what is right and wrong, and with what will enhance or detract from human well-being; 2) moral discourse influences behavior; and 3) an individual may be motivated to act in accordance with his moral codes, and guilt arising
from behaving in an otherwise manner may be the result of social disapproval of the inappropriate behavior or conflict from the behavior not agreeing with one's ideals.

Sieber concludes that moral behavior is the result of the internalization of controls on behavior that arise from either social or personal influences. These controls facilitate the "right" behavior, and discourage the "wrong" behavior. The behavioral evidence of internalized control is the continued demonstration of that control in the absence of reinforcement. She sees no sharp distinction between internal and external controls, however, and describes instead a sort of continuum between these influences, with the situation itself shaping the particular response.

In arguing for the importance of situational and individual influences on moral judgments and behavior, Sieber supports the issues of ethical relativism, the relationship of moral judgments to moral behavior, and the possible consideration of self-interest in the formulation of moral judgments and/or behaviors. While recognizing the aspect of cognitive involvement in overall moral development, she nevertheless relies on the behavioral realm for the examination and understanding of morality.

Justin Aronfreed

In his book, Conduct and Conscience (1968), Justin Aronfreed deals with the processes by which a child translates his social experiences into eventual internalized controls over his behavior. Aronfreed characterizes these processes as the development of "conscience". According to Social Learning Theorists, behavior can be patterned after other individuals
through the use of reinforcements. Aronfreed points out that early social learning theories do not deal with how behavior eventually becomes independent of those reinforcements, however. More recent studies, including his own, try to account for internal mechanisms of control that are based upon learning experiences, but are not entirely dependent upon them. The term "conscience" is used by Aronfreed to describe these internalized cognitive and affective controls (Aronfreed, 1964; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957).

Aronfreed describes the development of conscience as occurring as the individual adopts "evaluative responses" as a result of his social interactions; these responses eventually become intrinsic reinforcements without external support. He continues to describe conscience as being composed of value systems; values being defined within the realm of conscience as moral judgments.

While Aronfreed contends that conscience is a prime regulator of conduct, he also points out that it is not the only governor of behavior. Some conduct is regulated by conditioning rather than cognitive evaluations. As a "Cognitive Social Learning Theorist", Aronfreed documents his claims for both cognitive and conditioned involvement in moral judgments and behavior. He cites a number of studies which confirm his belief that some behavior is not governed by evaluative cognitions. A study by Aronfreed and Reber, 1965, concludes that children will continue to produce desired behavior (or suppress "undesired" behavior) even when no cognitive explanation had been given for producing appropriate behavior. Bandura, 1965 a, concludes that children will produce or suppress behavior solely on the basis of the punishment or reward that accompanies the behavior. This conclusion apparently holds true even
when the children only witness other children being punished or rewarded for particular behaviors, but produce that behavior anyway if they see that it gains rewards.

Aronfreed describes great discrepancies between a child's verbal expression of rights and wrongs and how he will actually behave in real situations. He does not see this discrepancy to be the mere result of linguistic translations, but as a genuine difference between moral knowledge and moral behavior. Aronfreed refers to the research of Hartshorne and May (1928) in confirming the claim that "Knowledge of the standards of conduct to which a child subscribes will often not permit an accurate prediction of its behavior under conditions where the child is not exposed to the surveillance or reactions of external agents of control" (1968 Page 9).

The relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior is further weakened as Aronfreed continues to explain that even though conscience obviously develops with age, there is not a corresponding change in the predictability of behavior. Greater awareness of rights and wrongs, and stronger feelings associated with these rights and wrongs does not necessarily indicate that a child will act in accordance with cognitive evaluations. "There is no indication, for example, of age-related increments in the general effectiveness of children's control over their own behavior in situations which are designed to test their honesty," (Aronfreed, 1968 Page 10). Aronfreed cites studies (Hartshorne and May, 1928; Sears, Rau, Alpert, 1965; and Grinder, 1964) to support this contention that increased levels of conscience do not correspond to increased levels of behavioral conformity. Aronfreed concludes that "The fact that conduct often does not follow from the evaluative structure of conscience emphasizes the
importance of the affective correlates of cognitive processes" (1968 Page 12). Restated, knowledge of what is right behavior is not necessarily sufficient motivation to sway an individual from what he wants to do.

Aronfreed states, however, that a child's social behavior does gradually become influenced more by his own internal mechanisms of control (conscience) than by external social influences. These internal controls come to replace many of the functions that originally required external reinforcement. Aronfreed discusses the processes by which external controls become internalized controls in terms of the commonly accepted theories of social learning, including concepts such as reinforcement, extinction, imitation, etc.

In the last section of his book, Aronfreed discusses the concept of "altruism" at great length. He defines an altruistic act as being one in which an individual determines that the consequences of his behavior will benefit another person rather than himself. He continues, however, to describe how seemingly "altruistic" acts can provide positive reinforcement to the individual performing the act, as well as benefiting "others". Even when that reinforcement appears to be negative, it can be assumed that the total outcome of the act may be preferable to alternative courses of action. Another possibility is that the altruistic act may provide the "actor" with good feelings about himself, thereby providing positive reinforcement in and of itself. This would seem to substantiate the belief that behavior, even on altruistic levels, is motivated by self interest. Aronfreed interprets a study by Irwin (1961) to show that negative consequences of altruistic acts can still be preferable to the consequences of other acts that are not considered to be altruistic.
Finally, Aronfreed disputes any claim for universality of morality by stating, "Our analysis of the structure of conscience cautions us to expect that any universality in its acquisition will be found in the development of cognitive capacity rather than in the substance of values...there is no reason to expect that these principles will have a uniform nature or order that transcends the child's rearing in a specific culture." (1968 Page 267).

Related Research Regarding Social Learning Theories

Mischel and Mischel (1975) tackle the issue of relating verbal expressions about moral judgments to moral behavior. It is their conclusion that age related changes in moral judgment and moral behavior are reflective of changes in an individual's cognitive and verbal development in interaction with social learning variables. They claim that the ability to form particular moral judgments does not influence actual moral behavior as much as the individual's expectations of the consequences of behavior. They also support Aronfreed's contention that as an individual matures, moral behavior becomes influenced more by internalized controls based upon these expectations and moral knowledge, than by externally reinforced controls.

In a later study, (1976), Mischel and Mischel argue that what people say about morality has only a tenuous relationship to what they will actually do. They claim that development in moral judgment may very well be a mere reflection of general and linguistic development; that moral judgment examined solely by cognitive criteria may be little more than an interpretation of one's ability to express more sophisticated thoughts.

Grinder (1964), in a study examining children's
resistance to temptation in real-life settings, and their explanations of moral knowledge elicited by stories regarding moral dilemmas, was unable to document any significant relationship between the development of cognitive and behavioral dimensions of morality. He determined that while judgment does increase with age, the relationship of that judgment to behavior is weak. Grinder therefore concludes that behavioral and cognitive dimensions of conscience develop independently, and that behavior reflects social learning experience more than changes in a child's cognitive structure. In another study, (1963), Grinder compares Samoan and American Caucasian children by their resistance to temptation and guilt and concludes that each group interprets and reacts to moral situations differently, indicating support for the claim of cultural relativism.

Gutkin (1975), examines whether the behavior that mothers report they would use in situations involving intent and damage relates to the kind of judgments that their children make about similar situations. He concludes that there is no relationship; that parents don't provide consistent models for children, and that a child's anticipation of parental response is not important to his overall moral choices. If anything, Gutkin proposes that overly assertive parents inhibit their children's moral growth. This is in direct contrast to the studies of Bandura (1962, 1963, 1969), who argues that social agents provide important models for behavior, and that modeling is far more important than cognitive stimuli.

Both Bandura and Mischel's more recent research approaches the issue of the child's developing awareness of the relationship between his or her own abilities and social expectations, thereby acknowledging the
interaction between internal and external forces in shaping moral judgments and behavior. In particular, Bandura (1977) deals with the role of internal forces, which is a modification of his earlier claim that modeling is more important than cognitive influences.
V. Summary and Conclusions
Summary and Conclusions

Theorists for each philosophy make a strong case for their claims. Both theories of moral development define morality in terms of an individual's interaction with others. Contrary to "grandmotherly proclamations", then, there are no immoral acts that one can perpetrate on oneself. The very essence of "morality" involves the interaction of more than one person; morality is a knowledge of, concern for, and defense of the basic, inalienable rights of an individual by other individuals.

Structuralists examine and measure the development of morality in a relatively pure cognitive context. The process by which an individual arrives at a moral judgment is seen as a reflection of the level of moral development. Structuralists consistently refer to interactions with the social and physical environment, but view this interaction as a constant sort of influence, bearing only a stimulating effect on the individual, not affecting the development itself. Social Learning Theorists, on the other hand, view moral development in terms of the behavioral manifestations of individuals without regard to the cognitive affect. They interpret cognitive capacities as being rather constant, providing the stimulating effect on an individual's ability to absorb socially mandated values.

The lack of a relationship between cognitive and behavioral aspects of moral development, as reflected by these two theories, would tend to suggest that morality is either the conceptual understanding and acceptance of rights and wrongs, or a conditioned reflex to lectures and modeling. The consideration of either of these issues without the other seems to present a sorely incomplete explanation for the development of morality.
How an individual formulates moral judgments seems obviously to be the result of more than mere cognitive capacities. How one thinks, and consequently behaves, must depend -- at least in part -- upon how he believes his world to be; how he sees himself, how he anticipates being seen and treated by others, how he interacts with his environment. If, as Kohlberg suggests, the individual is "striving for equilibrium", then it is important to determine how that individual interprets what "equilibrium" is. One maintains certain capacities for a sophistication of thoughts based on age and maturity, but experience and individualized inclinations influence what information is taken in, and how it is processed. To assume that all individuals will develop the same cognitive structures, in the same invariant sequence, ignores the very essence of what makes individuals "individual".

To assume, however, that one's behavior is the sole manifestation of morality is to ignore the significance of the affect of thought processes altogether. Morality must reflect more than blind imitation. Some inconsistencies between behavior and judgment, as determined by Social Learning Theorists, may be accounted for by a lack of real understanding and acceptance of the underlying issues by the individual displaying the behavior at a particular time. It would seem more reasonable to consider the possibility that cognitive and behavioral aspects of morality develop interdependently, and that the relationship is significant although difficult to correlate due to the influence of many variables.

It is interesting that neither theory supports a significance of the relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior. While both acknowledge some correspondence, it is readily relegated to a position of
little importance. This may be due to the theorist's inability to produce any significant and valid criteria to substantiate this relationship, not due to a real lack of importance of this relationship as they would like to imply. Perhaps a more reasonable approach would be to seek a "commonality" of behaviors which correspond to particular moral judgments, representing dominant "stages" of development, rather than trying to isolate particular behaviors which relate to particular cognitive levels. While Structuralists claim that moral judgment is predictive of moral behavior, Social Learning Theorists do not recognize any strong affiliation between judgment and behavior and cite evidence showing that effective behavior modification is not dependent on prior moral judgments. Questions arise, however, when Structuralists discount moral judgment that does not predict or correlate with moral behavior, and whether behavior without corresponding moral judgments (as suggested by Social Learning Theorists) actually reflects behavior in the realm of morality.

Discrepancies in interpretations of the relationship of moral judgments to moral behavior may result, at least in part, from each theory's definition of the development of "values". Structuralists assume that everyone has their own values, arising from internal cognitive processes based on universal, underlying concepts. Social Learning Theorists, in contrast, argue that values are learned concepts, internalized through modeling and imitation; values are relative and culturally determined. Neither theory recognizes the influence that internal predispositions may have on socially sanctioned teachings, or vice versa. Again, it seems fair to assume that the inability -- by present means of assessment -- to pinpoint any consistent correlations between internal and external forces
affecting moral development may actually be the underlying motive for claiming a lack of correspondence.

Deanna Kuhn (1978) proposes that a potential point of intersection exists between Social Learning Theories and Structuralist theories, and that recognition of such an "intersection" would enhance the overall consideration and examination of moral development. She observes that, at present, each theory tends to adhere narrowly to its own paradigm, either "organismic" (concerning cognitive factors), or "mechanistic" (concerning social influence factors), in philosophy. Instead of this narrow mindedness, she suggests that each theory might do well to incorporate into its philosophy significant aspects of the other. She further explains that Social Learning Theorists are beginning to acknowledge the importance of cognitive processes, while Structuralists have yet to consider the influence of the social environment. Her conclusion is that a new, more complete paradigm would arise from this interplay of cognitive and social influences.

In Social Learning and Cognition (1978), Ted Rosenthal and Barry Zimmerman provide an extensive review of literature regarding both Social Learning Theory and Structuralist Theory as they relate to cognition. It is apparently their goal to understand the development of a child's cognitive processes as they relate to environmental forces. While their research does indicate a relationship between cognitive development and societal influences in the area of moral development, the support for this interaction is shaky. A focal point of this research is the finding that rule abstraction/generation occurs with observational learning, rather than mere imitation taking place, thereby making social forces a major impetus to cognitive development. Rosenthal and Zimmerman also
cite methodological problems in structuralist research which they contend confuses and makes questionable reported findings. This study provides a starting point for further consideration of the interrelationship between cognitive processes and sociocultural influences in the development of moral judgment and behavior.

Because it is based on basic, universal, inherent cognitive capacities for moral development, Structuralist theories do not heed any consequences to the importance of parental influence or child rearing. Parents, like other significant adults, are seen only as providers of cognitive conflict, inspiring the child to develop more sophisticated means of resolving the differences between his own level of thought and that of older individuals. Social Learning Theorists, on the other hand, see parents as particularly important by providing the most visible and consistent models for the child to imitate. As in every other instance thus far discussed, the possibility is dismissed that cognitive capacities act in conjunction with role models to produce overall morality. While Social Learning Theorists contend that basic moral systems are formed early, between the ages of five and eight, and are merely reinforced from that point on, Structuralists contend that moral growth is extended over time. It might be suggested here that another interpretation of this issue would be that with the passage of time, and the increased ability to comprehend social edicts, the individual becomes better able to understand and internalize values and rules that had previously been only conditioned responses.

The passage of time, however, is not the only variable affecting an individual's capacity to comprehend and internalize the values and rules or moral orders. As Simpson pointed out in her criticism of
Kohlberg's theories (1974), Kohlberg and other Structuralists fail to take into account the impact of sociocultural forces. Even assuming that cognitive capacities develop at particular times in an individual's life, and further assuming that the individual has been conditioned to particular modes of moral behavior by appropriate role models as suggested by Social Learning Theorists, particular environmental influences at any given can create the decisive influence on moral choices. McNamee points out that an individual's stage of moral reasoning determines how he will define a situation and significantly influences his behavioral choice (1977). However, even he fails to consider how the pursuit of one's self interest in a particular social situation will ultimately affect the overall moral choice. For example, cognitive capacities and behavioral inclinations not withstanding, the instinct for survival will preempt all other influences. To consider an extreme, which is not the only instance in which an individual might be disposed to seemingly "inappropriate" moral choices, a person who is starving and out of work and out of hope might well find himself stealing food. In economically depressed times, such as the present, otherwise "moral" individuals might well be inclined to accept too much change from a store clerk or a bank, and rationalize this moral transgression by a sense of "need".

Kohlberg claims that morality involves the ability to "sacrifice". While this may be true, he views this ability to sacrifice as resulting in upward movement. In contrast, it seems likely that the ability or desire to sacrifice may in itself produce the "disequilibrium" that Kohlberg claims to be the stimulus to moral change, and yet the change needn't always be upward as he suggests. Increased disequilibrium can result in more
complex arrangements of moral thoughts, and a choice of a less moral alternative based upon these sophisticated rationalizations. The variable of self interest is a powerful influence on operational levels of morality in actual moral dilemmas. When one is faced with a choice of alternatives in "real life" moral situations, the degree to which one's self interest will best be served may well be the ultimate determinant to how one reasons and behaves. Re-examining McNamee's research, (1977), it can be determined that in a controlled situation such as his, where the situation did not involve physical loss or gain to the subject himself, it was possible to obtain an objective measurement and comparison of cognitive and behavioral variables of moral development, and compare them to Kohlberg's model. This is clearly an example of how the definition of the situation affects levels of morality. The experiment set up a situation where the subject's response was almost exclusively "other oriented", except for the ascetic rewards associated with helping another individual. If, however, the subjects were offered rewards or punishments of some kind, the possibility emerges that responses might have been different. This does not suggest that all responses would be based on external reinforcements, but that depending on an individual's particular needs at a particular time, that individual might be inclined towards more subjective responses rather than purely objective responses. Gerson and Damon (1975) substantiate this claim in their study relating reasoning in hypothetical situations to reasoning in concrete situations. They conclude that there is a marked tendency of individuals towards lower levels of reasoning in real situations as opposed to hypothetical. In practical contexts, where children were directly involved in the outcome of their
reasoning, lower levels of judgment reflected considerations of serving one's self interest.

Discrepancies between the outcomes of hypothetical moral "tests" and real life moral situations points to still another controversial issue, the relevance of hypothetical tests themselves. As Aron argues, (1980), Kohlberg's dilemmas concern highly philosophical issues, and are presented in intellectual and sometimes idealistic terms. Not to discount the contribution of "artificial" tests, the consideration for more appropriate tools remains. Hypothetical issues might be presented in more earthy language, and concern topics relevant to specific segments of societies rather than attempting to find universal topics and languages. A test to solicit behaviors and judgments that are more in touch with an individual's real life and concerns would better tap that individuals methods of resolving moral conflicts. Few people are faced with a decision regarding stealing a drug to save the life of a family member (as in the Heinz dilemma). Many people, however, are faced with a decision as to whether to accept too much change from a supermarket clerk, or whether to accept the credit for a job that someone else may actually have done, or whether to steal food to feed a starving family. Kohlberg insists that moral stages are universal; how, then, would he account for societies where "sharing" spouses, or even taking lives, is considered to be of the highest tribute to other individuals or gods?

Morality is based on an individual's reaction to the world as that individual perceives the world to be. The concept of "justice" may be a deviation of the Golden Rule; "do unto others as you expect them to do unto you". What is "fair", and "just", and "truth"? How one sees himself, and his place in his world, is largely
dependent upon his interaction with his environment; how he is seen and treated by others, as well as how he anticipates being seen and treated by others. To follow Piaget's and Kohlberg's concept of striving for equilibrium, it is important to understand that one rationalizes and justifies his own sense of being in terms which enable him to find a comfortable "place" in which to survive. This "place may or may not be based on reality. Even discounting pathological deviates, and taking into consideration relatively "normal" individuals, their interpretation of "equilibrium", and how it is to be maintained, arises from many other variables besides cognitive capacities and moral teachings. Experience influences expectations, needs color judgments, and circumstances determine relative interpretations. How people define situations is based on humanistic capacities in conjunction with individual peculiarities. Also taking into consideration the possibility that an individual may be in a period of physical or emotional flux, the quantity of moral responses may be as important, or more important that the quality of the responses. A commonality of moral expressions may be more representative of moral stage than particular responses.

Based on the criteria selected for evaluating these theories of moral development, it is difficult to conclude that either provides a "better" model than the other. The structure and underlying principles of the Structuralist's stage theory encompasses significant issues and concerns. However, one can argue with the philosophy of considering only the cognitive element of moral development as reflecting "morality". Likewise, behavioral influences and expressions of values and rules is a very real manifestation of moral attitudes, but cannot by themselves be considered to be a complete
picture of "morality". If, instead, the ability to formulate moral judgments, along with the ability to act on particular judgments is examined, then it becomes possible to identify all of the various processes and influences that affect moral development.

Suggestions for further study:

Assuming that human beings possess and display certain "properties" which act in combination with molding forces from the external environment to produce moral judgments and moral behavior, a "new" or modified model for moral development may be devised. Also assuming that individuals are motivated largely by their own, personal needs at given times, this model might well reflect the hierarchy of these needs as according to Maslow's definition and explanation of this phenomenon, (Maslow, 1954).

A new model for moral development should include:
1) a clear definition of the term "moral";
2) the ability to distinguish between reactive or imitative behavior and deliberate, cognitively influenced behavior;
3) a balance and correlation between motivation and behavior;
4) the structure of sequential levels according to cognitive sophistication and the consideration of basic human needs in their order of importance (ie. Maslow's hierarchy);
5) the allowance for variance between hypothetical situations and actual moral dilemmas, and a relation between the two;
6) the consideration of culturally relative influences;
7) adequate guidelines for testing and measurement.
significance of this study and future applications:

It is an easily recognizable fact -- especially in light of recent publicity about the "moral majority", rapidly rising crime rates, abortion issues, public official scandals, school bussing controversies and the like -- that people are both concerned and confused about contemporary moral trends. A comprehensive and efficient model for moral development would provide educators, philosophers, psychologists, and professionals of many related fields with a meaningful instrument with which to measure and understand moral trends of individuals and groups.

It would seem to be of particular importance to have a clear definition of the parameters of moral values and trends as they relate to psychological counseling. Whether morals are relative to specific cultures, or whether moral judgment is related in fact to moral behavior, are only two examples of how moral issues specifically affect a counseling situation. The assumption that morals are relative, for example, would point to the understanding that husband and wife moral values are variously determined by different cultures. Whether the wife makes decisions, the number of children in the family, sexual behavior, and husband and wife roles are just a few of the issues that differ from culture to culture. A counselor accepting the premise that cultural differences do exist can then move on towards understanding those differences, accepting his own biases should there be any, and then enabling the clients to do likewise.

A counselor's refusal to acknowledge cultural differences in morality might well result in a whole new set of difficulties for the counselors. Then too the
issue arises as to whether a counselor can be impartial about mandates with which he is not personally familiar. Religious differences, like cultural differences, can account for particular behaviors; a non-Catholic counselor must accept that divorce is not an option in a Catholic marriage, or that an abortion may not be a realistic alternative to an unwanted pregnancy.

How individuals arrive at their values must be understood and respected. People cannot be assumed to fit into particular molds, nor can molds be assumed to be adjustable to particular individuals.

Moral issues affecting counseling are many and varied. Some ethical issues can be resolved in philosophy and practice with little or no questions, others are not so absolute. All of these issues, however, need to be carefully considered. While it is not possible to arrive at absolute resolutions for some ethical dilemmas, since the particular counseling and/or living situation may dictate the particular philosophy or application, it is hoped that the counselor would have a clear understanding of himself and of his values and that he would have considered some of these issues in light of a theory of moral development that is clear and complete.
Appendix
Appendix I
Piaget's Stories
for Moral Judgment

Stories of Carelessness

I. A. A little boy named John is in his room. He is called to
dinner. He goes into the dining room. But behind the door there is
a chair, and on the chair there is a tray with fifteen cups on it.
John couldn’t have known that all this was behind the door. He
goes in, the door knocks against the tray, bang go the fifteen cups
and they all get broken.

B. Once there was a little boy whose name was Henry.
One day when his mother was out he tried to get some jam out of
the cupboard. He climbed up onto a chair but he couldn’t reach it.
However, while he was trying to get it he knocked over a cup. The
cup fell down and broke.

II. A. There was a little boy named Julian. His father had
gone out and Julian thought it would be fun to play with his fa­
ther’s inkwell. First he played with the pen, and then he made a lit­
tle blot on the tablecloth.

B. A little boy named Augustus once noticed that his fa­
ther’s inkwell was empty. One day, when his father was away, he
decided to fill the inkwell in order to help his father, so that he
would find it full when he came home. But while he was opening
the ink bottle, he made a big blot on the tablecloth.

III. A. A little girl named Marie wanted to give her mother a
nice surprise and cut out a piece of sewing for her. But she didn’t
know how to use the scissors properly and cut a big hole in her
dress.
B. A little girl named Margaret took her mother's scissors one day when her mother was out. She played with them for a while. Then, because she didn't know how to use them properly, she made a little hole in her dress.

When we have analyzed the answers obtained by means of these pairs of stories, we shall study two problems relating to stealing. Since our aim for the moment is to find out whether the child pays more attention to motive or to material results, we have presented acts of stealing with those that are well-intentioned.

Stories of Stealing

IV. A. Alfred meets a friend who is very poor. This friend tells him that he has had no dinner that day because there was nothing to eat in his home. Then Alfred goes into a baker's shop, and since he has no money, he waits until the baker's back is turned and steals a roll. Then he runs out and gives the roll to his friend.

B. Henriette goes into a shop. She sees a pretty piece of ribbon on a table and thinks to herself that it would look very nice on her dress. So, while the saleslady's back is turned, she steals the ribbon and runs away at once.

V. A. Albertine had a little friend who kept a bird in a cage. Albertine thought the bird was very unhappy, and she was always asking her friend to let him out, but the friend wouldn't. So one day when her friend wasn't there, Albertine stole the bird. She let it fly away and hid the cage in the attic so that the bird would never be shut up in it again.

B. Juliet stole some candy from her mother one day when her mother was not there. She hid and ate them.

Stories of Lying

I. A. A little boy goes for a walk in the street and meets a big dog who frightens him very much. He goes home and tells his mother he has seen a dog that was as big as a cow.
B. A child comes home from school and tells his mother that the teacher has given him good marks, but it is not true; the teacher has given him no marks at all, either good or bad. His mother is very pleased and rewards him.

II. A. A boy was playing in his room. His mother called and asked him to deliver a message for her. He didn’t feel like going out, so he told his mother that his feet were hurting. But it wasn’t true. His feet weren’t hurting him in the least.

B. A boy wanted very much to go for a ride in a car, but no one ever asked him. One day he saw a man driving a beautiful car. When he got home he told his parents that the gentleman in the car had stopped and had taken him for a little drive. But it was not true; he had made it all up.

III. A. A boy couldn’t draw very well, but he would have liked very much to be able to draw. One day he was looking at a beautiful drawing that another boy had done, and he said: “I made that drawing.”

B. A boy was playing with the scissors one day when his mother was out and he lost them. When his mother came in he said that he hadn’t seen them and hadn’t touched them.

IV. A. A child who didn’t know the names of streets very well was not quite sure where Main Street was. One day a gentleman stopped him in the street and asked him where Main Street was. So the boy answered, “I think it is that way.” But it was not. The gentleman completely lost his way and could not find the house he was looking for.

B. A boy knew the names of streets quite well. One day a gentleman asked him where Main Street was. But the boy wanted to play a trick on him, and he said: “It’s there.” He showed him the wrong street, but the gentleman didn’t get lost and managed to find his way again.

Stories of Punishment

I. A mother tells her three boys that they must not play with the scissors while she is out. But as soon as she is gone, the first one says, “Let’s play with the scissors.” Then the second boy goes
to get some newspapers to cut out. The third one says, "No! Mother said we shouldn't. I won't touch the scissors." When the mother comes home, she sees all the bits of cut-up newspaper on the floor. She knows that someone has been touching her scissors, and she punishes all three boys. Was that fair?

II. After coming out of school, some boys started throwing snowballs at each other. One of the boys accidentally broke a window of a house with a snowball. The owner comes out and asked who did it. Since no one answered, he complained to the principal. The next day the principal asked the class who broke the window. But again, no one spoke. The boy who had done it said that it wasn't he, and the others wouldn't tell on him. What should the master do? (If the child does not answer or misses the point, you can add details to make things clearer.) Ought he to punish no one, or the whole class?

III. Some boys were throwing snowballs against a wall. They were allowed to do this, but on condition that they did not throw them too high, because above the wall there was a window, and the windowpanes might get broken. The boys had a wonderful time—all except one who was rather clumsy and who was not very good at throwing snowballs. When no one was looking, he picked up a rock and put it in the middle of a snowball. Then he threw it, and it went so high that it struck the window, broke the windowpane, and fell into the room. When the father came home he saw what had happened. He even found the rock with some melted snow on the floor. He was angry and asked who had done this. But the boy who had done it said it wasn't he, and so did the others. They did not know that he had put a rock in his snowball. What should the father do—punish everyone, or no one?

IV. During a school outing, the teacher allowed the children to play in a barn, on condition that they put everything back where they found it before going away. Some of them took rakes, others took spades, and they all went off in different directions. One of the boys took a wheelbarrow and played by himself, until he accidentally broke it. Then he came back when no one was looking and hid the wheelbarrow in the barn. In the evening when the teacher looked to see if everything was tidy, he found the broken wheelbarrow and asked who had done it. But the boy who had
done it said nothing, and the others didn't know who it was. What should have been done? (Should the whole class be punished or no one?)

V. There was a school with only two classes—a class of older children and a class of younger ones. One day, when they had finished their schoolwork, the younger children asked the older ones to lend them one of their beautiful animal books. The older ones did so, telling them to take good care of it. Two of the younger children tried to turn to different pages at the same time. They quarreled, and some of the pages of the book got torn. When the older ones saw that the book was torn, they declared that they would never lend it to the younger children again. Were they right or not?

VI. A mother gave her three little boys a lovely box of colored crayons and told them to be very careful not to drop them so that they wouldn't get broken. But one of them who drew badly saw that his brothers were making better drawings than he was, and out of spite he threw all the crayons on the floor. When the mother saw this, she took the crayons away and never gave them back to the children again. Was she right to do this or not?

Stories of Immanent Justice

I. Once there were two children who were stealing apples in an orchard. Suddenly a policeman came along and the two children ran away. One of them was caught. The other one, going home by a roundabout way, crossed a rotting bridge over a river and fell into the water. Now what do you think? If he had not stolen the apples and still had crossed the river on that rotten bridge, would he also have fallen into the water?

II. In a class of very little children the teacher had forbidden them to sharpen their pencils themselves. Once, when the teacher had her back turned, a little boy took the knife and was going to sharpen his pencil, but he cut his finger. If the teacher had allowed him to sharpen his pencil, would he have cut himself just the same?

III. There was a little boy who disobeyed his mother. He took the scissors one day when he had been told not to. But he put
them back in their place before his mother came home, and she never noticed anything. The next day he went for a walk and crossed a stream on a little bridge. It gave way, and he fell in the water with a splash. Why did he fall into the water? (And if he had not disobeyed, would he still have fallen in?)

*Stories of Justice and Authority*

I. Once there was a camp for Boy Scouts (or Girl Scouts). Each one had to do his bit to help with the work and leave things tidy. One had to do the shopping, another brought in wood or swept the floor. One day there was no bread and the one who did the shopping had already gone. So the Scoutmaster asked one of the Scouts who had already done his job to go and fetch the bread. What did he do?

II. One Thursday afternoon, a mother asked her little girl and boy to help her around the house because she was tired. The girl was to dry the plates and the boy was to fetch some wood. But the little boy (or girl) went out and played in the street, so the mother asked the other one to do all the work. What did he (she) say?

III. Once there was a family with three brothers. The two younger brothers were twins. They all used to polish their shoes every morning. One day the oldest brother was ill, so the mother asked one of the others to polish the brother's shoes as well as his own. What do you think of that?

IV. A father had two boys. One of them always grumbled when he was sent on messages. The other one didn't like being sent either, but he always went without saying a word. So the father used to send the boy who didn't grumble more often than the other one. What do you think of that?

*From Moral Development: A Guide to Piaget and Kohlberg*

Appendix II
Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Situations

I. Joe is a fourteen year old boy who wanted to go to camp very much. His father promised him he could go if he saved up the money for it himself. So Joe worked hard at his paper route and saved up the $40 it cost to go to camp and a little more besides. But just before camp was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of his friends decided to go on a special fishing trip, and Joe's father was short of the money it would cost. So he told Joe to give him the money he had saved from the paper route. Joe didn't want to give up going to camp, so he thought of refusing to give his father the money. — Should Joe refuse to give his father the money or should he give it to him? Why?

I. A. Joe lied and said he only made $10 and went to camp with the other $40 he made. Joe had an older brother named Bob. Before Joe went to camp, he told Bob about the money and about lying to their father. — Should Bob tell their father? Why?

II. In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together
about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. The druggist said, “No, I discovered the drug and I’m going to make money from it.” So Heinz got desperate and broke into the man’s store to steal the drug for his wife.—Should the husband have done that? Why?

II. A. The doctor finally got some of the radium drug for Heinz’ wife, but it didn’t work, and there was no other treatment known to medicine which could save her. The doctor knew that she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of a painkiller like ether or morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods she would ask the doctor to give her enough ether to kill her. She said she couldn’t stand the pain and she was going to die in a few months anyway.—Should the doctor do what she asks and make her die to put her out of her terrible pain? Why?

II. B. While all this was happening, Heinz was in jail for breaking in and trying to steal the medicine. He had been sentenced for ten years. But after a couple of years he escaped from the prison and went to live in another part of the country under a new name. He saved money and slowly built up a big factory. He gave his workers the highest wages and used most of his profits to build a hospital for work in curing cancer. Twenty years had passed when a tailor recognized the factory owner as being Heinz the escaped convict whom the police had been looking for back in his home town.—Should the tailor report Heinz to the police? Why?

III. In Korea, a company of Marines was greatly outnumbered and was retreating before the enemy. The company had crossed a bridge over a river, but the enemy were still mostly on the other side. If someone went back to the bridge and blew it up as the enemy soldiers were coming over it, it would weaken the enemy. With the head start the rest of the men in the company would have, they could probably then escape. But the man who stayed back to blow up the bridge would probably not be able to escape alive; there would be about a 4 to 1 chance that he would be killed. The captain of the company has to decide who should go back and do the job. The captain himself is the man who knows
best how to lead the retreat. He asks for volunteers, but no one will volunteer.—Should the captain order a man to stay behind, or stay behind himself, or leave nobody behind? Why?

III. A. The captain finally decided to order one of the men to stay behind. One of the men he thought of had a lot of strength and courage but he was a bad troublemaker. He was always stealing things from the other men, beating them up and refusing to do his work. The second man he thought of had gotten a bad disease in Korea and was likely to die in a short time anyway, though he was strong enough to do the job.—If the captain was going to send one of the two men, should he send the troublemaker or the sick man? Why?

IV. Two young men were in trouble. They were secretly leaving town in a hurry and needed money. Karl, the older one, broke into a store and stole $500. Bob, the younger one, went to a man who was known to help people in town. Bob told the man that he was very sick and needed $500 to pay for his operation. He really wasn't sick at all, and he had no intention of paying the money back. Although the man didn't know Bob very well, he loaned him the money. So Karl and Bob skipped town, each with $500.—Which would be worse, stealing like Karl or cheating like Bob? Why? Suppose Bob had gotten the loan from a bank with no intention of paying it back. Is borrowing from the bank or the old man worse? Why? What do you think is the worst thing about cheating the old man? Why shouldn't someone steal from a store? What is the value or importance of property rights? Which would be worse in terms of society's welfare—cheating like Bob or stealing like Karl? Why?

V. During the war in Europe, a city was often heavily bombed. All the men in the city were assigned to different firefighting and rescue stations all over the city. A man named Diesing was in charge of one fire engine station near where he worked. One day after an especially heavy bombing, Diesing left the shelter to go to his station. But on the way, he decided that he had to see whether his family was safe. His home was quite far away, but he went there first.—Was it right or wrong for him to leave the station to protect his family?

Appendix III

Defining Issues Test

For further information about test availability, administration, and scoring, write to Minnesota Moral Research Projects, 330 Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Drive S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

APPENDIX

OPINIONS ABOUT SOCIAL PROBLEMS

This questionnaire is aimed at understanding how people think about social problems. Different people often have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. There are no "right" answers in the way that there are right answers to math problems. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories. The papers will be fed to a computer to find the average for the whole group, and no one will see your individual answers.

Please give us the following information:

Name _____________________________  ________female
Age ___________  Class and period _____________________  ________male
School________________________________________

*  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *

In this questionnaire you will be asked to give your opinions about several stories. Here is a story as an example.

Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The car he buys will be his family's only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized that there were a lot of questions to consider. Below there is a list of some of these questions.

If you were Frank Jones, how important would each of these questions be in deciding what car to buy?
Instructions for Part A: (Sample Question)

On the left hand side check one of the spaces by each statement of a consideration. (For instance, if you think that statement #1 is not important in making a decision about buying a car, check the space on the right.)

IMPORTANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives. (Note that in this sample, the person taking the questionnaire did not think this was important in making a decision.)

2. Would a used car be more economical in the long run than a new car. (Note that a check was put in the far left space to indicate the opinion that this is an important issue in making a decision about buying a car.)

3. Whether the color was green, Frank's favorite color.

4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200. (Note that if you are unsure about what "cubic inch displacement" means, then mark it "no importance.")

5. Would a large, roomy car be better than a compact car.

6. Whether the front connubilies were differential. (Note that if a statement sounds like gibberish or nonsense to you, mark it "no importance.")

Instructions for Part B: (Sample Question)

From the list of questions above, select the most important one of the whole group. Put the number of the most important question on the top line below. Do likewise for your 2nd, 3rd and 4th most important choices. (Note that the top choices in this case will come from the statements that were checked on the far left-hand side—statements #2 and #5 were thought to be very important. In deciding what is the most important, a person would re-read #2 and #5, and then pick one of them as the most important, then put the other one as "second most important," and so on.)

MOST 2ND MOST IMPORTANT 3RD MOST IMPORTANT 4TH MOST IMPORTANT

5 2 3 1
HEINZ AND THE DRUG

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one dr that doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same tow had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging 10 times what the drug cost to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman’s husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, “No, I discovered the drug and I’m going to make money from it.” So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man’s store to steal the drug for his wife.

Should Heinz steal the drug? (Check one)

_____ Should steal it _____ Can’t decide _____ Should not steal it

IMPORTANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Whether a community’s laws are going to be upheld.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Isn’t it only natural for a loving husband to care much for his wife that he’d steal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is Heinz willing to risk getting shot as a burglar going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whether Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable influence with professional wrestlers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing it solely to help someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Whether the druggist’s rights to his invention are to be respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the termination of dying, socially and individually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whether the druggist is going to be allowed to be behind a worthless law which only protects the rich anyhow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Would stealing in such a case bring about more good for the whole society or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important ________ Second most important ________
Third most important ________ Fourth most important ________
STUDENT TAKE-OVER

At Harvard University a group of students, called the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), believe that the University should not have an army ROTC program. SDS students are against the war in Viet Nam, and the army training program helps send men to fight in Viet Nam. The SDS students demanded that Harvard end the army ROTC training program as a university course. This would mean that Harvard students could not get army training as part of their regular course work and not get credit for it towards their degrees.

Agreeing with the SDS students, the Harvard professors voted to end the ROTC program as a university course. But the President of the University stated that he wanted to keep the army program on campus as a course. The SDS students felt that the President was not going to pay attention to the faculty vote or to their demands.

So, one day last April, two hundred SDS students walked into the university's administration building, and told everyone else to get out. They said they were doing this to force Harvard to get rid of the army training program as a course.

Should the students have taken over the administration building? (Check one)

__Yes, they should take it over __Can't decide __No, they shouldn't take it over

IMPORTANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the students doing this to really help other people or are they doing it just for kicks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the students have any right to take over property that doesn't belong to them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the students realize that they might be arrested and fined, and even expelled from school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Would taking over the building in the long run benefit more people to a greater extent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whether the president stayed within the limits of his authority in ignoring the faculty vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will the takeover anger the public and give all students a bad name?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would allowing one student take-over encourage many other student take-overs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did the president bring this misunderstanding on himself by being so unreasonable and uncooperative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whether running the university ought to be in the hands of a few administrators or in the hands of all the people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are the students following principles which they believe are above the law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Whether or not university decisions ought to be respected by students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important _____ Second most important _____
Third most important _____ Fourth most important _____
ESCAPED PRISONER

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country, and took on the name of Thompson. For 8 years he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Then one day, Mrs. Jones, an old neighbor, recognized him as the man who had escaped from prison 8 years before, and whom the police had been looking for.

Should Mrs. Jones report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison?

(Check one)

___ Should report him  ___ Can't decide  ___ Should not report him

IMPORTANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Hasn't Mr. Thompson been good enough for such long time to prove he isn't a bad person?
2. Everytime someone escapes punishment for a crime doesn't that just encourage more crime?
3. Wouldn't we be better off without prisons and the oppression of our legal systems?
4. Has Mr. Thompson really paid his debt to society?
5. Would society be failing what Mr. Thompson should fairly expect?
6. What benefits would prisons be apart from society especially for a charitable man?
7. How could anyone be so cruel and heartless as to send Mr. Thompson to prison?
8. Would it be fair to all the prisoners who had to serve out their full sentences if Mr. Thompson was let off?
9. Was Mrs. Jones a good friend of Mr. Thompson?
10. Wouldn't it be a citizen's duty to report an escape criminal, regardless of the circumstances?
11. How would the will of the people and the public good best be served?
12. Would going to prison do any good for Mr. Thompson or protect anybody?

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important _____  Second most important _____
Third most important _____  Fourth most important _____
WEBSTER

Mr. Webster was the owner and manager of a gas station. He wanted to hire another mechanic to help him, but good mechanics were hard to find. The only person he found who seemed to be a good mechanic was Mr. Lee, but he was Chinese. While Mr. Webster himself didn’t have anything against Orientals, he was afraid to hire Mr. Lee because many of his customers didn’t like Orientals. His customers might take their business elsewhere if Mr. Lee was working in the gas station.

When Mr. Lee asked Mr. Webster if he could have the job, Mr. Webster said that he had already hired somebody else. But Mr. Webster really had not hired anybody, because he could not find anybody who was a good mechanic besides Mr. Lee.

What should Mr. Webster have done? (Check one)

- Should have hired Mr. Lee
- Can’t decide
- Should not have hired him

**IMPORTANCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Does the owner of a business have the right to make his own business decisions or not?
2. Whether there is a law that forbids racial discrimination in hiring for jobs.
3. Whether Mr. Webster is prejudiced against Orientals himself or whether he means nothing personal in refusing the job.
4. Whether hiring a good mechanic or paying attention to his customers’ wishes would be best for his business.
5. What individual differences ought to be relevant in deciding how society’s roles are filled?
6. Whether the greedy and competitive capitalistic system ought to be completely abandoned.
7. Do a majority of people in Mr. Webster’s society feel like his customers or are a majority against prejudice?
8. Whether hiring capable men like Mr. Lee would use talents that would otherwise be lost to society.
9. Would refusing the job to Mr. Lee be consistent with Mr. Webster’s own moral beliefs?
10. Could Mr. Webster be so hard-hearted as to refuse the job, knowing how much it means to Mr. Lee?
11. Whether the Christian commandment to love your fellow man applies in this case.
12. If someone's in need, shouldn't he be helped regardless of what you get back from him?

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important
Second most important
Third most important
Fourth most important
THE DOCTOR’S DILEMMA

A lady was dying of cancer which could not be cured and she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of pain-killer like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods, she would ask the doctor to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn’t stand the pain and that she was going to die in a few months anyway.

What should the doctor do? (Check one)

____ He should give the lady an overdose  ____ Can’t decide  ____ Should not give the
that will make her die  overdose

IMPORTANCE:

Great  Much  Some  Little  No

1. Whether the woman’s family is in favor of giving her the overdose or not.

2. Is the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving her an overdose would be the same as killing her.

3. Whether people would be much better off without society regimenting their lives and even their deaths.

4. Whether the doctor could make it appear like an accident.

5. Does the state have the right to force continued existence on those who don’t want to live.

6. What is the value of death prior to society’s perspective on personal values.

7. Whether the doctor has sympathy for the woman’s suffering or cares more about what society might think.

8. Is helping to end another’s life ever a responsible act of cooperation.

9. Whether only God should decide when a person’s life should end.

10. What values the doctor has set for himself in his own personal code of behavior.

11. Can society afford to let everybody end their lives when they want to.

12. Can society allow suicides or mercy killing and still protect the lives of individuals who want to live.

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important  Second most important

Third most important  Fourth most important
Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a mimeographed newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the war in Vietnam and to speak out against some of the school's rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair.

When Fred started his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal's approval. Fred agreed and turned in several articles for approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks.

But the principal had not expected that Fred's newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred's opinions. They phoned the principal telling him that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the rising excitement, the principal ordered Fred to stop publishing. He gave as a reason that Fred's activities were disruptive to the operation of the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the principal more responsible to students or to the parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did the principal give his word that the newspaper could be published for a long time, or did he just promise to approve the newspaper one issue at a time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would the students start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When the welfare of the school is threatened, does the principal have the right to give orders to students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the principal have the freedom of speech to say &quot;no&quot; in this case?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If the principal stopped the newspaper would he be preventing full discussion of important problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether the principal's order would make Fred lose faith in the principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What effect would stopping the newspaper have on the student's education in critical thinking and judgments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whether Fred was in any way violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Whether the principal should be influenced by some angry parents when it is the principal that knows best what is going on in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important_____ Second most important_____ Third most important_____ Fourth most important_____
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