2011

Role of Religion, Culture, and Education in Moral Judgment

Ana Katerina Lambrakopoulos.

BARRY UNIVERSITY

ROLE OF RELIGION, CULTURE, AND EDUCATION IN MORAL JUDGMENT

by

Ana Katerina Lambrakopoulos

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of
Barry University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Miami Shores, Florida

December 19, 2011

BARRY UNIVERSITY

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

ROLE OF RELIGION, CULTURE, AND EDUCATION IN MORAL JUDGMENT

by

Ana Katerina Lambrakopoulos

Approved:

_____ _____

Lenore Szuchman, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

_____ _____

David Feldman, Ph.D. **Date**
Assistant Professor of Psychology

For my parents.

Abstract

The current study investigated factors that are believed to impact moral judgment in college students (N = 50). Religious orientation, cultural values, and high-school education were expected to be associated with differences among participants' moral judgment scores. Participants completed four self-report questionnaires: a) an academic and demographic questionnaire; b) Francis' (2007) New Indices of Religious Orientation; c) Triandis, Bontempo, and Villareal's (1988) Individualism-Collectivism Scale; d) and Rest et al.'s (1979) Defining Issues Test. There was a significant relationship between participants' quest (religion) scores and culture scores, which reflects an increase in collectivistic cultural values, as there is an increase in the tendency to question religious beliefs. No factors were found to be significantly related to moral judgment. Findings suggest that a larger sample size is needed for future morality research focused on relationships among moral judgment and the current study's independent variables.

The field of moral development in psychology has expanded considerably in the past 30 years, due in part to new theories, and also the revision, criticism, and empirical testing of older theories (King & Mayhew, 2002). There is, however, a scarcity in current research aimed at investigating associations between moral judgment, religion, culture, and education.

Lawrence Kohlberg's moral stages serve as the central theoretical concept on which the current study is based. Kohlberg's (1981) model will be described in detail with empirical evidence supporting its structure and components. Critics of Kohlberg include Carol Gilligan (1982), and her model of moral reasoning will also be described with supporting evidence. Attainment of postconventional moral reasoning, as posited by Leventhal (1980), is a manifestation of a strategic cognitive style geared towards justice. Leventhal's procedural justice rules will be described in order to provide additional information about the principle of justice in moral reasoning.

The high-school environment has the ability to foster moral growth in students (King & Mayhew, 2002; Maeda, Bebeau, & Thoma, 2009) and that high-school religiosity has been previously explored as being associated with moral reasoning (Bunch, 2005). Religious orientation, specifically the concept of quest, will be defined and explained. Quest has been found to be a significant predictor of moral reasoning (Batson, 1991; Francis, 2007; Ji, 2004). Cultural ideology (individualism and collectivism) is expected to be associated with higher levels of moral reasoning, based on the findings of past research (Lin & Ho, 2009; Walker & Taylor, 1991).

Theories

Kohlberg

Jean Piaget was the first to develop a theory of moral stages, which laid the foundation for Kohlberg's developmental theories (Woods, 1996). The main components of Kohlberg's theory are the six stages of moral reasoning as shown in Table 1(Walker, 1982). Kohlberg maintained that a person could not reach a particular stage based on socialization alone. That is, "socializing agents" such as parents cannot teach people to think about moral problems. Instead, social experiences promote development by stimulating mental processes (Crain, 1985). There are three levels, with two stages within each level as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Kohlberg's Levels and Stages of Moral Reasoning

Level	Stage
Preconventional	1. Obedience and Punishment (Child obeys rules handed down by authorities)
	2. Individualism and Exchange (Child understands that different individuals have an array of viewpoints)
Conventional	3. Good Interpersonal Relationships (Child realizes morality is more than obedience and behaving "good" establishes good relationships with others)
	4. Maintaining Social Order (Individual is becoming more concerned with society as a whole and strives to maintain social order)
Postconventional	5. Social Contract and Individual Rights (Individual begins to evaluate his/ her own society and question existing rights and values)

6. Universal Principles (Individual considers justice as benefitting all people)

Kohlberg claimed that the moral stages follow an invariant order. That is, moral development is irreversibly progressive, one stage at a time (Walker, 1989). As shown in Table 1, Stage 6 represents the highest stage of moral reasoning. Individuals at this stage can reason morally in a just way, and attainment of this stage is marked by the usage of universal principles. Universal principles are based upon impartiality and the worth of all persons (Walker, 1989). Additionally, reasoning at Stage 6 is characterized by the belief that people are ends in themselves and should never be used as means to an end (Crain, 1985). For example, an individual should not be given the harshest sentence for robbery in order to set an example for the public. Rather, this individual should receive the typical sentence for the crime and not be used as a means of deterring others from committing similar crimes.

As depicted in Table 1, individuals at Stage 6 consider rights to mean more than merely having civil liberties, and every individual is owed equal consideration of his or her interests in every situation (Crain, 1985). Additionally, individuals at Stage 6 make decisions consistent with the principles of reciprocity, respect for the dignity of all human beings, and equality of human rights (Cottone et al., 2007). By contrast, those at Stage 4 consider it important always to obey the law because if one person disobeys it, then it is possible everyone will. Those at this stage are focused on their obligation to uphold rules set forth by society (Kohlberg, 1973, pp. 630-646). Thus, those at Stage 4 are driven by a

need for social order and obedience, which indicates that their morality is being driven by an external force. Kohlberg (1973, pp. 630- 646) posited that most active members of society remain at Stage 4.

The stages emerge as an individual thinks about moral problems throughout the lifetime. Social situations and interactions with others help to generate new and change existing cognitive viewpoints, which results in both questioned and challenged stances (Kohlberg et al., 1975). In turn, new positions are formed and each stage is a reflection of these broader, more comprehensive viewpoints on what is fair and just (Kohlberg et al., 1975). In essence, Kohlberg's model indicates that moral action is based on concern for both fairness and justice (Woods, 1996). What exactly develops within people in order to allow them to move forward to each stage? As individuals develop a sense of justice, they are able to adjust their cognitive structures and formulate decisions based on what they believe is right or wrong, and who they believe carries responsibility for a given situation (Pratt, Golding, Hunter, & Sampson, 1988).

Procedural Justice Rules

What does it mean to be fair? Leventhal's procedural justice rules (1980) are used as a way of explaining Stage 6 reasoning. Stage 6 reasoning can be seen as a function of these rules. Procedural justice refers to fairness in resolving disputes and allocating resources. Procedural justice is recognized as being a component the American judicial system, and is interwoven in American legal proceedings, specifically due process (Myyry & Helkama, 2002). Leventhal (1980) suggested that people attribute more importance to procedural rules in favor of their personal interests, and these procedural rules (although used in the legal field) are also the way by which people reach Kohlberg's

postconventional moral stages (Stages 5 and 6). Leventhal's procedural justice theory postulates that fair procedures lead to fair outcomes (Myyry & Helkama, 2002)

There are five rules that compose the procedural justice theory. (1) *Consistency*: The procedure should be applied to all persons across time and if any changes are made, all persons who may be affected must be notified; (2) *Bias Suppression:* The individual who makes the decision (i.e., judge) should not be influenced by possible personal gain in the decision in order to ensure all arguments are considered equally; (3) *Accuracy*: Decisions should be based on expert opinion and precise information; (4) *Representativeness*: Those who are affected by the decision outcome should have the opportunity to voice their opinions; and (5) *Ethicality*: The procedure should be consistent with standard ethical principles (i.e., no bribery, invasion, and cheating) (Myyry & Helkama, 2002).

Kohlberg (1984, pp 51-52) wrote, "procedural justice is a concern more clearly distinguishable in high-stage moral judgments." Leventhal's procedural justice rules are associated with Kohlberg's moral stages in that they represent a specific cognitive style that some people may use to reach higher moral decisions in both real-life and hypothetical moral dilemmas. Myyry and Helkama's (2002) research supports the notion that Leventhal's procedural justice rules, specifically bias suppression, are used more frequently at the higher stages of moral reasoning in both real-life and hypothetical moral dilemmas.

Real-Life Decision-Making Model

Moral development research has focused largely on Kohlberg's moral stages in the past 30 years (Pratt, Hunsberger, Pancer, & Alisat, 2003). Rest and Narvaez (1995)

argue that there is extensive evidence which suggests that Kohlberg's stages are only "moderately predictive" of actual moral action, and so they put forth a model to explain how people address real-life moral decision-making. Its components function interactively in any situation (Pratt et al., 2003).

Rest and Narvaez's (1995) model's first component is *moral sensitivity* to the specific needs and viewpoints of participants in a situation. The second is *moral motivation,* which involves figuring out an actual plan of action for the situation. The third is *steadfastness,* which is described as the capacity to maintain the plan of action while maintaining purpose. The components provide a practical general portrayal of the processes at work in real-life moral decision-making (Pratt et al., 2003). For example, a student who values honesty more than a peer may determine a different plan of action in regards to cheating on a test. This example illustrates the main point of the model: there is a range of possibilities in the way people choose their plans of action based on individual goals and values (Erikson, 1982; Pratt et al., 2003).

During late adolescence, people determine which values are more or less important in their own lives, in the process of identity construction (Pratt et al., 2003). The findings in the Pratt et al. study support the hypothesis that engagement in prosocial activities promotes moral values. Specifically, those participants who reported being active in community service at age 17 were more likely to consider prosocial moral values important and relevant for themselves.

Leming (2001) investigated senior high-school students' identity formation in three conditions: community service requirement with an ethical reasoning component, community service with reflection, and no community service requirement. It was found

that subsequent to these interventions, students who had to perform community service with an ethical reasoning discussion made greater headway in identity formation and had a greater sense of academic responsibility when compared their classmates in the other two conditions. Leming explained that community service programs may help adolescents identify the values that "transcend the immediate concerns of family and self and connect them with the traditions of their communities (p. 34)." Thus, it seems that the ethical reasoning component enhances the experiences of community service to promote moral growth (Leming, 2001).

Impediments to Moral Development. The two obstacles to developing morality, according to Kohlberg (1969) are (1) an authoritarian parenting style, which does not allow children role-taking opportunities and (2) ideological indoctrination, which inhibits children's cognitive exploration and inquisition of dogmas and taboos (Puka, 2002). Kohlberg's theory has been controversial, not only because opponents such as Carol Gilligan have argued that his model is inadequate in representing moral judgment in women (Walker, 1989).

Critique of Kohlberg's Moral Stages

As a student of Lawrence Kohlberg, Carol Gilligan took interest in the stage theory of moral development. Gilligan (1982) argued that Kohlberg's developmental psychology theories were male-centered. In an attempt to explain why female participants were consistently scoring lower than males on Kohlberg's stages, Gilligan developed the Stages of Ethics of Care (Woods, 1996).

Similar to Kohlberg's stage theory, Gilligan posited three stages of moral development: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. The transition

through each stage is marked by changes in the sense of self, rather than adjustments in cognitive mechanisms (Gilligan, 1982). For example, in Gilligan's model, the goal for the preconventional stage is individual survival. The goal for the conventional stage is to view self-sacrifice as a positive element in one's life. The goal for the postconventional stage is the principle of nonviolence, which is characterized by adopting the principle to not hurt others or the self (Gilligan, 1982).

Gilligan posited that many people might never transition to the postconventional stage because the adoption of the principle of nonviolence is a difficult endeavor. Unlike Kohlberg, Gilligan posited that women's moral action concerns itself with "considerations of care and responsibility (Gilligan, 1982, p. 82)." In order to transition from preconventional to conventional morality, the shift from selfishness towards responsibility to others must occur. That is, the primary focus of care shifts from the self to the other (Pratt, Golding, Hunter, & Sampson, 1988). In order to reach the postconventional stage, one must transition from goodness (attempt to be a "good" person) to truth (accepting one's faults as a person) (Wood, 1996).

Care and Justice Reasoning. Gilligan (1982) claimed that there are two types of "moral voices," morality of care and morality of justice. They are ways people think about and make moral decisions. These "moral voices" can also be understood as moral *orientations* (Walker, 1989). These moral voices refer to different ways of explaining moral dilemmas that arise from human relationships, different ways of comprehending these problems, and different paths of action for resolving them (Tappan, 2006).

Possessing a justice orientation means considering moral dilemmas as conflicts between opposing positions that originate from individuals' rights and duties. Thus,

resolving moral conflicts involves weighing opposing claims and deciding which one carries the strongest argument. A justice orientation is guided by a commitment to duty, equality, and fairness through the application rules and standards (Walker, 1989).

By contrast, having a care orientation means considering moral dilemmas as stemming from tensions in relationships because people are bound to each other's needs and responsibilities. Therefore, a care orientation is guided by considerations of sensitivity to the needs of others and a desire to maintain relationships through compassion for the feelings and desires of others (Gilligan, 1982; Juuvarvi, 2006). Gilligan (1982) observed that a care orientation was innate in women's natural conflicts, and so it would be evident in their life choices such as education and career.

Gilligan's moral orientations (care and justice) theory was actually based on Kohlberg's earlier work, in which he described four orientations in addition to his well-known moral stages. The *normative orientation*, similar to Gilligan's justice orientation, gives emphasis to duty as defined by societal standards and rules. The *fairness orientation* emphasizes liberty, reciprocity, and equality, and the *utilitarianism orientation* emphasizes the welfare and/ or happiness that may result from moral action. The *perfectionism orientation* emphasizes achieving dignity and harmony with the self and others (Walker, 1989).

Juujarvi (2006) conducted a longitudinal study in which she administered the Ethics of Care Review (ECI) and the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) to all participants during the first test phase. The ECI was designed to measure care reasoning. It is a structured interview during which each participant is asked about four life dilemmas: (a) unplanned pregnancy, (b) marital fidelity, (c) care for a parent, and (d) one of the participant's real-

life dilemmas.

During the second test phase, both the ECI and MJI were administered to the participants in addition to a Self-Concept Interview. Eighty percent of participants were consistent in their justice reasoning over 2.2 years. Care reasoning was found to be consistent in 78% of the participants across all four dilemmas. Thirty-four percent of participants progressed in care reasoning and 48% progressed in justice reasoning. Four participants showed a decrease in justice reasoning and one participant regressed in care reasoning.

Social work and practical-nursing students were chosen because their scores on the ECI indicated they are empathetic, caring, and have been found to have further-developed identities in comparison to other occupations (Juujarvi, 2005). Social work and practical-nursing students, as hypothesized, progressed in care reasoning. All three samples progressed in justice reasoning. Juujarvi (2006) explains that the results are consistent with Kohlberg's and Piaget's theories concerning moral development in early adulthood, but as life experiences accumulate for an individual, care reasoning and justice reasoning both develop separately, but in parallel as a function of mature moral thought (Juujarvi, 2006).

Law-enforcement students were chosen because, in general, they are concerned with upholding laws, justice, and protecting civil rights. Differences were found for both genders. Women consistently scored higher in care reasoning. Care reasoning has been found to be more common in females because it is consistent with female identity development and the care-taking roles most commonly filled by women.

Walker, de Vries, and Trevethan (1987) investigated Gilligan's theory of two moral

orientations and Kohlberg's theory of moral stages to determine which could best explain participants' decision-making processes. Participants discussed their personal real-life moral dilemmas and had their reasoning compared to that of hypothetical dilemmas. The researchers aimed to determine whether Kohlberg's and/or Gilligan's theory would best explain moral development. Eighty family triads (mother, father, and child) were recruited for the study. Parents were working in diverse career fields. In the first phase of the study, participants were asked to take the MJI, which consisted of three hypothetical moral dilemmas, and then were probed as to what their reasoning was in reaching a decision. In the second phase, participants were asked to tell researchers about their experience with recent moral dilemmas. Specifically, they were asked to describe the conflict, explain the decision taken, and if they felt the decision was the right thing to do. By asking participants to explain their decisions after the hypothetical and real-life dilemmas, researchers were able to analyze their responses based on Kohlberg's moral stages and Gilligan's moral orientations.

Results indicated consistency in moral stage between responses to hypothetical and real-life dilemmas, which supports Kohlberg's claim that the stages are invariant in sequence. By contrast, fewer participants demonstrated consistent use of a single moral orientation. There was no gender difference found in moral stage (Walker et al., 1987).

Measuring Moral Development

Kohlberg developed the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) in 1987, which consisted of three stories that posed moral dilemmas. Each dilemma was followed by 9 to 12 questions that were devised to elicit responses that were used to identify the respondents' moral judgment perspective, thus placing him or her in one of Kohlberg's

moral stages (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). Kohlberg developed the MJI because hypothetical dilemmas would elicit the highest level of competence and so preconceptions would not interfere in participants' decision making. Hypothetical dilemmas are non-personal, which would mean participant responses would be non-biased and truthful (Walker, de Vries, & Trevethan, 1987).

Gender in Morality Research

The MJI has been used to test both men and women, but whereas women were consistently scoring at Stage 3, men were scoring higher at Stages 4 and 5 (Wood, 1996). Bussey and Maughan (1982) offer an explanation as to why gender is as significant a determinant as cognitive functioning at the level to which moral decisions are made. In Western cultures, men are generally socialized into an *instrumental orientation*, which emphasizes efficient problem- solving, whereas women are socialized into an *expressive orientation*, which emphasizes giving and getting affection. Both the instrumental style of men and the expressive style of women influence their moral judgments as much as their cognitive capacity. Therefore, empirical testing in moral judgment must not put either gender at a disadvantage (Bussey & Maughan, 1982).

Bussey and Maughan (1982) presented adult participants with the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI). The final sample consisted of 10 feminine females, 10 masculine males, 10 androgynous females, and 10 androgynous males. Each participant was given the MJI to complete, but 5 participants from each sex-role group received the original MJI in its original format (with male protagonists) and the other half of the participants in each sex-role group received revised MJI, which was altered to include all-female protagonists.

Results showed that male participants, when judging from the point of view of a female protagonist, averaged at Stage 3 of moral reasoning. By contrast, male participants who judged from the point of view of a male protagonist averaged at Stage 4 moral reasoning. Female participants scored at Stage 3 in both female and male protagonist conditions. Researchers determined that although participants' moral reasoning did not differ among their sex role types, males seem to believe that males and females make moral decisions differently. Specifically, they believe that males' decisions are based on laws and females' decisions are based on emotion. The decline in the men's scores in the revised MJI (female protagonists) is inconsistent with Kohlberg's claim that moral stages are invariant in their sequence and cognitively based (Colby & Kohlberg, 1977), and provides further support for Bussey and Maughan's (1982) claim that the MJI did not have sufficient construct validity.

Gender in morality research continues to be investigated. Resnick (2008) analyzed the film *Mean Girls* as a fictitious, but revealing glimpse into the moral life of American high-school teenage girls. The movie portrays how influential community is in shaping morality and behavior. Just as Gilligan (1982) makes distinctions between the moral orientations of each gender, she also posited that females could also employ male hierarchic social structures of domination rather than their typical networking structure. The plot of *Mean Girls* includes scenarios in which the teenage students are operating under a typically male hierarchic social structure of domination. Resnick's study is unique in that it provides support for Gilligan's theory of the differences among men and women's morality via popular culture.

Defining Issues Test

The Defining Issues Test (DIT; Rest, 1979) has been widely used in moral development research among college students, and was developed to combat the biases found with the MJI (Puka, 2002). DIT scores have been compared to scores from other domains to investigate the following in college students: education, identity development, cognitive development, academic achievement, locus of control, empathy, perspective-taking, tolerance, and conflict resolution (King & Mayhew, 2002). The DIT consists of five hypothetical moral dilemmas, and is constructed in much the same way as Kohlberg's original MJI.

Participants are asked to read six moral dilemmas and choose their answer based on what they believe should be done in each hypothetical situation: (1) a husband contemplates stealing a medication for his dying wife from a druggist demanding more money than the husband can pay, (2) a group of students protest their college president's office when they disagree with the president's decision about the curriculum, (3) A woman must decide whether to tell authorities that she has knowledge of an escaped prisoner's whereabouts, (4) a doctor must decide whether to give an overdose of pain-killer to a suffering but frail patient, (5) A business owner lied to a job candidate about an available position because other members of the community dislike the candidate's ethnicity, and (6) a school principal breaks a promise to a student writer after receiving pressure from parents of other students about publications in the school paper (King & Mayhew, 2002).

The DIT is a useful measure because it reveals distortions in cognitive processes that lead to poor judgment (Puka, 2002). One's beliefs may interfere with one's moral development, and the most common of these setbacks are close-mindedness, prejudice,

ego-defensiveness, and stereotyping (Puka, 2002). Scores on the DIT shed light on the conflict that exists between one's ability to deliberate on a moral issue and one's personal beliefs. The DIT is a good measure of moral reasoning because participant responses reflect cognitive processes at work in decision-making as well as impediments to development, which are the above-mentioned setbacks that are also known as personal ideologies. A personal ideology (belief), such as prejudice, can influence responses on the DIT, which could determine whether one scores lower than Stage 6 (Puka, 2002). Rather than saying that the DIT simply places someone at a stage, it is more useful to consider DIT responses as the product of both cognitive processes and tacit personal beliefs (Puka, 2002).

Education. Moral development is partly a product of higher education as measured by the DIT (King & Mayhew, 2002; Rest, 1979, 1987, 1988). Information about individuals' academic history should be taken into consideration to comprehend the variation in DIT scores (Maeda et al., 2009). Rest, Narvaez, Thoma, and Bebeau (1999) state that education is "powerfully related" to gains in moral growth. During college, students tend to increase their inclination for postconventional moral reasoning and this inclination cannot be attributed solely to intelligence or maturation (King & Mayhew, 2002). Instead, the college experience as a whole seems to result in a decrease in conventional moral reasoning. For the most part, the collegiate context encourages students to explore personal values and fosters the exchange of viewpoints regarding social issues, academic values, and personal integrity (Maeda et al., 2009). Most college communities are unique environments in that students are encouraged to discuss moral dilemmas in the classroom while wrestling with real ones of their own.

Institutional differences can account for variation in moral reasoning, and liberal arts colleges have been found to foster moral development more so than other types of universities (McNeel, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Institutions also differ in that they can be public or private, religious or secular. To demonstrate how moral development is affected by education, the current study investigated participants' academic history, including whether they attended a private or public, religious or secular high-school. Additionally, number of completed college semesters was measured because they have been found to be associated with increased moral growth (Finger, Borduin, & Baumstark, 1992).

Although DIT scores have shown to increase most with duration of college education, there are marked differences in the DIT scores of students from religious and secular colleges. Bunch (2005) found that students attending an interdenominational fundamentalist college with few hours of ethics discussion did not experience significant growth in moral reasoning. The college is identified as being fundamentalist in a theological sense in that it teaches the "inerrancy" of the Bible. The study compared three groups of students: lecture only classes, 25 hours of lectures classes and 7 hours of ethics class, and 30 hours of ethics class with no lecture classes. All participants were given the DIT to complete on the first and last day of classes. Only the students from the third group (30 hours ethics) improved their moral reasoning scores. Findings suggest that a strong biblically based curriculum alone does not promote moral development.

The high-school environment, although different from the collegiate experience, can also cultivate moral development. High-schools with similar missions that many American universities embrace (such as character development, identity development,

community service, and just leadership) can foster moral development in their students (King & Mayhew, 2002; Maeda et al., 2009).

By interviewing alumnae, Williams, Yanchar, and Jensen (2003) investigated the effects of a *Unified Studies* program in a public American high-school that has been active since 1975. *Unified Studies* focuses largely on high-involvement learning and "lived" experiences within and outside of the classroom. The program aims to teach students life-long lessons by requiring them to work closely in groups and in the natural environment. Additionally, the teachers in this program are required to be flexible, creative and dynamic in their teaching, as well as willing to work alongside the students during all activities (Williams et al., 2003). The authors found that this program, which was developed to build character and encourage life-long learning, had a self-reported positive effect on 99% of the graduates interviewed for their study. Participants reported "profound reverence" for their *Unified Studies* teachers, and 94% felt as though the program helped changed their lives for the better by helping them become respectful, contributing, and responsible citizens. The authors concluded that the success of the program is due largely in part to the way its teenage students were learning. Rather than forcing the students to adopt a set of values, the teachers let their students' own values emerge naturally from their experiences in team work, dialogue, problem-solving, and participation in all subject matters being taught.

In a similar study Whitney et al. (2005) asked urban high-school students (N = 271) from grades 9 to12 in special, honors, and standard classes to anonymously reflect on teachers they admire and classes in which they feel comfortable. The researchers identified three major themes concerning what students considered "good teaching:" (1)

personal connections, (2) balance, and (3) universality. The third theme is relevant to Kohlberg's final stage of moral development, wherein an individual considers justice as benefitting all people (Crain, 1985). Participants expressed their respect and appreciation for teachers who made sure every student understood the lesson. Seven students specifically reported that they believed teachers should be tolerant of all races, religions, and ethnicities.

The authors suggested that students look to their teachers as moral compasses and look to them for guidance in moral decision-making. Furthermore, teachers' actions and beliefs leave lasting impressions on their students. The current study investigated the impact of teachers as an element in education on participants' moral reasoning.

Kohlberg did not posit age requirements for attainment of each stage (Colby & Kohlberg, 1977). The current study investigated the high-school background of each participant because high-school environments may also play a role in post conventional moral development. Specifically, if the participants' high-schools required them to perform community service, had teachers who they considered role models, encouraged the exchange of viewpoints regarding social issues, academic values, and personal integrity, then these gains in moral reasoning should be reflected in DIT responses. Kohlberg's stages follow an invariant sequence (Colby & Kohlberg, 1977), and stage regression is not possible. This makes it reasonable to assume that high-school experiences similar to those found in college foster moral growth in high-school students and can be associated with responses on the DIT.

Quest. Cottone, Drucker, and Javier (2007) and Ji (2004) found that quest orientation is a significant predictor of post-conventional moral reasoning. Quest

"denotes the degree to which an individual's religion involves an open-ended, responsive dialogue with existential questions raised by the contradictions and tragedies of life," (Cottone et al., 2007, p. 40). Measuring religious affiliation and religious practice distinguishes between individuals high and low in religiosity. By contrast, measuring religious orientation is quite different in that it distinguishes different ways of being religious (Francis, 2007; Ji, 2004). The New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO) was developed to provide highly reliable measures of three separate constructs regarding what it means to be religious. The NIRO possesses good internal consistency reliability and was developed to be robust enough to transcend the effects of variables such as gender and ethnicity (Francis, 2007). The three religious orientations are intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest. All have three conceptual components identified within each (Batson, 1991).

The three components of intrinsic orientation are integration of religion and the rest of life, public religion (importance of attending church), and personal religion (importance of praying and reading for religious gain.) The three components of extrinsic orientation are compartmentalization (degree to which one's religion is separated from the rest of one's life), social support (use of religion in social life), and personal support (use of religion for personal comfort.) The three components of quest orientation are readiness to take on existential questions, perception of religious doubt as being constructive, and openness to change (Francis, 2007).

Individuals who record high scores on quest orientation on the NIRO feel compelled to ask religious questions because their life experiences have caused them to reconsider their religious beliefs. These individuals positively value religious uncertainty

and consider this uncertainty to be a vital component of being religious. These individuals also display readiness to consider different perspectives and expect that their religion will grow and change as they do. Additionally, these individuals also admit that because they continually question their religious beliefs, they view their religion as a journey rather than certain and stable (Francis, 2007).

Scriptural literalism can loosely be considered as quest's opposite (Batson, 1976). Kohlberg considered ideological indoctrination as a hindrance to moral development because it does not encourage critical thinking (Puka, 2002). Quest orientation is associated with abstract reasoning and cognitive flexibility (Batson, 1976). Quest represents a construct of criticism of the status quo, enthusiasm for personal freedom, and a proclivity toward intense thought. Quest orientation has been found to be positively correlated with post-conventional moral reasoning (Batson, 1976; Ji, 2004). Cottone et al. (2007) examined quest's correlation with post-conventional moral reasoning and hypothesized that the two would indeed correlate positively. Batson (1991) found that quest was a significant predictor of moral reasoning on the DIT. Ji (2004) proposed that future research investigating the relationship between religious orientation and moral reasoning be expanded to include the role of education in the shaping of morality.

Individualism and collectivism. Cultural ideology is a basic process involved in moral judgment and refers to groups' shared norms, principles, and values. Individualism-Collectivism (I/C) theory has been traditionally used as the basis for empirical evaluation of psychological distinctions that exist between countries with different cultures (Dy-Liacco, Piedmont, Murray-Swank, Rodgerson, & Sherman, 2009). Individualistic cultural ideology emphasizes independence, competition, individual

success, and exclusivity. Collectivistic cultural ideology emphasizes membership in groups, social behaviors determined by group norms, priority of group goals over personal ones, and consideration of the needs of others (Dy- Liacco et al., 2009).

No culture is completely individualistic or collectivistic. Rather, one ideology is usually found to be dominant. Moral judgments cannot be reduced to cultural ideology alone, but moral judgment can be explained as a product of the *combination* of cultural ideology and individual conceptual development (Narvaez, Getz, Rest, & Thoma, 1999). Cultural ideology is associated with moral judgment because the very nature of morality is intertwined with expected norms, principles, and values. Kohlberg's theoretical model emphasizes justice as being associated with the highest levels of moral reasoning, and principles of justice may differ between the two (I/C) cultural ideologies (Narvaez et al., 1999). The DIT is founded in Kohlberg's theory of moral stages, which posits that social experiences fuel mental processes (Crain, 1985). Cultural ideologies manifest in social experiences, thus culture is expected to be associated with moral judgment.

Cultural ideologies also manifest in parenting roles. Walker and Taylor (1991) examined parents' roles and interaction styles in their children's moral development. Findings indicated that children's moral development was best predicted by a parental style that involved supportive interactions and discussions. There was no relation found between parents' and children's' level of moral reasoning competence. In other words, the parents' ability did not suggest or ensure that their children would develop similarly (Walker & Taylor, 1991). Kohlberg posited that a hindrance to moral development is an authoritarian parenting style, which would not allow children role-taking opportunities (Puka, 2002). Findings from the Walker and Taylor (1991) study provide further support

for Kohlberg's claim because authoritarian parents do not usually participate in supportive discussions with their children about moral dilemmas.

The act of lying can mistakenly be assumed to be universally wrong. Fu, Xu, Cameron, Heyman, and Lee (2007) investigated a sample of Canadian and Chinese children's views on lying. The premise of the Fu et al. (2007) study was based on a moral dilemma: whether to tell a lie that might help an individual or a group, or to tell the truth, which may harm an individual or a group. Asian culture, which is generally collectivistic, condones lying when the truth harms group cohesiveness (Lin & Ho, 2009). Assuming that any given society's culture directly impacts its children's acquisition of the moral elements regarding truths and lies (Lin & Ho, 2009), Fu et al. (2007) found support for the hypotheses that Chinese children (age 7 to11 years) would assess lying as more positive when it serves group objectives than when it serves individual objectives, and that Canadian children would do the opposite. The majority of the Chinese sample rated truth telling to harm a group and help an individual as less positive than the alternative. The majority of the Canadian sample did the opposite and favored lies in benefit of individual objectives.

Findings from the Fu et al. (2007) and the Walker and Taylor (1991) study provide further evidence that cultural ideologies manifest in social experiences. The present study measured participants' culture by a scale developed by Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, and Lucca (1988).

Rationale for Current Study

Moral growth can be attributed to a variety of environmental factors and cognitive processes (King & Mayhew, 2002). Kohlberg theorized that social experiences promote

moral development by provoking mental processes (Crain, 1985).The current study focused on three variables associated with scores on the DIT: quest orientation, high-school education, and cultural values.

High-school can be a place of moral growth if its environment is rich in experiences similar to those usually found within college campuses. The collegiate context has been the preferred domain for many researchers who use the DIT (Maeda et al., 2009), but few studies have considered the influence of the high-school years. If there are no specific age requirements for Kohlberg's moral stages, then it should be possible to attain postconventional moral reasoning shortly after completing high-school. In addition to completed college semesters, participants in the present study were asked about their high-school experiences, specifically their participation in community service, the presence of a role model during high-school, and what type of high-school they attended. These are considered some of the building blocks of moral development (King & Mayhew, 2002).

Quest orientation is a significant predictor of postconventional moral reasoning (Drucker & Javier, 2007) and represents one's inquisitiveness about one's religion. It has been found to be associated with abstract reasoning and cognitive flexibility (Batson, 1976). Quest is a construct that involves the degree to which one questions one's religion when it cannot explain life's tragedies or circumstances (Cottone et al., 2007). The inquisitive nature of this construct reflects the way in which cognitive processes operate in moral decision-making. Kohlberg's Stage 6 involves the incorporation of universal principles. Scriptural literalism (quest's opposite) does not promote equal consideration of every person's interests in every situation (Crain, 1985).

In Kohlberg's model, justice is associated with higher moral stages, but the principle of justice may differ among I/C ideologies. Cultural values manifest in decisions and behaviors. The current study was expected to show a stronger association between a collectivistic rather than individualistic cultural ideology and moral judgment. Collectivistic cultures emphasize group needs over personal needs, and this ideology is expected to translate into considering justice for all in the hypothetical moral dilemmas of the DIT.

Moral judgment can be explained as a product of the combination of education, quest, and culture. The value of this study is in the combination of these factors that have not been previously investigated together as possible constituents of moral reasoning. Social experiences fuel mental processes (Crain, 1985). Experiences in high-school, such as the presence of a role model, the secularity or religiousness of the high-school environment, and performance of community service in addition to probing religious beliefs, and behaving in accordance to one's cultural ideology are all social experiences that together were expected to show advances in individual moral judgment.

Hypotheses

H_1: Quest orientation, collectivistic culture, and number of college credit hours would predict high scores on the DIT.

H_2: Attendance at a public high-school would predict high scores on the DIT

H_3: Completion and formal discussion of community service hours with either fellow students or teachers in a group setting would predict high scores on the DIT.

Method

Participants

A sample of 6 male and 44 female college students enrolled at Barry University Miami Shores, and attending at least one class in the Psychology Department participated in the study. Participants either received course credit or extra credit for participating. With 50 participants, the primary analysis had a power of .80 to detect a medium effect size. The sample consisted of 20% first-year college students, 30% sophomores, 24% juniors, 20% seniors, and 6% graduate students. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 26 years (M = 21.0). There were 3 missing cases of age among the sample. Forty-two percent of the sample attended public high-school and 58% of the sample attended private school. Eighty percent of the sample was required to discuss their community service experiences and 20% was not required. See Appendix A for consent form.

Materials

Demographic/ Academic Questionnaire. The nine items on this questionnaire include basic information about sex, age, ethnicity, high-school requirements, and completed college credit hours. See Appendix B for the demographic questionnaire.

New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO*).* The NIRO (Francis, 2007) measures the construct of religious orientation. Only the quest scale of the NIRO was used in this study. There are 6 items in this questionnaire. A sample item is: “I value my religious doubts and uncertainties.” The response format of the NIRO is 5-point Likert scale anchored as follows: *strongly agree* (1), *agree* (2), *not certain* (3), *disagree* (4) and *strongly disagree* (5). Participants’ quest scores are calculated by obtaining a mean from all 6 responses. High scores indicate a quest orientation. The quest portion of the NIRO has an alpha coefficient of .97 and it has been shown to be a highly reliable measure (Francis, 2007). See Appendix C for the quest portion of the NIRO.

Individualism-Collectivism Scale (INDCOL). The INDCOL (Trandis, Bontempo, & Villareal, 1988) is composed of 29 items. Many of the items of the scale were adopted from Hui (1984) and Trandis (1985). There are 12 items that measure self-reliance, 10 items that measure concern for in-group, and 7 items that measure distance from in-groups. A sample item is: "Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life." The response format of the INDCOL is 5-point Likert scale anchored as follows: *strongly agree* (1), *agree* (2), *not certain* (3), *disagree* (4), and *strongly disagree* (5). Participants' culture scores are calculated by obtaining a mean from all 29 responses High scores indicated a predominant collectivistic cultural value. See Appendix D for the INDCOL.

Defining Issues Test (DIT). The DIT is a projective measure composed of six stories, or moral dilemmas, followed by questions concerning how the dilemmas should be considered. It has been widely used (over 500,000 participants worldwide) to investigate moral reasoning and has consistently been found to be a reliable and valid measure (Rest et al., 1979). The DIT has 12 considerations for each story that participants rated in order of importance. They were then asked to indicate their first, second, third, and fourth most important considerations in deciding what the right thing to do is in each of the stories. Participants' DIT scores were derived by obtaining a P-score, which is the calculated score of relative importance given to moral considerations in making a decision. The DIT Manual (Rest, 1986) specifies how to calculate the P-score and provides a scoring sheet. High scores indicated postconventional moral reasoning. See Appendix E for the DIT.

Procedure

Participants were tested in small groups. The experimenter handed out informed consent forms. Once consent forms were signed, the experimenter collected them and stored them apart from the other materials. Then the participants received envelopes containing four questionnaires in the order in which they were described above.

Results

Correlations were computed among two predictor variables and the outcome variable. The results of the correlations among quest, culture, and DIT can be seen below in Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Quest, Culture, and DIT (Morality)

Measure	1	2	3	*M*	*SD*
1. Quest	-	.36*	.14	20.02	4.03
2. Culture		-	.08	100.28	6.80
3. DIT			-	30.38	11.79

Note. $N = 50$
* $p < .05$

There was a significant relationship between participants' quest scores and culture scores, $r = .36$, $p < .05$. This reflects a relationship between collectivistic cultural values and the tendency to question religious beliefs.

An independent samples *t* test was conducted to compare DIT (morality) scores in public and private high-school conditions. Participants who attended public high-school ($M = 29.61$, $SD = 12.40$) did not score higher on the DIT than participants who attended private high-school ($M = 30.93$, $SD = 11.52$), $t\ (48) = .39$, $p = .702$.

Another independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare DIT scores in discussion of community service condition and non-discussion of community service condition. Participants who completed and discussed their community service experiences ($M = 33.47$, $SD = 14.52$) did not score higher on the DIT than participants who did not discuss their community service experiences ($M = 29.41$, $SD = 10.60$), $t\ (37) = 1.00$, $p = .32$.

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to test if quest, culture, and number of credit hours predicted participants' DIT scores, $R^2 = .022$, $F\ (3, 43) = .33$, $p < .001$.

Discussion

The main aim of this study was to investigate whether religious orientation, culture, and academic experiences would impact moral reasoning as defined by Kohlberg's (1981) model. Although each factor has previously been studied as a constituent of morality (Batson, 1976; Cottone et al., 2007; Ji, 2004; King & Mayhew, 2002; Leming, 2001; Narvaez et al., 1999; Triandis et al., 1988), the current study was the first to investigate all three simultaneously as components of moral reasoning using the NIRO, INDCOL, and DIT as measures.

The results lent no support to any of the three hypotheses. Morality was not interrelated with any other variable (see Table 2.) The results are not consistent with the findings of previous studies, which indicate that culture, religion, and education each play a role in the formation of a person's morality. A significant relation was, however found among the two predictor variables quest and culture. This reflects an increase in collectivistic cultural values, as there is an increase in the tendency to question religious

beliefs. The NIRO has consistently been shown to be a highly reliable measure of religious orientation (Francis, 2007), and quest orientation a significant predictor of post-conventional moral reasoning (Cottone, Drucker, and Javier, 2007; Ji, 2004). It in unclear why quest was not found to be correlated with morality in the present study, but there is a great deal of empirical support of quest's relation to moral reasoning (Batson, 1976; Francis, 2007; Ji, 2004; Puka, 2002). Individuals who demonstrate quest orientations continually question their religious beliefs and view their religions in terms of a journey rather than certain and stable (Francis, 2007).

No significant differences were found in DIT scores of participants who attended public high-school and of those who attended private high-school. This basic institutional difference did not account for participants' moral growth. High-schools that promote leadership skills, character development, and identity formation are those that cultivate moral development in their students (King & Mayhew, 2002). The result of this study could signify that whether a high-school is public or private has little-to-no influence on the moral development of its students. Instead there are other contingencies at play in the high-school environment affecting morality development during these pre-college years.

Results also showed that participants' community service experiences did not predict DIT scores. Critical thinking is fundamental to the moral decision-making process because several considerations must be weighed in order to make determinations (Leming, 2001). Results suggest that discussion of community service hours at some point during their high-school years may not have been sufficient enough to foster moral growth in the participants. Although the current study investigated the relationship between community service discussions and morality, there are numerous ways in which

academic experiences could facilitate moral development (King & Mayhew, 2002; Maeda et al., 2009). While the current study investigated events from high-school, the majority of studies that have investigated the relationship between academia and morality honed in on the experiences of higher education (Maeda et al., 2009). College communities, institutional differences, and classroom discussions are three ways in which moral development is impacted by higher education (Finger et al., 1992; McNeel, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Completed credit was the only college-related factor hypothesized to predict higher DIT scores, but the results provided no supporting evidence for what was expected. First-years, sophomores, and juniors comprised 74% of the student sample, and as expected, seniors and graduate students had the most credits.

A limitation in the current study was that of non-counterbalanced measures. The DIT is a lengthy questionnaire that requires concentration in making important considerations about six dilemmas. Each participant received the questionnaires in the same order (see appendices B through E) with the DIT being last. If the sequence of the questionnaires were changed to: DIT, INDCOL, NIRO, and demographic/academic for half of the participants, there may have been more control over confounding variables. This may have affected participants' scores and the resulting analyses.

Implications for Future Morality Research

The NIRO is a valuable tool for future research in moral development because its efficacy has been established in various studies (Batson, 1976; Francis, 2007; Ji, 2004; Puka, 2002) and its relationship with collectivistic cultural values was found to be significant in the current study.

It is arguable that there have been notable religious figures throughout history that have

exhibited quest orientations- their religions have involved open-ended responsive dialogues with existential questions raised by the contradictions and tragedies of life. Mahatma Ghandi, the Dalai Lama, and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. all advocated for nonviolent social change, and have been heralded by millions as being prolific, highly moral leaders.

In regards to public versus private school, it seems this fundamental difference in institution is not enough to determine the moral status of a high-school's students. Whether a school is private or publicly funded cannot account for differences in morality scores. Future investigations should instead focus on the core values of any given high-school institution, specifically pedagogic strategies, mission statements, and leadership-building programs. Similarly, future research should explore more than just community service in investigations of high-school experiences conducive to moral growth. The exchange of viewpoints that occur during discussions about community service can also take place in a variety of other contexts (King & Mayhew, 2002) such as in specialized programs aimed to teach critical thinking.

Although completed college credits did not predict higher DIT scores, there is unquestionable value in the college experience as a whole in the development of postconventional moral reasoning. College students, more so than high-school students, are encouraged to discuss moral dilemmas in the classroom while dealing with real ones in their own lives (Maeda et al., 2009). Kohlberg (1981) did, however, posit that intelligence alone cannot account for advances in moral reasoning, and this could explain why college coursework did not predict DIT scores. Therefore, future morality research must explore other college experiences that promote postconventional moral reasoning.

References

Althof, W., & Berkowitz, M. (2006). Moral education and character education: Their relationship and roles in citizenship education. *Journal of Moral Education, 35,* 495-518. doi:10.1080/03057240601012204

Bunch, W. (2005). Changing moral judgment in divinity students. *Journal of Moral Education, 34,* 363-370. doi:10.1080/03057240500211543

Burke, A., Harper, M., Rudnick, H., & Kruger, G. (2007). Moving beyond statutory ethical codes: Practitioner ethics as a contextual, character-based enterprise. *South African Journal of Psychology, 37,* 107-120.

Bussey, K., & Maughan, B. (1982). Gender differences in moral reasoning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42,* 701-706. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.42.4.701

Bruggeman, E., & Hart, K. (1996). Cheating, lying, and moral reasoning by religious and secular high-school students. *Journal of Educational Research, 89,* 340-344.

Corsini, R. & Wedding, D. (2010). *Current psychotherapies: ninth edition*. Belmont: Cengage Learning.

Cottone, J., Drucker, P., & Javier, R. (2007). Predictors of Moral Reasoning: Components of Executive Functioning and Aspects of Religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 46,* 37-53. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5906.2007.00339.x

Crain, W.C. (1985). *Theories of Development (2nd ed.).* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Crowson, H., DeBacker, T., & Thoma, S. (2007). Are DIT score empirically distinct from measures of political identification and intellectual ability? A test using post-9/11 data. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 25*, 197-211. doi:10.1348/026151006X103627

Dy-Liacco, G., Piedmont, R., Murray-Swank, N., Rodgerson, T., & Sherman, M. (2009). Spirituality and religiosity as cross-cultural aspects of human experience. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 1*, 35-52. doi:10.1037/a0014937

Emler, N., Tarry, H., & St. James, A. (2007). Post-conventional moral reasoning and reputation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*, 76-89. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2006.02.003

Erikson, E. (1982). *The life cycle completed*. New York: Norton Company.

Finger, W., Borduin, C., & Baumstark, K. (1992). Correlates of moral judgment development in college students. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 153*, 221-223.

Francis, L. (2007). Introducing the New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO): Conceptualization and measurement. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 10*, 585-602.

Fu, G., Xu, F., Cameron, C., Heyman, G., & Lee, K. (2007). Cross-cultural differences in children's choices, categorizations, and evaluations of truths and lies. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 278-293. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.2.278

Giacalone, R. (2007). Taking a red pill to disempower unethical students: Creating ethical sentinels in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 6,* 534-542.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gibbs, J., Basinger, K., Grime, R., & Snarey, J. (2007). Moral judgment development across cultures: Revisiting Kohlberg's universality claims. *Developmental Review, 27,* 443-500. doi:10.1016/j.dr.2007.04.001

Guttmann, J. (1984). Cognitive morality and cheating behavior in religious and secular school children. *Journal of Educational Research, 77,* 249-254.

Hardy, S. (2006). Identity, reasoning, and emotion: An empirical comparison of three sources of moral motivation. *Motivation and Emotion, 30,* 207-215. doi:10.1007/s11031-006-9034-9

Haviv, S., & Leman, P. (2002). Moral decision-making in real life: Factors affecting moral orientation and behaviour justification. *Journal of Moral Education, 31,* 121-140. doi:10.1080/03057240220143241

Henderson, K. (1998, May). Moral reasoning, empathy, and behavior of students with and without emotional and behavioral disorders and learning disabilities: Impact of a structured program of experiential learning activities involving animals and nature. *Dissertation Abstracts International*: Section A.

Hogan, M. (2005). The Choice of Character. PsycCRITIQUES, *50.* doi:10.1037/05229012

Jensen, L. (2008). Through two lenses: A cultural-developmental approach to moral psychology. *Developmental Review, 28,* 289-315. doi:10.1016/j.dr.2007.11.001

Ji, C. (2004). Religious orientations in moral development. J*ournal of Psychology and Christianity, 23,* 22-30.

Juujärvi, S. (2006). Care reasoning in real-life moral conflicts. *Journal of Moral Education, 35,* 197-211. doi:10.1080/03057240600681728

Juujärvi, S. (2006). The ethic of care development: A longitudinal study of moral reasoning among practical-nursing, social-work and law-enforcement students. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 47,* 193-202. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2006.00507.x

King, P., & Mayhew, M. (2002). Moral judgment development in higher education: Insights from the Defining Issues Test. *Journal of Moral Education, 31,* 247-270. doi:10.1080/0305724022000008106

Kohlberg, L. (2008). The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: I. Sequence in the development of moral thought. *Human Development, 51,* 8-20. doi:10.1159/000112530

Krebs, D., & Denton, K. (2006). Explanatory limitations of cognitive-developmental approaches to morality. *Psychological Review, 113,* 672-675. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.113.3.672

Kristjánsson, K. (2006). Emulation and the use of role models in moral education. *Journal of Moral Education, 35,* 37-49. doi:10.1080/03057240500495278

Kroll, J., Egan, E., Keshen, R., Carre, G., Johnson, M., & Carey, K. (2007). Moral worry and religiosity in US and Canadian college samples. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 10,* 621-630.

Leming, J. (2001). Integrating a structured ethical reflection curriculum into high-school community service experiences: Impact on students' sociomoral development. *Adolescence, 36,* 33-45.

Lies, J. (2006). Effects of service-learning on college student moral reasoning. *Dissertation Abstracts International*: Section A.

Lin, C., & Ho, Y. (2009). Cultural influences on moral reasoning capacities of purchasing managers: A comparison across the Taiwan Strait. *Social Behavior and Personality, 37,* 203-208. doi:10.2224/sbp.2009.37.2.203

Maclean, A., Walker, L., & Matsuba, M. (2004). Transcendence and the moral self: Identity integration, religion, and moral life. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 43,* 429-437. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5906.2004.00245.x

Maeda, Y., Thoma, S., & Bebeau, M. (2009). Understanding the relationship between moral judgment development and individual characteristics: The role of educational contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101,* 233-247. doi:10.1037/a0013381

Mayhew, M., & King, P. (2008). How curricular content and pedagogical strategies affect moral reasoning development in college students. J*ournal of Moral Education, 37,* 17-40. doi:10.1080/03057240701803668

Myyry, L., & Helkama, K. (2002). Moral reasoning and the use of procedural justice rules in hypothetical and real-life dilemmas. *Social Justice Research, 15,* 373-391. doi:10.1023/A:1021271108440

Narvaez, D., Getz, I., Rest, J., & Thoma, S. (1999). Individual moral judgment and cultural ideologies. *Developmental Psychology, 35,* 478-488. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.35.2.478

Nasir, N., & Kirshner, B. (2003). The cultural construction of moral and civic identities. *Applied Developmental Science, 7,* 138-147. doi:10.1207/S1532480XADS0703

Neff, J. (2006). Exploring the Dimensionality of 'Religiosity' and 'Spirituality' in the Fetzer Multidimensional Measure. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 4,* 449-459. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5906.2006.00318.x

Osguthorpe, R. (2008). Review of 'Ethical visions in education: Philosophies in practice'. *Journal of Moral Education, 37,* 133-135. doi:10.1080/03057240701803734

Helton, W., & Helton, N. (2007). The intrinsic value of nature and moral education. *Journal of Moral Education, 36,* 139-150. doi:10.1080/03057240701325225

Pratt, M., Golding, G., Hunter, W., & Sampson, R. (1988). Sex differences in adult moral orientations. *Journal of Personality, 56,* 373-391. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1988.tb00891.x

Pratt, S. (2002, March). Moral development in college students engaged in community service learning: A justice-care perspective. *Dissertation Abstracts International*: 62.

Pratt, M., Hunsberger, B., Pancer, S., & Alisat, S. (2003). A Longitudinal Analysis of Personal Values Socialization: Correlates of a Moral Self-Ideal in Late Adolescence. *Social Development, 12,* 563-585. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00249

Puka, B. (2002). The DIT and the 'dark side' of development. *Journal of Moral Education, 31,* 339-352. doi:10.1080/0305724022000008157

Resnick, D. (2008). Life in an unjust community: A Hollywood view of high-school moral life. *Journal of Moral Education, 37,* 99-113. doi:10.1080/03057240701803718

Rest J. & Narvaez, D. (1995). The four components of acting morally. In. W. Kurtines & J. Gerwitz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S., & Bebeau, M. (1999). DIT2: Devising and testing a revised instrument of moral judgment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91,* 644-659. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.91.4.644

Revell, L., & Arthur, J. (2007). Character education in schools and the education of teachers. *Journal of Moral Education, 36,* 79-92. doi:10.1080/03057240701194738

Skoe, E., Cumberland, A., Eisenberg, N., Hansen, K., & Perry, J. (2002). The influences of sex and gender-role identity on moral cognition and

prosocial personality traits. *Sex Roles*, *46*, 295-309. doi:10.1023/A:1020224512888

Stables, A. (2005). Multiculturalism and moral education: Individual positioning, dialogue and cultural practice. *Journal of Moral Education*, *34*, 185-197. doi:10.1080/03057240500127152

Tappan, M. (2006). Moral functioning as mediated action. *Journal of Moral Education*, *35*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/03057240500495203

Thoma, S., & Rest, J. (1999). The relationship between moral decision making and patterns of consolidation and transition in moral judgment development. *Developmental Psychology, 35,* 323-334. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.35.2.323

Triandis, H., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 323-338. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.2.323

Tudin, P., Straker, G., & Mendolsohn, M. (1994). Social and political complexity and moral development. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *24*, 163-168.

Walker, L. (1982). The sequentiality of Kohlberg's stages of moral development. *Child Development*, *53,* 1330-1336. doi:10.2307/1129023

Walker, L. (1986). Experiential and cognitive sources of moral development in adulthood. *Human Development, 29,* 113-124.

Walker, L., de Vries, B., & Trevethan, S. (1987). Moral stages and moral orientations in real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. *Child Development, 58,* 842-858. doi:10.2307/1130221

Walker, L. (1989). A longitudinal study of moral reasoning. *Child Development, 60,* 157-166. doi:10.2307/1131081

Walker, L., & Taylor, J. (1991). Family interactions and the development of moral reasoning. *Child Development, 62,* 264-283. doi:10.2307/1131002

Walker, L. (2002). The model and the measure: An appraisal of the Minnesota approach to moral development. *Journal of Moral Education, 31,* 353-367. doi:10.1080/0305724022000008160

Whitney, J., Leonard, M., Leonard, W., Camelio, M., & Camelio, V. (2005). Seek balance, connect with others, and reach all students: High-school students describe a moral imperative for teachers. *The High-school Journal, 89,* 29-39. doi:10.1353/hsj.2005.0024

Williams, D., Yanchar, S., Jensen, L., & Lewis, C. (2003). Character education in a public high-school: A multi-year inquiry into Unified Studies. *Journal of Moral Education, 32,* 3-33. doi:10.1080/0305724022000073310

Woods, C. (1996). Gender differences in moral development and acquisition: A review of Kohlberg's and Gilligan's models of justice and care. *Social Behavior and Personality, 24,* 375-384. doi:10.2224/sbp.1996.24.4.375

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1999). Youth service and moral-civic identity: A case for everyday morality. *Educational Psychology Review, 11,* 361-376. doi:10.1023/A:1022009400250

Zarinpoush, F., Cooper, M., & Moylan, S. (2000). The effects of happiness and sadness on moral reasoning. *Journal of Moral Education, 29*, 397-412. doi:10.1080/713679391

Appendix A

Consent Form

Barry University
Informed Consent Form

Your participation in a research project is requested. The title of the study is *Decision-Making in Moral Dilemmas.* The research is being conducted by Ana Lambrakopoulos, a graduate student in the Psychology Department at Barry University, and is seeking information that will be useful in the field of moral development. The aims of the research are to find how people think about moral issues. In accordance with these aims, the following procedures will be used: you will be asked to fill out four questionnaires. We anticipate the number of participants to be one hundred.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to do the following: answer items on four questionnaires about your high-school experience, your cultural views, your thoughts on religion, and what you think about 7 stories that involve a

moral dilemma. This will take approximately 35-45 minutes to complete. After you are finished, the researcher will skim your pages to see if you have accidentally skipped any items. If there are items left blank, she will offer you the opportunity to fill them in. If you choose not to do so, there will be no penalty and you will still receive the class credits. After this, you will place your materials in the envelope provided, seal it, and return it to the researcher. This signed consent form will not be in the envelope and your name will not be on any of the other materials.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects on your class credit or extra credit.

There are no known risks. Although there are no direct benefits to you, your participation in this study may help our understanding of what factors are involved in thinking about moral dilemmas and you will learn how psychologists typically study this.

As a research participant, information you provide will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Any published results of the research will refer to group averages only and no names will be used in the study. Data will be kept in a locked file in the Psychology Department. Your signed consent form will be kept separate from the data. All data will be destroyed after 2 years.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Ana Lambrakopoulos through Andrea Bello in the Department of Psychology at (305) 899- 3270 or by email at **ana.lambrakopoulos@mymail.barry.edu** or my supervisor, Dr. Lenore Szuchman, at (305) 899-3278 or by email at **lszuchman@mail.barry.edu**. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Barbara Cook, at (305) 899-3020. If you are satisfied with the information provided and are willing to participate in this research, please signify your consent by signing this consent form.

Voluntary Consent

I acknowledge that I have been informed of the nature and purposes of this experiment by Ana Lambrakopoulos and that I have read and understand the information presented above, and that I have received a copy of this form for my records. I give my voluntary consent to participate in this experiment.

_____ _____

Signature of Participant *Date*

_____ _____ _____ _____

Researcher *Date* *Witness* *Date*

(Witness signature is required only if research involves pregnant women, children, other vulnerable populations, or if more than minimal risk is present.)

Appendix B

Demographic/ Academic Questionnaire

Please complete the following questions. It is important for you to be completely honest. All of your answers will be kept confidential.

1. Sex:

Male	O
Female	O

2. Age:

_____

For question 3, please consider the following definition. ***Ethnic group*:** A group whose members identify with each other, through a common heritage that is real or presumed. Ethnic identity is further marked by recognition of common cultural, linguistic, religious, and behavioral traits as indicators of contrast to other groups.

3. What is your predominant ethnicity?

_____

Academic history

1. What type of high-school did you attend?
   - Private O
   - Public O
   - Home School O

2. Was your high-school religiously affiliated?
   - Yes O
   - No O

3. Were you required by your high-school institution to perform community service?
   - Yes O
   - No O

4. If you answered yes for question 3, which of the following options best describes your experience? (Please choose only one.)

I completed my community service requirement and was not required to formally discuss my experience with either fellow students or faculty members in a group setting
O

I completed my community service requirement and was required to formally discuss my experience with either fellow students or teachers in a group setting. O

I did not complete my community service hours. O

5. While I was in high-school, I had a teacher who I looked up to and/ or considered a role model

Yes	O
No	O

6. Current class/year:

First year	O
Sophomore	O
Junior	O
Senior	O
Graduate	O

Major:

_____

7. Not including the current semester, approximately how many credit hours of college coursework have you completed?

_____

Appendix C

The New Indices of Religios Orientation (NIRO)

Please rate the following statements

1. I was driven to ask religious questions by a growing awareness of the tensions in my world.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

2. My life experiences have led me to re-think my religious beliefs.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

3. I value my religious doubts and uncertainties.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

4. For me, doubting is an important part of what it means to be religious.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

5. As I grow and change, I expect my religion to grow and change as well.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

6. I am constantly questioning my religious beliefs.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

Appendix D

Individualism- Collectivism (INDCOL)

Please rate the following statements.

1. If the group is slowing me down, it is better to leave it and work alone.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

2. To be superior, every man must stand alone.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

3. Winning is everything.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

4. Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

5. If you want something done right, you've got to do it yourself.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

6. What happens to me is my own doing.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

7. I feel winning is important in both work and games.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

8. Success is the most important thing in life.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O O O O O

9. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Certain Disagree Strongly Disagree

O	O	O	O	O

10. Doing your best is not enough; it is important to win.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

11. In most cases, to cooperate with someone whose ability is lower than oneself is not as desirable as doing the thing on one's own.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

12. In the long run the only person you can count on is yourself.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

13. It is foolish to try to preserve resources for future generations.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

14. People should not be expected to do anything for the community unless they are paid for it.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

15. Even if a child won the Nobel Prize the parents should not feel honored in any way.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

16. I would not let my parents use my car (if I had one), no matter whether they are good drivers or not.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

17. I would help within my means if a relative told me that she or he is in financial difficulty.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

18. I like to live close to my friends,

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

19. The motto “sharing is both a blessing and a calamity” is still applicable even if one’s friend is clumsy, dumb, and causing a lot of trouble.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

20. When my colleagues tell me personal things about themselves, we are drawn closer together.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

21. I would not share my ideas and newly acquired knowledge with my parents.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

22. Children should not feel honored even if the father were highly praised and given an award by a government official for his contributions and service to the community.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

23. I am not to blame if one of my family members fails.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

24. My happiness in unrelated to the well being of my co-workers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

25. My parents' opinions are not important in my choice of a spouse.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

26. I am not to blame when one of my close friends fails.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

27. My co-workers' opinions are not important in my choice of a spouse.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

28. When a close friend of mine is successful, it does not really make me look better.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

29. One need not worry about what the neighbors say about whom one should marry.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Certain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
O	O	O	O	O

Appendix E

Defining Issues Test (DIT)

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.

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 and 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 in the right.)

IMPORTANCE:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
				X	1. Whether the car dealer was in the in the same block where Frank lives. (Note that in this sample, the person taking the questionnaire did not think this was important in making a decision.)
X					2. Would a used car be more economical in the long run than a new car. (Not 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.)
		X			3. Whether the color was green, Frank's favorite color.
				X	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."
X					5. Would a large, roomy car be better than a compact car.
				X	6. Whether the front connibilies were differential. (Note that if a statement sounds like nonsense to you, mark it "no importance.")

Instructions for Part B (Sample Question)

From the list of the questions above, select the more important one of the whole group. Put the number of the most important questions 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	SECOND MOST IMPORTANT	THIRD MOST IMPORTANT	FOURTH 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 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 to

make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2000 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 $1000, 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. Bu 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:

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

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 any army ROTC program. SDS students are against the war in Vietnam, and the army training program helps send men to fight in Vietnam. 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 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 attention to the faculty vote or to their demands. So, one day in 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 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:

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

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 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)

_____Yes, she should report him

_____Can't decide

_____No, she should not report him

IMPORTANCE:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
					1. Hasn't Mr. Thompson been good enough for such a long time to prove he isn't a bad person?
					2. Every time 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 escaped criminal, regardless of the circumstances?
					11. How would the will of the people and the public good best be served?
					12. How 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_____

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 painkiller 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 giver 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 giver the lady an overdose that would make her die

_____Can't decide

_____Should not give the 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 overdoes 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 look 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 lady'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 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_____

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 a 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. Weber is he could have the job, Mr. Webster said that he had already hired someone 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:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
					1. Does the owner of a business have the right to take 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 be otherwise 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 is 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_____

NEWSPAPER

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 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.

Should the principal stop the newspaper? (Check one)

_____Should stop it

_____Can't decide

_____Should not stop it

IMPORTANCE:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
					1. Is the principal more responsible to students or to the parents?
					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?
					3. Would the students start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper?
					4. When the welfare of the school is threatened, does the principal have the right to give orders to students?
					5. Does the principal have the freedom of speech to say "no" in this case?
					6. If the principal stopped the newspaper would it be preventing full discussion of important problems?
					7. Whether the principal's order would make Fred lose faith in the principal.
					8. Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his country.
					9. What effect would stopping the paper have on the student's education in critical thinking and judgments?
					10. Whether Fred was in any way violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions.
					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.
					12. Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent.

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

Most important_____
Second Most Important_____
Third Most Important_____
Fourth Most Important_____